Seattle Community Design Process Online Survey

1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path

	Response Count
	765
answered question	765
skipped question	182

2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East

	Response Count
	575
answered question	575
skipped question	372

3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside

	Response Count
	665
answered question	665
skipped question	282

4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East

	Response Count
	421
answered question	421
skipped question	526

5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East

	Response Count
	581
answered question	581
skipped question	366

6. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration

	Response Count
	345
answered question	345
skipped question	602

7. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

	Response Count
	359
answered question	359
skipped question	588

8. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?

	Response Count
	464
answered question	464
skipped question	483

9. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?

	Response Count
	550
answered question	550
skipped question	397

10. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	Response Count
	812
answered question	812
skipped question	135

11. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	Response Count
	617
answered question	617
skipped question	330

12. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

	Response Count
	505
answered question	505
skipped question	442

13. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	Response Count
	554
answered question	554
skipped question	393

14. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

	Response Count
	348
answered question	348
skipped question	599

15. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	Response Count
	505
answered question	505
skipped question	442

16. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

	Response Count
	288
answered question	288
skipped question	659

17. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate to the Arboretum

	Response Count
	542
answered question	542
skipped question	405

18. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

	Response Count
	537
answered question	537
skipped question	410

19. Goals The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	Response Count
	545
answered question	545
skipped question	402

20. Regional shared-use path The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	Response Count
	446
answered question	446
skipped question	501

21. Diverse users The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs?

	Response Count
	334
answered question	334
skipped question	613

22. Effective planning and broad participation The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	Response Count
	273
answered question	**273**
skipped question	**674**

23. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area shown is:

	Very Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	Response Count
Roanoke Area	15.1% (97)	**53.1% (342)**	23.3% (150)	5.6% (36)	3.0% (19)	644
Portage Bay Bridge Area	11.8% (75)	**47.1% (300)**	26.1% (166)	9.4% (60)	5.7% (36)	637
Montlake Area	16.2% (103)	**36.1% (229)**	24.1% (153)	9.9% (63)	13.7% (87)	635
West Approach Bridge Area	12.2% (76)	**48.1% (299)**	29.0% (180)	5.6% (35)	5.0% (31)	621
Bicycle and pedestrian connections	20.1% (132)	**38.0% (249)**	21.5% (141)	14.5% (95)	5.9% (39)	656
					answered question	**680**
					skipped question	**267**

24. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?

	Response Count
	419
answered question	**419**
skipped question	**528**

25. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Bellevue	4.5%	37
Clyde Hill	0.6%	5
Downtown Seattle	3.5%	29
Eastlake	1.5%	12
Eastside	2.5%	21
Hunts Point	0.0%	0
Kirkland	4.7%	39
Laurelhurst	1.7%	14
Madison Park	2.5%	21
Medina	0.5%	4
Montlake	14.8%	122
North Capitol Hill	8.9%	73
Portage Bay	1.3%	11
Redmond	3.3%	27
Roanoke	0.8%	7
Shelby/Hamlin	1.2%	10
University District	7.5%	62
Yarrow Point	0.2%	2
Other (please specify)	**39.8%**	**328**
	answered question	**824**
	skipped question	**123**

26. Personal information

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name:	90.9%	441
Address:	84.1%	408
Address 2:	9.1%	44
City/Town:	92.0%	446
State:	93.6%	454
ZIP:	**96.1%**	**466**
	answered question	**485**
	skipped question	**462**

27. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	31.2%	207
No	32.9%	218
Already receive email updates	**35.9%**	**238**
	If yes, please enter your email address:	209
	answered question	**663**
	skipped question	**284**

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
1	This is a smart idea that I greatly support. I see that separating pedestrian and bicycle traffic from auto traffic would make inter-modal interactions in this busy crossing safer. It would be imperative to include a seemless connection from this path to the west side of the lid, which should further connect seemlessly, meaning by separated shared-use path, to the east with a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-Use trail.	Oct 5, 2012 11:35 PM
2	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail. Important!	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 PM
3	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 PM
4	It's crucial that for the long term bicycle master plan that the bike lanes continue from the Montalke intersection, across the portage bay bridge, and then connect down to Eastlake. In support of this vision, this should not be a shared use path but have a dedicated bike lane for serious east side to west side commuters to use.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
5	Yes, to provide a safe bicycle and pedestrian connection to the Eastlake area. Focus should be on cyclists and peds moving through quickly as noise levels are not conductive to lingering.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
6	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 PM
7	Yes! Many of us in Montlake use our feet and our bicycles! I support this multi use plan to improve our community! But please use plantings on the dudes/edges for safety and beautification reasons	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 PM
8	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 PM
9	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 PM
10	I like this option as it makes it safe to cross I-5. It is not clear to me as a cyclist where I go eastbound when I arrive at SR 520 offramp opposite Harvard. Do I continue off-street or do I need to move onto the street? If the latter I have safety	Oct 5, 2012 8:29 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	concerns. Are cyclists and pedestrians separated from each other or intermixed? I'd prefer to see an effort to group cyclists to one area and pedestrians to another. Overall - provide a SAFE and intuitive way for cyclists and pedestrians to move from this location to the bridge.	
11	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 7:19 PM
12	Important to be sure cyclists and peds can then cross safely after they get to Boylston on Roanoke.	Oct 5, 2012 6:04 PM
13	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools - connections are really hard to add after the fact	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
14	I support this. I do not have a car so safe bike and pedestrian ways are important to me.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
15	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 5:42 PM
16	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 5:35 PM
17	I think this serves the goal of connecting neighborhoods; strongly support!	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 PM
18	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 4:42 PM
19	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 4:40 PM
20	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:02 PM
21	keep grade good even if it means going under road.	Oct 5, 2012 3:59 PM
22	A 30-foot wide path sounds and looks great! A couple comments: -I strongly support the addition of crosswalks on all lets of the Harvard Ave E and Roanoke intersection. -Broadway E is a major north-south route through the neighborhood for bicyclists traveling between Capitol Hill and UW. It would be great to see some better connections to Broadway E with the new shared-use path and users heading to and from 10th Ave E. -This might be a little far out, but it would be interesting to investigate the impact of reducing the width of Roanoke in this area	Oct 5, 2012 3:45 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	(for example, reducing westbound Roanoke to a single lane after the bus stop and coordinating stoplights accordingly? or off-peak parking on the south side of the street?). I understand this is a busy intersection, but the cost for this wide street is a very uninviting and unsafe environment for pedestrians and cyclists while being dense with cars. It could be an interesting proposal to help improve the safety of connections among Roanoke park, the shared-use path, and the Delmar lid.	
23	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 3:32 PM
24	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 3:31 PM
25	Separate bikes from peds, if only with paint.	Oct 5, 2012 3:25 PM
26	I think it is a great idea. I especially love the idea of it being landscaped.	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
27	This would help create better east-west bicycle and pedestrian connections across I-5. It'll help connect nearby neighborhoods on both sides of I-5. And it'll help kids walk/bike to area schools such as TOPS and Seattle Prep.	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
28	no	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
29	Don't interrupt the automobile traffic flow, preferably by moving the bicycle traffic to a different grade than the automobile traffic, and separate the bicycle and pedestrian portions of the path.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
30	I think this is best for the long term.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
31	Options for safe I-5 bike crossings are essential. Please make sure the local bike transportation areas are connected to the new bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
32	It is essential to have bike and pedestrian access across the bridge. Prefer to have bike and pedestrian access separate from each other to reduce collisions.	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
33	Strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
34	NOT NEEDED. Eliminate this to save money.	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM
35	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
36	good	Oct 5, 2012 2:47 PM
37	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
38	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 2:40 PM
39	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 2:32 PM
40	Bicycle and pedestrian access is badly needed and will enable low carbon commuting.	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
41	How about a bike lane to cross Lake Washington? That is a huge need.	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
42	I strongly support improving bike access to the new bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:19 PM
43	We really need good bike access with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:17 PM
44	bicycle access across I-% is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:17 PM
45	This crossing would much better connect these neighborhoods! I love it.	Oct 5, 2012 2:08 PM
46	Great.	Oct 5, 2012 2:03 PM
47	Yes, I support the 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian path.	Oct 5, 2012 1:54 PM
48	I strongly support the shared use -- especially the bicycle path	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
49	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 1:47 PM
50	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 1:46 PM
51	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 1:17 PM
52	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 1:08 PM
53	Strongly supported. Provides essential connections between neighborhoods otherwise divided by I-5. Useful for users to/from both the Delmar lid and the Portage Bay Bridge multi-use trail.	Oct 5, 2012 1:02 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
54	Yes, I support this preference to improve bicycle/pedestrian safety, and improve bicycle commute connections between Eastlake/S. lake Union, and the University. (would be a viable alternative to my current Eastlake bicycle commute route.	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
55	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
56	Yes, this is a hard spot to be a pedestrian or cyclist. It is not easy to navigate in a car either.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
57	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 12:50 PM
58	Love it.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
59	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
60	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 12:35 PM
61	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
62	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
63	Don't waste bridge construction money on bicycle and pedestrian paths; there are too few users to make a difference and the bridge should be primarily for commuters and other auto users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
64	not necessary	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
65	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
66	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
67	I strongly support this for good connectivity between schools, businesses, and neighborhoods.	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
68	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
69	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 12:14 PM
70	1st want to keep traffic moving as efficiently as possible across I-5. There are very few places to cross, therefore do not decrease capacity of cars for bikes. Bikes and pedestrian crossing should be provided, but not at any expense to car capacity. This isn't a significant bike route and is a flat crossing, therefore it is not essential to provide an additional bike lane.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
71	I strongly support this: This will created a safer walkway for students from TOPS	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
72	I support this as there is currently limited ways to cross the highway and this will allow biking in the city in a safer context than currently exists. This should be expanded to include a more clear transition from the bridge crossing to teh area where the T and down hill occur, this is currently not as safe for biking as it could be in future designs.	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
73	I strongly support this: This will help reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
74	This is a good idea as it will provide safe passage - this bridge gets busy at peak times	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
75	Nice buffer!	Oct 5, 2012 11:49 AM
76	I strongly support this for connecting the 520 area to the rest of seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
77	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM
78	Strongly support a bike path.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM
79	Extremely important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:31 AM
80	yes! i support bike paths	Oct 5, 2012 11:30 AM
81	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
82	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
83	An essential pedestrian connection "bridge" to Lake Union and Chesiahud Trail	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
84	This crossing should be expanded to a maximum amount to enable safe passage over I5 for pedestrians and bicycle traffic. The extra expansion of the path would also assist in reduction of noise and other pollution form this busy intersection of I5 and 520. The location of Seward school and the impact of the fly over ramp should be a major issue in the west side connection mitigation, a wider lid pathway would do much to help this situation.	Oct 5, 2012 11:20 AM
85	I strongly support this option: it will help kids get the TOPS Public Elementary school and reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It provides important access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
86	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
87	Even though I am a regular cyclist pedestrian user of this area, this is not a high priority: there are plenty of surface street alternatives, and with moderate cost those can be improved more effectively than a path on the highway.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 AM
88	This would be immensely helpful for bike commuters and pedestrians.	Oct 5, 2012 11:08 AM
89	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 AM
90	Not a priority for me, in my experience most bicycle traffic does not use this crossing, and pedestrian facilities are adequate	Oct 5, 2012 11:04 AM
91	Strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 AM
92	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 10:56 AM
93	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
94	Yes, very perferable #2	Oct 5, 2012 10:51 AM
95	Please provide a minimum 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge. Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
96	Yes! This would be most beneficial to all bikers, pedestrians, and drivers.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
97	I strongly support this so neighborhoods are connected	Oct 5, 2012 10:36 AM
98	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 10:34 AM
99	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 10:26 AM
100	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on	Oct 5, 2012 10:25 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	
101	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
102	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
103	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
104	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
105	No Comment except to support what people who live in this neighborhood. 30 feet wide seems to wide to me. Even along the river in Salzburg Austria the pedestrian bike trail is only 16 feet wide	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
106	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM
107	This is a good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 AM
108	I strongly support the creation of pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 AM
109	I strongly support this. The two neighborhood are current chopped in half in an ugly and dangerous way. Biking across this is crazy at this point. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
110	This is a highly desirable feature that will enhance the quality of the crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists. As the design advances special attention should be paid to improving pedestrian comfort, particularly reducing noise impacts from I-5.	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
111	The Madison Park Community Council strongly support this Preference	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM
112	I strongly support this, though believe 30 feet wide is too wide, too easy to change into traffic lanes in the future. But a path is great in that: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
113	Strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
114	I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 AM
115	I strongly support this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
116	I bike through here many times a week on the way from Capitol Hill to UW. I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
117	Like it	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
118	This is a huge luxury. The shared use infrastructure on Alki is a great example of an economical implementation.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
119	Yes please! Much more friendly to people in the neighborhood, as well as the many people who bike through that area (our family included).	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
120	Definitely needed!	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
121	I support a pedestrian bicycle connection as long as it does not add any unsightly concrete details that would impact the homes on either side of the connection. It should be designed to allow for trees, shrubs and have landscape buffers between the nearby homes and the path. It should not be wider than necessary and should conform to standards required by Seattle Parks for pedestrians and bicycles. It doesn't need to be 30 feet wide to accomodate bikes and peds.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
122	This is my first preference. I think that this are would be most improved by incorporation of a shared-use trail.	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
123	If there were ever a time to address the mayhem at this intersection (other than 30 years ago) now would be prudent. Having a new path that limits the interaction of cyclists/pedestrians from the automobile flow in this area would provide a faster/safer travel for cyclists and a less interactive situation for cars and bikes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:20 AM
124	Yes. Definitely do this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
125	Connecting North Capitol Hill to Eastlake is a great idea. It's not very welcoming at the moment!	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
126	The 30-foot wide crossing is a much needed improvement, connections to downtown should be provided in/along the I-5 corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
127	Agree, but only if this provides access to new 520 bike east/west bike lanes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:18 AM
128	Though unpleasant, the existing sidewalk does work. Adding 30 feet seems unnecessarily wide.	Oct 5, 2012 9:06 AM
129	Yes, I strongly support this shared use path. It would make me feel more	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	comfortable getting to the area with my children by bike or walking from the bus.	
130	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
131	Waste of money not really needed.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
132	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
133	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 8:41 AM
134	Verify the bike/pedestrian path is fully continuous with the new pathways on the floating bridge and the eastside corridor. These must be fully continuous.	Oct 5, 2012 8:31 AM
135	I like the idea of having something for peds and bikes	Oct 5, 2012 8:31 AM
136	I have regularly crossed the I-5 freeway here on bicycle, but I am always headed to go north on Harvard to the University Bridge. Is there a way you can make the northbound connection easier, or should cyclists just use the street for my route?	Oct 5, 2012 8:30 AM
137	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 8:11 AM
138	Yes, this is critical. A well-designed path will connect different areas and make for safer and more pleasant pedestrian and bicycle use for children and adults.	Oct 5, 2012 8:10 AM
139	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 8:04 AM
140	I support this becuase it helps connect areas that are difficult to connect otherwise. It just seems like common sense.	Oct 5, 2012 8:02 AM
141	Preference 1: I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 7:49 AM
142	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 AM
143	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 7:36 AM
144	I would support this.	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
145	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
146	I strongly support this concept. Getting across I-5 in that area is difficult now and this is a great opportunity to make a simpler connection. This would benefit more than commuters. A freeway has the effect of splitting neighborhoods, and a bike/pedestrian path would help to reduce this effect.	Oct 5, 2012 7:09 AM
147	Landscaped? Gimme a break. Just make a simple bike lane and get on with it.	Oct 5, 2012 7:08 AM
148	This is a great idea. This is an important bike connection, and heavy traffic makes it presently very dangerous.	Oct 5, 2012 7:05 AM
149	I support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 5, 2012 6:44 AM
150	I've biked in this area a couple of times and it definitely needs improvement.	Oct 5, 2012 6:33 AM
151	Great connectivity for neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 6:15 AM
152	I strongly support dedicated pedestrian and bicycle access along each and every portion of the 520 project. We absolutely need to include full accomodation for non-motorized transportation in this regional project. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity, and we need to get it right and maximize this public investment. I-5 crossing? Yes, full shared-use path!	Oct 5, 2012 6:01 AM
153	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM
154	Improving Pedestrian and biking is necessary for all future construction to maximize options to driving.	Oct 5, 2012 5:29 AM
155	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 5:19 AM
156	Low priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
157	Absolutely necessary. Need non-car option to keep neighborhood together.	Oct 5, 2012 5:13 AM
158	This is fine, as long as the on street bicycle facilities are addressed 1st. Since there is no regional trail connecting to this short section, a shared use trail would be an inconsistent treatment for bicycle facilities leading to the bridge	Oct 5, 2012 5:03 AM
159	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 4:48 AM
160	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	
161	YES	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 AM
162	Please. Move biking students, workers, and commuting residents and encourage biking as a method of transportation. If they can quickly get to S Lake Union and downtown bypassing the Portage bay to Eastlake corridor I suspect many would consider biking instead of driving.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 AM
163	The current bridge seems sufficient.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 AM
164	would be a welcome and lovely connection to mitigate the disruption of and unpleasantness of i-5.	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 PM
165	Looks good. Make sure the lights (at Boylston and at Harvard) are timed such that westbound traffic doesn't back up into the Roanoke/Harvard intersection.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
166	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 PM
167	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools!	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
168	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
169	Current crossing is a bit of a pain, I support this but car about other things more.	Oct 4, 2012 10:43 PM
170	yes. This is a necessary connection that needs huge improvement for pedestrians and cyclists.	Oct 4, 2012 10:37 PM
171	This addresses bicycle access through a high traffic point and provides a connection to Eastlake and Capitol Hill.	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 PM
172	Elevate the per/bike crossing over or under the off ramps. Create grade separation.	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
173	Strongly support	Oct 4, 2012 10:18 PM
174	Yes. This path should connect seamlessly to the eastside and to the Burke Gilman	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM
175	Crossings for pedestrians of Harvard, Boylston, and the 520 offramp need to be greatly improved. Especially the crossing distance and the signal cycle length.	Oct 4, 2012 10:02 PM
176	Strongly support	Oct 4, 2012 10:01 PM
177	Yes! I support this. A safe, efficient crossing for children allows them to walk to school, uniting the community and making a safe crossing for all pedestrians and bicylists who wish to access Eastlake neighborhood, Roanoke park and the nearby houses.	Oct 4, 2012 10:00 PM
178	I am in full support of making all of this as bike friendly as possible. Until I can get from Kirkland to UW and downtown Seattle by bicycle, I am stuck using a car.	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
179	There needs to be a division of some kind to separate bicycles and pedestrians who use this shared-use path. Children walk across this path to attend the TOPS Program at Seward K-8 school.	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 PM
180	Strongly support. I can see this making a bicycle communte easier for my family in the future as well as provide good access for the local schools, park and businesses.	Oct 4, 2012 9:35 PM
181	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 9:30 PM
182	Yes please.	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
183	I strongly support this: This bike/ped access will reconnect the neighborhoods of Cap Hill/Eastlake/Montlake/Portage Bay, from what would otherwise be in impossible impasse of I-5. Also, having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
184	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10 Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area and Portage Bay trail	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 PM
185	Strongly support this preference. I use this route on my bike commute to work on First Hill.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
186	i like this alot. it will make a very difficult spot to navigate on a bike much safer.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
187	Just build the fucking thing and give us taxpayers a break	Oct 4, 2012 9:10 PM
188	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
189	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 8:55 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
190	Strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield	Oct 4, 2012 8:50 PM
191	For traffic going from 520 to Roanoke St using the offramp there needs to be two lanes (one for right only and one for straight/left). The right turn lane needs clear visibility to make a right hand turn. Today neither of these exist and it does not appear that they exist in the new design. In fact it appears that cars will have to pull into the bike path to make a right on red without clear visibility.	Oct 4, 2012 8:48 PM
192	Please include fully landscaped bicycle and pedestrian trails in all new construction, especially here! This is critical to Seattle as a whole and to this neighborhood. Freeways cut off nonmotorized traffic. We need to make it possible to cross the freeway here. This is really important to this project!	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
193	I like this, 30 feet is a lot, but considering how hard it is to get across I5 on bicycle and foot now, something has to be done.	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
194	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
195	This is a much needed enhancement to a currently very unsafe and unpleasant passage, so I strongly support this design proposal. As a cyclist who uses this route regularly to get from Boylston Ave to Harvard Ave, I would directly benefit from and appreciate this new crossing.	Oct 4, 2012 8:33 PM
196	YES!! Seattle needs to connect our neighborhoods for people who want to travel by foot or bike. It's desperately needed.	Oct 4, 2012 8:23 PM
197	Defiantly increase bicycle amenities. Provide bicycle access across new 520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:22 PM
198	I love this! This corridor is excellent for biking and walking. Safe protected walkways encourage healthier ways to commute.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
199	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 8:13 PM
200	yep	Oct 4, 2012 8:12 PM
201	Would be a vast improvement over the current bike-impassable 520 bridge. I strongly support.	Oct 4, 2012 8:07 PM
202	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:00 PM
203	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 7:59 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
204	Great concept	Oct 4, 2012 7:57 PM
205	great	Oct 4, 2012 7:46 PM
206	Excellent. But care should be made at the west end of this to make sure bicyclists have a clear route onto a designated route towards Eastlake Ave. The intersection should have special treatment like bicycle signal phase to deal with the trail <---> road connection	Oct 4, 2012 7:30 PM
207	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 7:19 PM
208	I support this design and would be excited to see a connection across I-5 for both bicycles and pedestrians	Oct 4, 2012 7:10 PM
209	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools,	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 PM
210	Such a bicycle path must be on land, as shown, rather than on the Portage Bay Bridge, which is already too wide for the fragile bay and shoreline.	Oct 4, 2012 6:28 PM
211	No - more room for cars, less for bikes and peds.	Oct 4, 2012 6:23 PM
212	We must have a wide, safe bicycle and pedestrian path across I-5.	Oct 4, 2012 6:01 PM
213	No tax payer money should be spent on this enhancement to the project- all these extras are too much for taxpayers	Oct 4, 2012 5:48 PM
214	YES	Oct 4, 2012 5:30 PM
215	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 5:30 PM
216	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 5:21 PM
217	Sounds good. It would also be nice to improve I5 access for the Eastlake neighborhood. Getting to I5 northbound is very difficult. If there was a solution that would allow an exit from 520 into this neighborhood that would also be helpful.	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
218	Grade separated is important	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
219	Agree. Eastlake is a good North-South corridor. It is currently pretty hairy getting to Eastlake from either the Interlaken area or 10th Ave.	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM
220	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
221	NO taxes are too high already	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
222	I stongly support this for connecting neighborhoods	Oct 4, 2012 5:07 PM
223	I strongly support this. It will go a long ways toward connecting neighborhoods.	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
224	Definitely need a bicycle and pedestrian path for sure. As it is now, nobody but car can use the bridge, it would be a shame to make a 6 lane bridge and have car only go on it!!!	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
225	This is very important to me. I cannot efficiently reach Redmond or Marymoor without access to SR520 on bike. The alternate routes of I90 or the north half of the Lake Washington loop add an additional 90 min travel time from Cap Hill.	Oct 4, 2012 4:34 PM
226	I am an avid cyclist and I strongly support cycling options for the 520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 4:27 PM
227	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
228	Very good. I support this design.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
229	Nice. I use this overpass fairly frequently while riding my bike.	Oct 4, 2012 3:59 PM
230	Makes sense, it doesn't feel that safe today when I walk across it with my 3 year old daughter, since the walk ways are relatively narrow and the traffic is very busy.	Oct 4, 2012 3:40 PM
231	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 3:36 PM
232	sidewalk is good, but don't waste unnecessary money on landscaping	Oct 4, 2012 3:31 PM
233	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 4, 2012 3:18 PM
234	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
235	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
236	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 3:13 PM
237	I support this preference #1.I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
238	I strongly support this -- it would help connect my neighborhood (Eastlake) to North Capitol Hill and allow kids to access TOPS public elementary school.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
239	building balanced, multimodal connections such as these are critical not only for this project but for the city and region. Public space is space for all and need to be designed for all. This shared use path across I-5 is a good beginning.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
240	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM
241	Yess	Oct 4, 2012 2:44 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
242	Multi-mode transportation options are critical, particularly when designing transportation elements that will be with us for many years to come.	Oct 4, 2012 2:41 PM
243	Yes, we need a dedicated bicycle lane.	Oct 4, 2012 2:40 PM
244	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 2:36 PM
245	As a cyclist I love this!	Oct 4, 2012 2:35 PM
246	I strongly support this option. This path will provide a critical connection between the Eastlake area and Capitol Hill for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. This path should be adequately constructed to ensure safe access from both the north and south along Boylston.	Oct 4, 2012 2:31 PM
247	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 2:20 PM
248	This would be great, it is hard to merge with traffic in this area as a cyclist. You have to take a lane to be safe and not all cars respect that.	Oct 4, 2012 2:04 PM
249	I am very much in favor of this.	Oct 4, 2012 1:59 PM
250	Looks good	Oct 4, 2012 1:55 PM
251	I strongly support this improved bicycle access	Oct 4, 2012 1:53 PM
252	I strongly support this: This helps reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
253	This is a must have! Make it safe for children to move without cars to schools	Oct 4, 2012 1:31 PM
254	YES this of course is the best.	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
255	Good improvement to current state.	Oct 4, 2012 1:23 PM
256	This is critical to link the bicycle lanes to a path to downtown Seattle. Once this bridge is complete, I would highly consider biking into work in downtown Seattle from Kirkland. Without this link, it will be more dangerous and inconsistent for bicyclists and drivers.	Oct 4, 2012 1:21 PM
257	I strongly support this connection for neighborhoods and kids going to school.	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM
258	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools. As seattle develops, the automobile as a method of quotidian transportation will become deprecated, so it is important to construct alternate transportation connections when given the chance.	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM
259	30-feet wide, 'eh? And, what, a hundred feet long? And "landscaped" meaning	Oct 4, 2012 1:13 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	"with lots of crap in your way"? Why would westbound cyclists cross the street to access a really short path that dumps them out on the wrong side of the street in a block and doesn't help them get across intersections? Speaking of intersections, all these intersections need their missing crosswalks added. It's a disgrace to have missing crosswalks in Seattle.	
260	We need to include ped and bike access for the new bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:11 PM
261	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
262	I support this preference for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
263	YES! I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 1:01 PM
264	I think just an expanded sidewalk would be fine, it's more important that bicycles be able to merge directly onto Harvard and Boylston	Oct 4, 2012 1:00 PM
265	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 12:56 PM
266	Preference 1: I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM
267	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 12:39 PM
268	Not needed; low volume usage for $$ construction	Oct 4, 2012 12:38 PM
269	Support	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
270	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 12:30 PM
271	I strongly support this crossing. It will help pedestrians, students and commuters alike.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
272	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM
273	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 12:18 PM
274	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
275	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
276	I strongly support this so that it will connect neighborhoods and schools!	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
277	I support this, as it is critical for allowing access to TOPS and for linking East Lake with Capital Hill.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
278	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
279	I strongly support this, it connects neighborhoods on both sides of the freeway and is essential for non-car traffic to move through the city.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
280	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
281	PLEASE, yes. We need better connections in this area!	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
282	Support as connection to Eastlake Ave.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
283	Adding a safe, comfortable crossing here will greatly improve bicycle and pedestrian use.	Oct 4, 2012 11:53 AM
284	A connection here is very desirable however the project should consider the cost of this improvement. 30' feet wide is twice as much as pedestrians and bikes need and landscaping should not be a concern over such a short span. Keep it simple and keep costs down.	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
285	I strongly support this. Helping provide access to the public elementary school and providing additional connection between the Eastlake neighborhood and north Capitol Hill would be great.	Oct 4, 2012 11:51 AM
286	Great idea - low priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
287	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
288	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
289	Strongly support. This will reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to Norht Capitol Hill and provide access from the west to Portage Bay. It needs adequate connections across Boylston Ave E for bikers	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
290	This sounds like a great idea and will get a lot of use.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
291	Yes!. I strongly support this option.	Oct 4, 2012 11:40 AM
292	This is important for connecting Eastlake and Roanoke. I strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:36 AM
293	Of course!	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
294	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
295	This area must be accessible to bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
296	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
297	I endorse this. I frequently use boylston on my bicycle, and would love a safe way to get over I-5 from capitol hill to eastlake and the mountain bike park on lakeview.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 AM
298	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
299	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
300	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:24 AM
301	I wish to be able to bike through this area safely and effectively.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
302	I very strongly support this opportunity to connect neighborhoods and schools.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
303	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 11:21 AM
304	I strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:09 AM
305	The more bike and pedestrian access and improved mobility, the better. The central location between Capitol Hill, Eastlake, and the University District makes this a natural area for non-car travel, but I-5 interrupts a lot of the natural travel paths.	Oct 4, 2012 11:08 AM
306	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 AM
307	bicycles and pedestrians should have separated lanes for safety and efficiency.	Oct 4, 2012 10:50 AM
308	Will the path go under the road? How will it affect traffic?	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
309	I own our home a half mile from this location and support this to allow my family to access the neighborhood safely.	Oct 4, 2012 10:38 AM
310	Good idea, especially for kids and bikes, but SOOOO noisy - consider more noise reduction. I walk there two or more times/week, and the noise is awful - above OSHA standards, I believe.	Oct 4, 2012 10:13 AM
311	Sounds good. Separated bike paths would be ideal.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 AM
312	Yes please	Oct 4, 2012 9:43 AM
313	The more connections between surface streets, the more likely pedestrian traffic can activate an area, so I support a path to connect Eastlake to North capitol hill. Having the path terminate some ways south (up the hill) on 10th Ave would be ideal so that bikes don't have to try to traverse the 10 Ave/Delmar Drive intersection to get onto Capitol Hill.	Oct 4, 2012 9:32 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
314	I strongly support this proposal	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
315	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 9:15 AM
316	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 AM
317	Strongly support	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
318	I do not support the addition of bicycle or pedestrian facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 7:01 AM
319	Very necessary to have better bike ped access	Oct 4, 2012 6:41 AM
320	YES!!!	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 AM
321	This is a great idea to help with safety for people of all abilities and ages. I also like the addition of greenery and wildlife habitat.	Oct 4, 2012 2:59 AM
322	Both "preferred" and "basic" schemes share the basic problem that the "bicycle/pedestrian" paths appear designed for recreation, not transportation. As a bike commuter, I would strongly prefer that the street simply be widened to allow a dedicated bike lane on each side of the street. In the proposed design, half of the time the the separated connection puts me on the WRONG SIDE OF THE STREET as I enter/exit the improvement area, forcing me to switch from pedestrian crosswalks to vehicle lane and back. This kind of movement is unpredictable to drivers and therefore far more dangerous than just staying in traffic lanes. Travelling westbound, I would almost certainly ignore the beautiful bike path on the opposite side of the street and just ride in the traffic lane.	Oct 4, 2012 1:49 AM
323	Fabulous. Go with this. Run with it.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 AM
324	Looks great. Very important for the neighborhood. This will help children access the TOPS K-8 as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 9:38 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
325	This is my preferred design.	Oct 3, 2012 9:24 PM
326	Support: Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 3, 2012 9:01 PM
327	Make it easy to get across by bikes and pedestrians and call it good. Do not waste money 'prettying-up' a noisy place above the freeway where no one wants to hang out anyway.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 PM
328	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
329	Terrific	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 PM
330	Yes, obviously. If not, missing a huge opportunity to focus on non-motorized regional connections. No worries that the bridge would have to be wider.	Oct 3, 2012 8:13 PM
331	Would be invaluable for this neighborhood, especially children and parents walking to and from TOPS.	Oct 3, 2012 4:20 PM
332	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
333	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 3:44 PM
334	This is not a huge priority. Most TOPS students come from outside the immediate area -- from neighborhoods all over the city -- and so arrive by bus or car. Spending additional money on landscaping or additional paths here should be lowest priority. It would be more helpful in terms of managing congestion and emissions for passing pedestrians or cyclists to widen this overpass to instead accommodate another lane of eastbound left-turn traffic. Currently this overpass is incredibly congested at many points on weekdays and weekends.	Oct 3, 2012 2:34 PM
335	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from	Oct 3, 2012 1:52 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	
336	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 3, 2012 1:48 PM
337	My preference. Space for cyclists and pedestrians that extends across I-5. East-West travel is challenging enough in this city. Why dump people in the U District and not go across the freeway?	Oct 3, 2012 1:47 PM
338	Yes, bicycle access is crucial	Oct 3, 2012 1:22 PM
339	This is VERY important. It needs to be easily accessible from both sides of I5, and from all directions on each side (coming from the south or north or west/east side). It is also important that it connect directly with a shared-use path on the Portage Bay road segment, which should in turn connect with the shared-use path across Lake Washington, allowing cyclists and pedestrians easy access to the Montlake and east-side areas from the Lake Union area.	Oct 3, 2012 1:13 PM
340	hooray!	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
341	Don't just design this, BUILD IT.	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
342	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 1:04 PM
343	Seems to make sense	Oct 3, 2012 12:44 PM
344	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 3, 2012 11:51 AM
345	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
346	keep bicyclists seperate from pedistrians	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
347	I support this	Oct 3, 2012 11:33 AM
348	Please pay special attention to the right turn from E Roanoke St onto Harvard.	Oct 3, 2012 11:28 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	Pedestrians are OFTEN not seen, especially small children crossing to TOPS.	
349	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
350	As someone who's lived a block away from this bridge for a six year stretch, improving this crossing would be a great step towards reuniting Eastlake and Capitol Hill. Pedestrian/bike safety crossing paths with freeway off-ramp traffic is really important here.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
351	great idea!	Oct 3, 2012 10:28 AM
352	Please provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 3, 2012 10:27 AM
353	Preferred option	Oct 3, 2012 10:26 AM
354	Wide bicycle access is important now and for the future!	Oct 3, 2012 10:03 AM
355	Bike paths are essential here; this is a difficult area to navigate by bike, and along an essential connecting corridor from the Montlake area (anyone coming from the north on the Burke Gilman trail) and Capitol Hill or downtown.	Oct 3, 2012 9:47 AM
356	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 9:43 AM
357	It would be great to have a pedestrian friendly crossing of I-5--we live in Montlake, and although Eastlake is a short walk away, it is a noisy unpleasant walk that we avoid because of the noise and multiple crossings of I-5	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
358	YES.	Oct 3, 2012 9:34 AM
359	I strongly support this. It is hard to tell from the image, but it looks like a separated lane, with trees and landscaping protecting walkers and bikers. This would be preferable to no separation, and will hopefull help slow cars. It is also an important connection from downtown/eastlake to capitol hill.	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM
360	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and	Oct 3, 2012 9:28 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	
361	Fantastic.	Oct 3, 2012 9:01 AM
362	Yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:58 AM
363	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:36 AM
364	This is important to connectivity to Eastlake and downtown via Lakeview	Oct 3, 2012 8:25 AM
365	OK	Oct 3, 2012 8:14 AM
366	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 8:01 AM
367	This is a good idea.	Oct 3, 2012 7:59 AM
368	I strongly support this: This will help children access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail, and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction. Having this I-5 crossing buffered by plantings on either side will make the crossing a safer and more pleasant experience.	Oct 3, 2012 7:55 AM
369	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 3, 2012 7:38 AM
370	Make the crossing, don't waste funds on landscape. Make it usable with no wasted on astetics.	Oct 3, 2012 6:32 AM
371	I've never crossed I-5 at this intersection. It seems there are other options available as you can just go down Harvard to Eastlake or take Lakeview Blvd. It is not in the most useful location.	Oct 3, 2012 2:00 AM
372	So the existing bridge will be demolished and re-built as a landscaped bike and pedestrian only bridge? Or are the 30 feet just to add bike paths on the sides or one side of the car bridge? I am just not sure that adding a bike path to a car brdge is worththe expense. It would make much more sense to improve the bike friendliness of Harvard, especially as Southbound cyclists cross the on-ramp to i-5. Also improving the bike friendliness of Boylston would make a much bigger difference forcyclists. Instead of re-building the bridge, you could turn it from a four lanes to cars, into two car lanes with plenty of room left for cycletracks and landscaping.	Oct 2, 2012 10:51 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
373	This would be great! Bicycle and pedestrian access is lacking in this area and needs to be improved.	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
374	sounds good	Oct 2, 2012 8:35 PM
375	yes! the I-5 crossing needs to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities	Oct 2, 2012 8:24 PM
376	yes	Oct 2, 2012 8:23 PM
377	Nice big wide bike section please :)	Oct 2, 2012 6:53 PM
378	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 2, 2012 6:13 PM
379	Absolutely!	Oct 2, 2012 5:46 PM
380	This would be excellent and useful for connecting the bridge to downtown!	Oct 2, 2012 5:38 PM
381	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 2, 2012 4:14 PM
382	Sounds like a great idea for the whole length of the bridge. The I-90 bike lane is too narrow for safe use by both pedestrians and cyclists going two directions.	Oct 2, 2012 3:12 PM
383	Car-free ways to cross the 520 corridor is essential for moving Seattle into the 21st century.	Oct 2, 2012 12:21 PM
384	Yes! A path for those of us on bikes and foot will be wonderful here.	Oct 2, 2012 12:20 PM
385	This would greatly improve bike and pedestrian accessibility between the Eastlake area and North Capitol Hill.	Oct 2, 2012 11:53 AM
386	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 AM
387	parks are always good, but all of these need to be merged into the design, along with easy access to the path across the bridge	Oct 2, 2012 11:01 AM
388	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 2, 2012 10:05 AM
389	Pls make sure that the path feels open and discourages people from getting right up against the roadway, which is VERY busy with drivers moving quickly and focused on navigating.	Oct 2, 2012 9:33 AM
390	I support the need to provide a safe crossing of I-5 at this location. But this must be in conjunction with providing a bike/ped facility connecting to Montlake along on the new Portage Bay viaduct/bridge. However, I am concerned about this being on the south side of Roanoke. How will this connect with the Portage Bay	Oct 2, 2012 9:32 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	bike/ped facility and then down the hill to Eastlake? Two-way bike facilities on one side of the street creates the need for unsafe (and usually unnecessary) crossings back/forth at their ends. Better solution is to provide good bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides of the street.	
391	I strongly support this: This will help access the TOPS Public Elementary school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a possible Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Boylston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Boylston Ave in either direction.	Oct 2, 2012 9:28 AM
392	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 2, 2012 9:02 AM
393	Our coalition of neighborhoods strongly supports this design preference and is satisfied with the proposed 30 foot width. This preference is backed up by our 346 neighborhood supporters in our original letter. Landscaping should be used to buffer the trail from E Roanoke Street and I-5. This amazingly improved path must safely connect across Bolyston Ave E in order to connect to the Eastlake and beyond. We also ask WSDOT and its partners to examine how this trail segment can be safely entered traveling south bound on Bolyston Ave e.	Oct 2, 2012 8:22 AM
394	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 1, 2012 9:20 PM
395	would allow for a safer and more convenient place for cyclists	Oct 1, 2012 7:58 PM
396	bicycle connections will be increasingly important as the climate warms; good idea	Oct 1, 2012 7:13 PM
397	This is a requirement! We need to provide other means of commuting--one that does not burn fossil fuels and increases physical activity/reduces health car costs.	Oct 1, 2012 4:06 PM
398	Yes, similar to the I-90 lids, a 30ft path is good.	Oct 1, 2012 4:05 PM
399	Bicycle access from 520 bridge that crosses I-5 is very important and would make a bicycle commute from eastside to downtown a reality. This is a top priority.	Oct 1, 2012 2:26 PM
400	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 1, 2012 2:16 PM
401	Great idea	Oct 1, 2012 1:16 PM
402	Need good ped adn bike connections across I-5.	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
403	This would be useful for getting east/west across corridor safely	Oct 1, 2012 12:30 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
404	Excellent	Oct 1, 2012 12:05 PM
405	I strongly support this: This will help access the TOPS school as well as reconnect the Eastlake neighborhood to N Capitol Hill and Roanoke. It also provides access from the west to a possible Portage Bay Bridge Multi-use Trail and the path from the Delmar Lid to Boyer and the Montlake Playfield. It serves essential neighborhood needs. It must ensure adequate connections across Bolyston Ave E, and for bikers entering this path from Bolyston Ave in either direction.	Oct 1, 2012 11:26 AM
406	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 1, 2012 10:05 AM
407	It would be nice to see a lid like the 10th and Delmar lid in this area. Eastlake is totally isolated from Capitol Hill and the lid should extend all the way to eastlake. This would provide a neighborhood amenity, provide a stronger connection to Capitol Hill (of which Eastlake was a part before I5) and help mitigate noise pollution in the adjacent eastlake streets (where I live).	Sep 30, 2012 9:16 PM
408	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 30, 2012 7:41 PM
409	Not as critical to be included if funding is a problem	Sep 30, 2012 2:55 PM
410	Bike & ped shared-use path is essential here. 30-foot wide would be incredible. Clear, safe connections to Boylston, Harvard, and 10th Ave must be integrated.	Sep 30, 2012 9:41 AM
411	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
412	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 30, 2012 3:34 AM
413	Personal experience makes me question the wisdom of this part of the plan. I have not seen enough bicycle or pedestrian traffic to warrant that improvement, but an improvement on the sightlines and timing of the lights is definitely called for in the case of cars exiting SR 520 W to Roanoke.	Sep 29, 2012 11:30 PM
414	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 29, 2012 9:58 PM
415	Essential to enable bike commuting to downtown.	Sep 29, 2012 9:06 PM
416	This would be good, include connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 29, 2012 7:39 PM
417	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and	Sep 29, 2012 7:24 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	
418	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 PM
419	The I-5 and 520 interchange is a prime cause of congestion on I-5 both directions. It badly needs to be rebuilt. Anything else done here is a waste of money.	Sep 29, 2012 6:09 PM
420	would like bike/pedestrian shared-use path all the way across 520	Sep 29, 2012 4:54 PM
421	Yes, I will cycle this route. Please provide a trail that is adequately wide and uses ramps, not stairs for access.	Sep 29, 2012 4:41 PM
422	The shared use path sounds fantastic! A key link between North Cap Hill and Eastlake.	Sep 29, 2012 4:25 PM
423	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 4:13 PM
424	Strongly support.	Sep 29, 2012 2:34 PM
425	This is an absolute MUST. WSDOT cannot spend $5.8 billion on a new bridge and leave out bicycle connections.	Sep 29, 2012 1:18 PM
426	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 29, 2012 1:12 PM
427	This is so exciting! I love the idea of having landscaping to make the I-5 crossing less unpleasant. Is the bicycle path going to be fully separated (like in the Netherlands?) I'm a timid bike rider and I only feel safe when there is a barrier between me and the cars....	Sep 29, 2012 1:06 PM
428	Stripe bicycle area for safety. Bicyclists are a danger to pedestrians	Sep 29, 2012 10:06 AM
429	Yes, please!!	Sep 29, 2012 9:21 AM
430	Good idea!	Sep 29, 2012 6:36 AM
431	This is great. I think cyclists will stay on the road since they will be better lined up to turn left down Harvard. This improvement will be good for walkers. I think improving the intersection would be great. Widen it a bit to add lanes where needed.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 AM
432	Provide very wide bicycle and pedestrian path with substantial landscaping.	Sep 28, 2012 10:47 PM
433	That area is so hostile right now that I don't ever even try to go there on my bicycle. Anything would be an improvement.	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 PM
434	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 28, 2012 9:44 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
435	For all of these elements, once constructed who will maintain them? Is WSDOT providing funding to City agencies to fund these elements?	Sep 28, 2012 9:16 PM
436	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 28, 2012 8:56 PM
437	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
438	I am very interested in bicycle paths that would connect 520 with downtown Seattle.	Sep 28, 2012 8:08 PM
439	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 28, 2012 7:17 PM
440	Very expensive, a narrower design could help keep the mobility benefits, while reducing the massive funding shortfall.	Sep 28, 2012 5:48 PM
441	excellent idea	Sep 28, 2012 5:38 PM
442	YES!	Sep 28, 2012 5:07 PM
443	It would be a significant improvement to have either a dedicated bike lane or a separate path over this bridge since it is so often jammed with cars waiting for the light and we cyclists add to that traffic.	Sep 28, 2012 3:31 PM
444	I prefer this one the most.	Sep 28, 2012 2:34 PM
445	strongly prefer	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM
446	Yes!	Sep 28, 2012 2:08 PM
447	Can a small solar array be installed to provide power for WSDOT to reduce future lighting bills?	Sep 28, 2012 1:58 PM
448	Need to improve visibility for traffic turning right onto Roanoke from the exit ramp. very hard to see left without sticking the nose of the car half way into traffic	Sep 28, 2012 1:45 PM
449	I work on Eastlake Ave. E, and access to Roanoke Ave. is frequently impeded at rush hour. Will you install a dedicated bike lane along Boylston Ave E leading to Roanoke?	Sep 28, 2012 1:36 PM
450	Yes! It should also be very clear how to get to the shared-use path from adjoining streets. For example, if someone is biking down 10th and turning left on Roanoke to cross I-5, signage and routing should be very clear to path users and nearby drivers.	Sep 28, 2012 1:13 PM
451	1	Sep 28, 2012 12:05 PM
452	Great! It would be great to have a nice bicycle connection from north Capitol Hill	Sep 28, 2012 11:40 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	to Eastlake.	
453	I support a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 28, 2012 11:30 AM
454	I think a good bicycle lane approach is an essential part of the design of the bridge	Sep 28, 2012 11:18 AM
455	I live in Clyde Hill and expect a good bike lane the length of the bridge that ends on the west side of I-5. I will use this daily to commute downtown. Without that, the bike lane across the bridge is considerably less useful to me, as it is a considerable distance to go around to get to downtown from Montlake.	Sep 28, 2012 11:08 AM
456	This is the optimal solution from as commuter perspective. For years I rode from Ballard to Redmond but couldn't take the most direct route due to lack of infrastructure. After 10 years of commuting frustration I moved to Redmond. Had this option been available at the time I likely would have remained in Seattle.	Sep 28, 2012 11:05 AM
457	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 28, 2012 10:16 AM
458	It would be fantastic to have an improved bike route across I-5.	Sep 28, 2012 9:59 AM
459	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 28, 2012 9:51 AM
460	Yes, definitely	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
461	Like	Sep 28, 2012 8:28 AM
462	This would be great but second only to adding bike path to new bridge itself.	Sep 28, 2012 7:11 AM
463	YES	Sep 28, 2012 7:00 AM
464	long needed and very valuable addition. this will ease traffic in the area	Sep 28, 2012 6:18 AM
465	Highest priority is to have a path friendly to both foot and biycle traffic. The path should be extended across the entire bridge to allow non-vehicle traffic to reach the other side.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 PM
466	30 feet - seems like plenty of room.	Sep 27, 2012 11:26 PM
467	Ideally, foot and bicycle traffic would not be combined - keep them seperated. And of course, this needs to be connected all the way to a path across the bridge as well. Remember, "Nature meets city".	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
468	Critical to serving Eastlake neighborhood	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 PM
469	I like having a wider crossing on the south side of the bridge. This encourages an easier transition from Capitol Hill to Eastlake and the U District.	Sep 27, 2012 10:46 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
470	I am all for new and improved bicycle lanes/paths.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 PM
471	Paths are valuable!	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 PM
472	Yes Yes we need a bridge for everyone	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 PM
473	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 PM
474	yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 PM
475	Allow s bikes to cross I5	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 PM
476	Please provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail	Sep 27, 2012 9:32 PM
477	Fantasti! Worth the effort.	Sep 27, 2012 9:24 PM
478	A safe corridor for bikes across the lake to I-5 is a high priority. What is the comprehensive plan for bicycles on this project?	Sep 27, 2012 9:18 PM
479	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail	Sep 27, 2012 9:00 PM
480	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 8:34 PM
481	Probably doesn't need landscaping, but the path is a great idea.	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
482	i like it	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
483	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 8:10 PM
484	We need mixed use cycling, walking running pathways mixed in with new road ways made with simple access and intuitive use. Create a separate lane for cycling and pedestrians for safety and speedy cycling.	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
485	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 7:31 PM
486	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM
487	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:02 PM
488	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and	Sep 27, 2012 6:29 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	
489	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 6:27 PM
490	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 6:16 PM
491	Yes please!	Sep 27, 2012 6:12 PM
492	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 5:57 PM
493	This seems logical	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
494	I am greatly in support of any design that makes crossing major interstates a more pleasant experience for pedestrians and cyclists. However, when adjacent to a road, and enough width is available, I suggest it is best to segregate bikes and pedestrians. This allows for both parties to travel as care free and unencumbered as possible. In addition the surface of the path should be different for cyclists and pedestrians where possible. Sidewalk blocks work great for pedestrians, a smoother even surface is better for cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 5:25 PM
495	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 5:09 PM
496	Highly desirable to make commuting to downtown on a bicycle from the east side easier.	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
497	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 4:50 PM
498	Ensure that the path safely crosses over I-5 and that it clearly and safely connects to north and south routes in the Eastlake area.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
499	Definitely should be a requirement	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
500	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
501	This is my highest priority. A fully accessible bike/pedestrian path crossing I-5	Sep 27, 2012 4:34 PM
502	Prefer separate paths for pedestrians and bicycle traffic	Sep 27, 2012 4:20 PM
503	A path bicycle and pedestrian path would be wonderful. It probably does not need to be 30 feet wide, 15 feet would be awesome.	Sep 27, 2012 4:19 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
504	nice but expensive?	Sep 27, 2012 4:05 PM
505	This is the most important consideration for Roanoke area. Many bikes will come from Bellevue accross the bridge and there needs to be a clear connection for them.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
506	Create a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, separate bicycled and pedestrian paths.	Sep 27, 2012 3:57 PM
507	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail. Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E. Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St. Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
508	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 3:35 PM
509	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 3:27 PM
510	Absolutely essentail	Sep 27, 2012 2:55 PM
511	Sounds like a good idea to enable bicycle and pedestrian access in this manner.	Sep 27, 2012 2:52 PM
512	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
513	No opinion	Sep 27, 2012 2:43 PM
514	I bike this daily - here are my recommendations 1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail. 2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E. 3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. 4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 2:41 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	
515	I highly recomend doing this!!!!	Sep 27, 2012 2:33 PM
516	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 2:31 PM
517	I could see the benefits of having a landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared use path. This addition would encourage the community to bike to work.. Stroll across the bridge. Benefit general community health and reduce carbon footstep. It might not necessarily have to be 30 foot wide though.	Sep 27, 2012 2:25 PM
518	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 2:21 PM
519	This needs to happen. Alternative transportation is so important right now for those who can avoid driving a car. This bike and pedestrian connection must happen to create connections so more people can get out of their cars and still move through this area efficiently.	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
520	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
521	Provide bicycle lane on the north side	Sep 27, 2012 2:02 PM
522	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
523	The I-5 crossing is needed, but a shared-use path serves neither pedestrians nor bicycles well. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be sparated where possible due to their inherent speed differences.	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
524	Highway crossing facility would be useful.	Sep 27, 2012 1:56 PM
525	This would be a fantastic element (extension) to add to the overall project. Getting people to the lid any way possible is a safe and nice way that will increase the number of users and overall experience.	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
526	1st Preference. Too many bikes on this road	Sep 27, 2012 1:41 PM
527	Great!	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
528	That is good for bike and peds traffic from the West, just don't forget people coming from Nord, balance with following points	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
529	Like it	Sep 27, 2012 1:26 PM
530	Agree - critical access improvement	Sep 27, 2012 1:25 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
531	Excellent - maximizing pedestrian and bicycle paths is essential.	Sep 27, 2012 1:19 PM
532	This makes great sense	Sep 27, 2012 1:15 PM
533	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
534	Strong preference. Bicycle navigation in this area is currently hard and dangerous.	Sep 27, 2012 1:04 PM
535	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 1:02 PM
536	non auto access should be very helpful, great!	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM
537	Fine	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
538	Would be good to encourage higher use of bicycles by assuring safe access.	Sep 27, 2012 12:29 PM
539	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
540	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 12:24 PM
541	30-ft is much too wide for a ped/bike path.	Sep 27, 2012 12:15 PM
542	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
543	Yes. A safer crossing of I-5 at Roanoke for bikes is much needed. A separate lane on the sidewalk along with ramps would work here.	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
544	quality bike/pedestrian paths are of the utmost importance in this (and all) projects to allow all modes of transportation to utilize this important connection (all the way from Bellevue to I5)	Sep 27, 2012 12:11 PM
545	Including safe bicycle and pedestrian paths as part of the project is crucial.	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
546	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 12:05 PM
547	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
548	This sounds like a good idea	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
549	YES - this is extremely important and should be high priority	Sep 27, 2012 11:59 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
550	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:58 AM
551	I prefer this option.	Sep 27, 2012 11:54 AM
552	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
553	Separated bike and ped would be ideal. Given limited crossing opportunities for I-5, having areas that keep peds, bikes, and cars separated would ensure the greatest safety and least bottlenecking.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
554	It would be tragic to not build a bike and walking lane across the 520. Bikers in Seattle have to add 45-60min to their commute by biking across I90. This will reduce traffic dramatically.	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 AM
555	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
556	Yes, cycling in this area is currently extremely dangerous once you leave Harvard or 10th and get on Roanoke, a shared use path for this crossing and along Roanoke that continues to the existing bike lanes further east towards the hill above Boyer ave would make it much safer.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
557	I like this concept. I am hoping that this will be separated from the street traffic and feed directly onto a dedicated uphill bike lane going south on 10th Ave E, i.e., a lane that does not have to compete with parked cars.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
558	need more bike friendly access between seattle and bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
559	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
560	Imperative this is part of new design	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
561	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
562	I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path	Sep 27, 2012 11:28 AM
563	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:25 AM
564	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
565	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
566	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
567	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
568	highly recommended	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
569	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail. Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E. Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St. Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM
570	Like that.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
571	Yes! I am a frequent bike commuter and also ride recreationally. I think that the lack of a bike path across 520 is pretty limiting. I live in Bothell and it would be VERY nice to have a lake crossing via bike that is closer than I-90! I feel strongly that adding bicycle and pedestrian lanes is a CRITICAL aspect of any new road work as it will provide better transportation and health opportunities for years to come.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
572	No need for the landscaping--the lake is very scenic. instead, take that money and: **Separate bicycle and pedestrian traffic with a berm or something more than mere signage. Many cyclists commute and work out along this route--i.e. need safe fast and efficient travel lanes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
573	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
574	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
575	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:04 AM
576	Should be a high priority to make bike travel across the bridge easy	Sep 27, 2012 11:04 AM
577	Very important.	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
578	Great idea	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
579	Bike path needs to feed into bike arterial to downtown core, and also north to U-district	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
580	Strong preference for a bicycle/pedestrian path	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
581	The 30 foot width is a good idea: the Burke Gilman trail is too narrow to be used effectively on weekend days when walkers, dog walkers, runners and cyclists of all ages are out. Please make sure there is clear signage (on the ground?) to show the direction people should be travelling in.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
582	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
583	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
584	Love it!	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
585	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
586	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
587	Very important - bicycle crossings of I-5 are always difficult so it would be great to have a safe on connecting this part of Eastlake with Montlake, and then hopefully with a trail on the portage bay bridge	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
588	The I-5 cross is a nice to have, but not a major priority.	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
589	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
590	It's imperative to have a proper bicycle and pedestrian path.	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
591	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
592	Absolutely. Bike crossing in this area needs to be safer and more efficient.	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 AM
593	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
594	I think this would be great	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
595	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail. Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E. Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St. Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
596	yes to inclusive design for all users, bikes, peds, young, old and in between	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
597	Right now this is very congested and unsafe for bikes. I strongly support this improvement..	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
598	Extending the a bicycle path all the way to I-5, will result in more people communiting via bike.	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
599	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
600	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
601	Great. Please include a bike path.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
602	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
603	Make sure to pay extra attention to the intersection of Boylston and Roanoke. See if there is a way to allow NB travel on Boylston north of Roanoke for bicycles. This is currently one way SB.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
604	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
605	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
606	Better and safe for all of the cyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
607	please do. I expect to make heavy use of bicycling across the bridge both professionally and recreationally. pedestrian seperation in this day and age of	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	smart phones is important	
608	Yes! Walkers & cyclists must be encouraged and supported.	Sep 27, 2012 10:23 AM
609	This makes a lot of sense on many levels. it is well worth the money. I will be happy to pay my share.	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
610	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 AM
611	Shared use path over I-5 soundsl like a good idea. Especially if there is a plan to have ped/bike access across the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
612	Insure that there are connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
613	Please add a bike and ped path. This will be incredibly widely used	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
614	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
615	Agree with all	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
616	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
617	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
618	Very important improvement!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
619	yes, any additional bicycle / pedestrian access is a necessity. Safe I5 crossing is a necessity!	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
620	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
621	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
622	Required we need a way across for bikes and ped	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
623	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
624	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
625	Please don't use a shared-use path. I really want to see separated bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Mixing bikes and pedestrians just doesn't work very well in my opinion, it creates a dangerous situation between potentially fast moving bikes and slow moving pedestrians. Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
626	I bicycle home from work in this direction, with the 520 bridge that should have a bicycle trail, this is a great way to improve my commute to Redmond to visit with my family.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
627	I fully support this preference!	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
628	This is a good plan but without bicycle access across the entire bridge, it's short sighted.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
629	I agree that both pedestrian & bicycle ared use path is a high priority.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
630	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
631	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
632	YES!!!!	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
633	30 feet seems excessively wide, but some sort of a shared path is very high on my list	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
634	This is a great idea. Love it. I have biked this many times and it is tricky for cyclists. This needs to be made safe. This needs to be made safe. I have also run this and again it could be made a bit safer.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
635	Not essential unless there is a direct connection on the west side of I-5 to safe bicycle routes.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
636	I like this option. Ultimately the connections for bicycles and pedestrians are important. The long term view should be a completely connected system so for example this section could ultimately connect to south lake union, downtown area including seattle center and on through to Elliot Bay park.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
637	all new road projects should be designed to accommodate bicycle traffic	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
638	1.Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
639	Please include a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail as part of the Portage Bay Bridge design. It’s only a half-mile connection, and if built would connect the Eastside of Lake Washington to North Capitol Hill in Seattle by a completely	Sep 27, 2012 9:47 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	separated trail that is safe, convenient, and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities to ride and walk on.	
640	We need the bike path and connectors.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
641	Bicycling... Definitely.... For the commuter biker... Any and every chance we get...	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
642	Yes. This is a brilliant idea. Cyclists (commuters in particular) and pedestrians need more and better transportation access in this area. Saves time and money; is safe for all.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
643	Love it	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
644	please include bicycle and pedestrian access as highest priority. Bonus points for seperating pedestrian and bicycle paths	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
645	A non-motorized traffic pedestrian path should be a top priority. A decent connection for bikes is lacking here.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
646	Should have ride and walk path that is divided in some way. As use increases - shared space such as BG trail and Green lake are not up to traffic and injuries are sure to happen. Time to lead the way and recognize that safety is an important element that must take into account the unique aspects of each.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
647	Yes - PLEASE!	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
648	This is my preference as a pedestrian and cyclist. I feel Seattle lacks safe bike lanes compared to cities like Portland and Washington DC.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
649	I'm in favor of having dedicated bicycle and pedestrian paths on this bridge --- keeping bicycles off the roadway over this bridge is desirable. Keeping pedestrians and bicycles separate is in the best interest of each set of bridge users. One thing to be mindful of is the route bicycles need to follow when turning back on to Boylston, Harvard, or 10th Ave --- currently these are tricky turns to navigate without getting in the way of traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
650	Separate bicycle and pedestrain paths.	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
651	I would like to see separate bike & pedestrian path.	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
652	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
653	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
654	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
655	Skip the landscaping. A simple shared-use path would be an improvement, but it is a frill.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
656	excellent	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
657	Sounds great	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
658	Please make sure there is a bike lane and pedestrian shared walk way.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
659	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
660	This path should have bike paths as well as soft running trails using sand.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
661	Better pedestrian access looks great!	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
662	I like bicycle friendly areas.	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 AM
663	Good	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 AM
664	Yes, this is essential	Sep 27, 2012 9:35 AM
665	This is a great idea and will help reduce car traffic	Sep 27, 2012 9:34 AM
666	The greenery here will have zero ecological value, but will have strong positive visual effects. I suggest a narrow planting, nothing that will cause path to curve - perhaps a green wall on the south side of the path, containers with very low drought tolerant evergreen shrubs to the north (between cars and peds).	Sep 26, 2012 11:44 PM
667	Would like a wider "lid" over I-5 at this point covering the on ramps leading from 520 to I 5	Sep 26, 2012 5:52 PM
668	seems like a low priority....its a short bridge..	Sep 26, 2012 11:15 AM
669	Yes, please! I-5 cuts this neighborhood in two, and it shouldn't be this impossible to get such a short distance.	Sep 26, 2012 11:07 AM
670	looks good, preserves what's there now	Sep 25, 2012 8:14 PM
671	This would be extremely useful when making east/west crossings across I5.	Sep 25, 2012 1:56 PM
672	I think that this connection is good for the community. I don't think it will do much for the commuting cyclist. Most will still be in the roadway to turn left at the signal. Waiting for the ped signals would add a lot of time. I think the City of Seattle and WSDOT should consider the Roanoke Harvard intersection for widening and include sharrows. Lots of cycling traffic through this area. I like what it looks like so far.	Sep 25, 2012 9:20 AM
673	I feel this is the best option. It completes the bicycle and footpath journey from the eastside to the downtown seattle core in the best manner. Adding a bicycle and footpath leading to roanoke park will provide outdoor recreation opportunities for individuals working and living in the downtown and south lake	Sep 25, 2012 9:14 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	union area.	
674	I am very much in favor of creating safe alternatives for bicycle and pedestrian traffic.	Sep 25, 2012 9:02 AM
675	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:45 AM
676	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:16 AM
677	what is wrong with what is already there? like the portage bay bridge pedestrian / bike path this seems like it goes from no-where to no-where ... if there is a plan for good bike and pedestrian connections from the west end of the path ... then this is probably a good idea. If it just ends no-where ... what is the point?	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
678	Love it! Will be glad for a safe and beautiful option for crossing 1-5.	Sep 24, 2012 9:10 PM
679	It's a big design mistake to add bicycle and pedestrian traffic to vehicular arterials. Pedestrians and bicycles should be clearly routed onto secondary streets for safety and traffic flow considerations, in this case through the park added recently under I5 connecting Eastlake and Capitol Hill neighborhoods.	Sep 24, 2012 6:03 PM
680	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 24, 2012 5:47 PM
681	I see the value, although I probably won't use it, even though I bicycle in the area often. My issues are mostly getting across 520.	Sep 24, 2012 5:20 PM
682	This is an excellent idea! shared space that is accesible to ped's and bikes that is wide enough to accomodate while traveling in both directions. Clear walking and biking lanes would be helpful.	Sep 24, 2012 2:12 PM
683	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail	Sep 24, 2012 1:08 PM
684	excellent	Sep 24, 2012 1:01 PM
685	Yes please.	Sep 24, 2012 12:54 PM
686	I think this proposal is very important because it provides a much-needed safe bicycle connection through the neighborhood for cyclists arriving from university district (via Hardvard, Roanoke park and surrounding streets) as well as from Eastlake.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
687	This improvement is critical. The city wants to promote more cycling as a means to help reduce traffic congestion. But drivers do not accommodate cyclists adequately enough. Safety of both driver and cyclist are served better by this improvement.	Sep 24, 2012 12:28 PM
688	A pedestrian and bicycle-friendly crossing at this point on I-5 is very important - there are only a very few good crossings in this area, and especially with connections to a 520 trail, this would be a must-have to enable bicycle	Sep 24, 2012 12:25 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	commuting.	
689	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
690	This shared-use path would greatly promote a direct commute from the east side and would solve a significant safety challenge: how to get over I-5 through this busy corridor.	Sep 24, 2012 12:05 PM
691	Great Idea.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
692	This would be an excellent way to get across I-5, which is almost always a problem. Please do this.	Sep 24, 2012 12:01 PM
693	A bike path is excellent, it will help Redmond/Bellevue bike commuters who work downtown and near South Lake Union.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
694	Wonderful idea - great to create a safe connection over I-5 for pedestrians and bikes.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
695	Pretty vital to have a safe pedestrian and bicycle route through this area. Adding a bike lane will be an excellent addition to the bridge, and we should continue the improvements on both sides.	Sep 24, 2012 11:55 AM
696	Yes, please do this. Having bicycle access from 520 to SLU area is very important to the community; especially with the focus on non-automotive commuting options into the city.	Sep 24, 2012 11:54 AM
697	I would use this routinely! It'll be twice as useful if it actually connects to an Eastbound route, though.	Sep 23, 2012 6:40 PM
698	improve the lights for pedestrians at each intersection. They take forever.	Sep 23, 2012 2:28 PM
699	Along with a shared-use path on the Portage Bay Bridge, this will be a critical element to link bicyclists and pedestrians to the Eastlake Community, the University District to the north, and South Lake Union to the south.	Sep 22, 2012 4:18 PM
700	I am confused by the ramp entering from the East-bound right lane, appearing to enter 520, concerned that if this is a design element that it will add greatly to the traffic on Boylston.	Sep 22, 2012 1:45 PM
701	This is the best design. The SE corner at the intersection of Harvard, Roanoke and the exit from 520 needs special attention. It is basically a blind turn. The cars have a tough time seeing bikers and pedestrians as they head west at this intersection. This design reduces the sense of safety for though that walk and ride.	Sep 22, 2012 10:43 AM
702	Adding is preferred if it doesn't take away from motor vehicle lanes. It is tough enough to get through this intersection as it is already. Also, there is a fire station there than needs to have a clear path to travel when emergencies arise.	Sep 22, 2012 10:32 AM
703	important to encourage and increase safe bike traffic to and from 520 to	Sep 22, 2012 9:56 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	downtown along Eastlake area	
704	A bicycle and shared bicycle path is imperative to the sustainability of transportation in Seattle. This will allow members of our community without cars cross I-5 without hazard.	Sep 22, 2012 2:27 AM
705	While I believe this would be beneficial to the area, I think it is of secondary importance, as there is already a bridge at this location; if funding needs to go elsewhere, there are minor improvements that could be done to this area to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.	Sep 21, 2012 3:27 PM
706	How will signalization be improved for on street bicycles? How will that effect motorized traffic flows?	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
707	Why build this crossing if WSDOT is not going to build a bicycle/pedestrian path on the Portage Bay Bridge? It would best serve those traveling from Boylston to Roanoke to Montlake along the proposed bike path.	Sep 20, 2012 3:00 PM
708	Hey bikes don't really have a reason to cross I5 here. I always go north of here up the wrong way / sidewalk on boylston and go under the freeway, under the ship canal bridge to get to the University Bridge.	Sep 19, 2012 3:20 PM
709	The amount of bicycle and pedestrian traffic coming over the 520 bike path will absolutely require a safe route across the I-5 that can handle the high volume especially during morning and evening "bike peak periods". 30' wide sounds great. Don't let vocal minorities reduce this!	Sep 19, 2012 12:21 PM
710	YES!	Sep 19, 2012 12:14 PM
711	The current overpass seems fine for bikers and peds. There are sidewalks on both sides so an expanded overpass doesn't seem necessary.	Sep 18, 2012 3:12 PM
712	Sidewalks here are pretty good. Not very important.	Sep 18, 2012 11:46 AM
713	A bike path all the way across the lake to Capitol Hill would be great.	Sep 18, 2012 6:35 AM
714	Yes, that is a good idea	Sep 17, 2012 9:23 PM
715	Maximize bike and ped connections at all opportunities	Sep 17, 2012 5:04 PM
716	Make sure this shared-use path connects directly to the (coming) new cycle tracks on Broadway.	Sep 17, 2012 2:54 PM
717	Yes! Please do this. Let's make more street space that is safe for walkers and cyclers.	Sep 17, 2012 11:13 AM
718	How much use does that sidewalk get today? I think we should devise a project that connects N Capitol Hill to Lake View area (like it was decades ago before i5). This wider path does not do it. Why not put a lid over i5 just south of the 520!!! It would connect two vibrant neighborhoods and increase everyone's quality of life. Preference #1 does not do that! There are too many cars coming from Harvard to E Roanoke and off of 520 W too. You need to do something for pedestrians in that are with so many cars...See #2 comments too	Sep 17, 2012 9:26 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
719	Bike improvements are badly needed here	Sep 17, 2012 6:08 AM
720	We are in need of a safer pedestrian & bicycle path connecting Eastlake to Cap Hill over I5 so I am greatly in support of this. In connection with this, the on the bridge across I5, there is currently a sidewalk on both sides of the road (north and south); however, the north sidewalk does not connect to a crosswalk or pedestrian crossing over Boylston Ave E on the Eastlake side, making this sidewalk useless. Either this sidewalk should be removed to reduce pedestrian confusion, or a second crosswalk should be added (which would be nice as we currently have to cross back and forth across the street to get to Cap Hill).	Sep 16, 2012 6:37 PM
721	Yes	Sep 16, 2012 3:36 PM
722	This is my preference.	Sep 16, 2012 1:16 PM
723	I appreciate the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Crossing I-5 via foot or bicycle at present is a challenge.	Sep 16, 2012 9:53 AM
724	I am not aware of that many people who go from one side of I5 to the other.	Sep 16, 2012 8:56 AM
725	Yes	Sep 16, 2012 7:19 AM
726	I support this	Sep 16, 2012 2:13 AM
727	This would be a nice feature to allow bicycles to access the new crossing, but a lot more work is needed everywhere else for bicycles to become viable within the city	Sep 15, 2012 9:18 PM
728	Please consider separating bicycle and pedestrian paths; 30 feet is adequate width to do this!	Sep 15, 2012 8:33 PM
729	I strongly support this path, but with 30 feet width it would be preferable to separate bikes and pedestrians.	Sep 15, 2012 7:47 PM
730	Nice, but is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520?	Sep 15, 2012 7:43 PM
731	That sounds nice, bust as long as we're doing it why not make it even wider, like 50 or 60'	Sep 15, 2012 6:06 PM
732	There must be continuous bike facilities to support traffic from 10th Ave E to Harvard Ave E. Will there be a continuation of the bike lane on Delmar/Roanoke west of 10th Ave? Unlike separated path on the south side of the street, a bike lane would facilitate traffic heading to the U Bridge via Harvard Ave. This would also optimize for Capitol Hill to U District (common) traffic rather than Eastlake to Capitol Hill traffic (probably less common given the smaller population and alternative of E Pine St). The visibility for cars turning right onto E Roanoke St from the SR-520 offramp is poor. I don't see the trees helping. There is also an opportunity to add a right turn lane here.	Sep 15, 2012 1:31 PM
733	Yes, if we are (finally) building, let's do it right from the get go.	Sep 15, 2012 12:47 PM
734	Provide physical separation between a) pedestrians, b) bikes and c) motor	Sep 15, 2012 11:57 AM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	vehicles to ensure safety and a better experience for all. Find space for more BIG trees.	
735	This area is used heavily by bicycle commuters, often moving at the speed of vehicle traffic or faster. Whatever is done in this area should also provide safe usage by pedestrians.	Sep 15, 2012 11:34 AM
736	Good idea	Sep 15, 2012 11:19 AM
737	The bridge does need improvement and this options looks good however the street connections to Eastlake and Harvard Ave need improvement.	Sep 15, 2012 10:51 AM
738	This seems like a good idea. The area is heavily used by cyclists and the area from Roanoke to 10th ave is also heavily used by cars cars. Safe separation is a priority.	Sep 14, 2012 5:49 PM
739	This is essential for our community. It will keep people safe and provide options for people of all abilities.	Sep 14, 2012 5:47 PM
740	I think you need to ensure there is adequate space for people on bikes and people walking not to be in conflict. It's distressing for both walkers and bikers to have to jockey for space.	Sep 14, 2012 5:14 PM
741	This is my preference, as I typically walk or bike	Sep 14, 2012 4:48 PM
742	Nice and very much needed	Sep 14, 2012 4:37 PM
743	Too little to beautify the area and lessen auto fumes' impact	Sep 14, 2012 4:25 PM
744	Green space here over the blank grey of I-5 is a great design element.	Sep 14, 2012 4:12 PM
745	Great idea! Just please make the new modifications bike and pedestrian friendly.	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
746	I don't feel this is so necessary. If money is tight I would suggest eliminating this.	Sep 14, 2012 1:47 PM
747	I am all in favor of extending Seattle's bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. it is my preference as a cyclist to use shared paths than ride on the street.	Sep 14, 2012 1:40 PM
748	Very important.	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
749	Too Wide, not needed. Too expensive. Bicycle riders and pedestrians are not paying for it.	Sep 14, 2012 1:10 PM
750	Looks good. A new shared-use path through there would be very welcome.	Sep 14, 2012 1:06 PM
751	I ride this route to work most days, and this would be a big improvement for cyclists.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
752	Buffer between the edge of the traffic on the bridge preferred over buffer between the bridge railing and traffic on I-5 below.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
753	This should be a fundamental element of this project. Potential bicycle ridership	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM

Page 3, Q1. Preference 1: I-5 crossing: Design new 30-foot wide landscaped bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path		
	in this area is enormous and is now inhibited because of the existing lack of safe infrastructure.	
754	this crossing is terrible to walk and bike across ... any improvements would be spectacular ... especially the west side ... pedestrian crosswalk signals need to trigger red lights faster than currently (sorry if this makes traffic slower but pedestrians are supposed to have the right of way always)	Sep 14, 2012 12:39 PM
755	Yes please! My biggest concern here would be ensuring a safe, convenient left turn from eastbound on the path to northbound on Harvard. This is already a popular bike route for people leaving the west side of Capitol and heading north across the University Bridge. I feel comfortable biking up in the left turn lane as-is, and would hate for cars to become angry with me if they think I ought to be on the bike path executing some kind of complicated multistage turn involving two crosswalks and then a lane change from the sidewalk to the street.	Sep 14, 2012 12:32 PM
756	Top priority. This would be great!	Sep 14, 2012 12:22 PM
757	Sounds great, I love the idea of more access over I-5	Sep 14, 2012 12:20 PM
758	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
759	Excellent idea.	Sep 14, 2012 12:01 PM
760	That's fine, as long as my car can still drive across that bridge from 520.	Sep 14, 2012 11:55 AM
761	All this money and effort, and 520 retains the left onramp?! The Mercer dive, one of the most harrowing stretches for anyone on the eastside going to Seattle, needs to be eliminated. Spend the money on moving traffic safely, rather than pretty park lids.	Sep 14, 2012 11:54 AM
762	I love this, we need as much space for bicycles as possible!	Sep 14, 2012 11:53 AM
763	Please make it easy for people who walk and bike to use this bridge and please connect multiple communities to the bridge. The bridge serves the region!	Sep 14, 2012 11:51 AM
764	Love it	Sep 14, 2012 11:46 AM
765	30' wide is too wide and wasteful - 10' is more appropriate and better use of tax dollars. No one needs a "park" across the freeway for the 30 seconds it takes to cross the bridge. Please use tax dollars more wisely.	Sep 14, 2012 10:28 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
1	I support this if the crossings for those on foot are made safer. Families deserve safe access to Roanoke Park.	Oct 5, 2012 11:35 PM
2	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E. Yep!	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 PM
3	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 PM
4	low priority; nothing really wrong w/ current intersection except capacity backups from Harvard onto Roanoke onto 10th, clogging the intersection area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
5	Provide separation between autos, cyclists and peds with smoother flow than currently.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
6	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 PM
7	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 PM
8	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 PM
9	I like this option.	Oct 5, 2012 8:29 PM
10	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably.	Oct 5, 2012 7:38 PM
11	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 7:19 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
12	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
13	I support improving the intersection and pedestrian/bike access. I have used this intersection walking, on a bike, and as a vehicle passenger. It is traffic heavy and often aggressive and confusing.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
14	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 5:42 PM
15	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 5:35 PM
16	With safety components for pedestrians and cyclists, I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 PM
17	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 4:42 PM
18	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 4:40 PM
19	My biggest concern is that the report indicates that 10th Ave E will have 2 southbound lanes, which eventually merge into a single lane. I strongly believe that 10th Ave E should be kept to 1 southbound lane, and instead the road can be narrowed further from what it is today to reduce the east-west crossing distance (wider sidewalks, landscaping, curb bulbs, etc). Making this crossing shorter and safer will become even more important with the new east-west pedestrian shared-use path that will connect with the Delmar lid. An awesome solution could be to incorporate a bus bulb at this intersection for the southbound stop at 10th and Roanoke.	Oct 5, 2012 3:45 PM
20	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 3:32 PM
21	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 3:31 PM
22	Yes, please! There are o many kids that cross that street, from little ones with caregivers, preschoolers and older through high school.We need a safer area for them to cross!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
23	Good idea. Lots of schoolchildren use these crossings.	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
24	Don't interrupt the automobile traffic flow, preferably by moving the bicycle traffic to a different grade than the automobile traffic	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
25	Seems reasonable.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
26	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
27	Design to ensure FASTEST TRAFFIC FLOW. Pedestrians and bikes are, by nature, not concerned with a fast trip. Drivers are. MAKE PEDESTRIANS AND BIKES WAIT FOR CARS!	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM
28	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
29	good	Oct 5, 2012 2:47 PM
30	I suuport this with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
31	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 2:40 PM
32	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 2:32 PM
33	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
34	Strongly support this.	Oct 5, 2012 2:19 PM
35	We really need good bike access with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:17 PM
36	ensure there are safe bicycle and pedestrian access here	Oct 5, 2012 2:17 PM
37	Will this have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections?	Oct 5, 2012 2:08 PM
38	Sorely needed, but it's hard to tell from the image what the "improvements" would be.	Oct 5, 2012 2:03 PM
39	O would like to see this intersection with safe bicycle and pedestrian connections.	Oct 5, 2012 1:54 PM
40	that intersection appears to need correction and widening, so yes	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
41	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 1:47 PM
42	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 1:46 PM
43	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably.	Oct 5, 2012 1:17 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	
44	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 1:08 PM
45	I support this. I'm pleased to see consideration was given to a bike/pedestrian Roanoke crossing on the east side, as auto traffic volume is often lower there and this would allow north/south peds to go between Roanoke Park and the lid more safely. In general bike/ped connections should be direct here, both between the parks and toward the I-5 crossing.	Oct 5, 2012 1:02 PM
46	Yes, I support improvements at this intersection for bicycle and pedestrian safety.	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
47	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
48	see above	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
49	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 12:50 PM
50	Prefer.	Oct 5, 2012 12:45 PM
51	No real change - not sure "improve" explains changes.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
52	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
53	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 12:35 PM
54	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
55	no preference.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
56	I prefer this design. I don't think that bridge money should be used for bicycle and pedestrian paths, nor should it be used for parking and other projects. The money should go strictly for bridge lanes and usage by autos. If Seattle wants other projects, the city should pay for them itself.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
57	not necessary	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
58	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
59	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East

	E.	
60	I support this with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
61	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
62	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 12:14 PM
63	Improve traffic flowing better in all directions.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 PM
64	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
65	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
66	The traffic flow and traffic light phasing needs improvement here - it is not clear if this will improve the intersection.	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
67	Safe intersections are always good on bike corridors	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
68	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM
69	This is a pinch point for cars, pedestrians and bikes, so I strongly support anything that improves safety and access to Roanoke Park.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM
70	yes - particularly as it relates to safe passage for bikes!	Oct 5, 2012 11:30 AM
71	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
72	Definitely needs improvement here.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
73	The traffic flow needs to account for potential backups from the traffic light at the corner of Harvard and Roanoke, do not block signs should be designated at the intersection of Broadway and Roanoke. Clear designated pedestrian and bicycle crossings with separation from the car traffic flow are essential to ensure non auto traffic safety.	Oct 5, 2012 11:20 AM
74	I support this idea. This intersection must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be an intersection design that helps people cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	
75	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM
76	Yes, absolutely. This would be cheaper and easier than highway path.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 AM
77	Making this safe and accessible by everyone is important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:08 AM
78	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 AM
79	support	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 AM
80	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 10:56 AM
81	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
82	nice idea #5	Oct 5, 2012 10:51 AM
83	Please improve to make best connection for bicycles and pedestrians of all abilities	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
84	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
85	It's ok as is, but the road is in bad condition.	Oct 5, 2012 10:36 AM
86	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 10:34 AM
87	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 10:26 AM
88	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 10:25 AM
89	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
90	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
91	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
92	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
93	no comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
94	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM
95	There needs to be a dedicated right-turn only lane on 10th Ave. E. where it T's into Delmar. At present, both lanes can turn left but the right-hand lane is used by most left-turning traffic as they then will be in place to take a right on red on Harvard so they can enter I-5 northbound. This leaves traffic wishing to make a right onto Delmar having to wait in a long line of other cars turning left. At rush hour, I've had to wait through two light cycles sometimes when traffic is backed up at the lights crossing Harvard and/or Boylston (from people trying to access I-5 southbound). This backup also causes many drivers to ignore the "Do Not Enter" sign on 11th Ave. E. northbound at E. Miller St. because that's the only way to make a simple right on Delmar without waiting in the northbound traffic on 10th Ave. E. A dedicated right-turn only lane on northbound 10th Ave. E. at Delmar would solve this problem.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 AM
96	Once again this area is very heavily trafficed. It is dangerous and scary. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
97	This is a major bicycle corridor. As the design develops give special attention to the needs of both fast and slow moving cyclists—with attention to actual desire lines. If pedestrian activated signals are unavoidable reduce to the maximum extent possible the wait time for the pedestrian crossing phase.	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
98	The MPCC supports this Preference.	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM
99	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM
100	Support	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
101	I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East

	Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car. Pedestrian facilities should not be an afterthought, nor should pedestrians be expected to go up and over or down and around to avoid cars. Pedestrians are like water, and if they see a flat route, they will take it, even if it is unsafe. Therefore, the pedestrian routes should be both safe AND direct.	
102	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
103	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
104	Like it	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
105	Yes please. Calming turn islands at the SW and NE corners would make a large safety difference for vulnerable users.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
106	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
107	Essential for safe pedestrian and bicycle use.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
108	This intersection should not be widened to accommodate more cars, only pedestrians and bicycles and should have green buffer between traffic and bikes and peds.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
109	While this may help ease the dangerous situation for cyclists and pedestrians, it will only make a minimal impact on chance for dangerous interactions of cars and bikes. Bikes will still need to be "in the flow" of the car traffic...even if it is "improved" with the Mayor's quaint placement of cyclist marking on the road which drivers have not been educated about, do not understand, and therefore...ignore.	Oct 5, 2012 9:20 AM
110	Yes, I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
111	This is mostly working okay for me at the moment.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
112	Agree.	Oct 5, 2012 9:18 AM
113	Enabling pedestrians to cross 10th on the south side of Roanoke would be desirable.	Oct 5, 2012 9:06 AM
114	I support this. I would like to be able to safely access Roanoke park with my young children.	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
115	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
116	Fine with as is. Adding more might muddy the waters.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
117	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
118	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 8:41 AM
119	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 8:11 AM
120	Safety is important at this intersection because it is used by many children. You should consider placing a refuge island in the intersection if it is large.	Oct 5, 2012 8:10 AM
121	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 8:04 AM
122	I support this- Roanoke Park needs better access.	Oct 5, 2012 8:02 AM
123	Preference 2: I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 7:49 AM
124	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 AM
125	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The current arrangement forces any cyclist attempting to transition from Harvard to 10th to make a dangerous left turn across oncoming traffic, wind their way through a series of back streets, ride through a crowded park, and cross a busy sidewalk. With the planned changes, the same trip is a simple matter of riding Harvard all the way to Roanoke and then turning left onto the shared-use path.	Oct 5, 2012 7:36 AM
126	I would support this.	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
127	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
128	The Broadway bike lane ends several blocks before this intersection, and the steep downhill makes it challenging to navigate. Roanoke is safe for advanced cyclists, but intimidating to most, and the park is not set up for commuting bicyclists. Improving this intersection to address these issues is a great idea.	Oct 5, 2012 7:05 AM
129	I'm in favor of this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 6:44 AM
130	Great for bicycles and pedestrians	Oct 5, 2012 6:15 AM
131	I strongly support dedicated pedestrian and bicycle access along each and every portion of the 520 project. We absolutely need to include full accomodation for non-motorized transportation in this regional project. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity, and we need to get it right and maximize this public	Oct 5, 2012 6:01 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	investment. I-5 crossing? Yes, full shared-use path!. Improve this for bikes and pedestrians.	
132	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM
133	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 5:19 AM
134	Low priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
135	Again, need safe non-car options. Strongly support.	Oct 5, 2012 5:13 AM
136	I like the previous graphic showing the realignment for the west-south movement	Oct 5, 2012 5:03 AM
137	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 5, 2012 4:48 AM
138	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 AM
139	YES	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 AM
140	Sure. Enough room on the street to ride bike on the right hand side of the street with cars comfortably driving in their lanes without switching to the left lane, aggressively tailgating the biker expecting the to go 25 mph or ditch to the sidewalk out of fear.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 AM
141	This would improve safety at this intersection.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 AM
142	could certainly be improved, not the highest of priorities though	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 PM
143	Fine, looks the same from this high level view.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
144	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 PM
145	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
146	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
147	Seems reasonable as is.	Oct 4, 2012 10:43 PM
148	This is currently a real ugly piece of road that when I'm cycling on it, I just want to get to Roanoke Park in one piece.	Oct 4, 2012 10:37 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
149	Crossings for pedestrians need to be improved to reduce the crossing distance and the signal cycle length.	Oct 4, 2012 10:02 PM
150	As a pedestrian and cyclist, support this with attention paid to how non-cars get through the intersection	Oct 4, 2012 10:01 PM
151	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children, wheelchairs/disabled, and all pedestrians to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. As it is configured now, crossing from one side to another repeatedly on marked crosswalks, to get all the way from Delmar to the elementary school is so time consuming that it is tempting to cross illegally.	Oct 4, 2012 10:00 PM
152	Roanoke Park, which is located directly across from the T-intersection needs ample protection from traffic and traffic associated air pollution. This is potentially a sport for lots of idling traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 PM
153	Sounds like a good improvement.	Oct 4, 2012 9:35 PM
154	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
155	I support this preference: This is a busy bike route and families with small children come to use this park frequently (as evidenced by the communal toys frequently left available). This is currently a dangerous intersection to cross as traffic comes into Montlake from Seattle Prep/Cap Hill/I-5 at high rates of speed.	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
156	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 PM
157	This intersection needs significant improvements.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
158	i like	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
159	DOT has way to much power	Oct 4, 2012 9:10 PM
160	support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
161	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This	Oct 4, 2012 8:55 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	
162	Yes. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably	Oct 4, 2012 8:50 PM
163	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
164	This intersection would be dangerous without some additional work	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
165	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
166	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle passage for park access and through passage.	Oct 4, 2012 8:33 PM
167	Yes, with safe ways for walkers and people on bikes including children.	Oct 4, 2012 8:23 PM
168	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 8:13 PM
169	yep	Oct 4, 2012 8:12 PM
170	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:00 PM
171	I think this intersection should be rechannelled so that 10th <--> Roanoake is the main route, and the east half of Roanoake is the T. 90% of the traffic is making that turn, rather than the other movements.	Oct 4, 2012 7:30 PM
172	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 7:19 PM
173	This would also be extremely beneficial improve the intersection here.	Oct 4, 2012 7:10 PM
174	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 PM
175	No - more room for cars, less for bikes and peds.	Oct 4, 2012 6:23 PM
176	if this is not a requirment then no taxpayer money should be spent	Oct 4, 2012 5:48 PM
177	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 5:30 PM
178	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 5:21 PM
179	Add an on-ramp to I-5 from Harvard; this would greatly reduce traffic at this intersection.	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
180	Agree. Cars are aggressive here, trying to get into the fastest lane to take them over to the highway. When taking a left from 10th Ave onto Roanoke (going West), there is no bike lane and it gets dicey fast.	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM
181	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
182	i support this preference, if it has safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 5:07 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
183	I hope this will help provide safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists.	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
184	Cool.	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
185	This is moderately important to me.	Oct 4, 2012 4:34 PM
186	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
187	Yes. I'm in favor of this.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
188	Excellent. This is a critical link between two important neighborhoods, UDistrict and Capitol Hill. It could use some improvement.	Oct 4, 2012 3:59 PM
189	Makes sense, would really help with safety at that intersection	Oct 4, 2012 3:40 PM
190	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 3:36 PM
191	so long as primary goal is reducing traffic impact on freeways	Oct 4, 2012 3:31 PM
192	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 4, 2012 3:18 PM
193	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
194	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
195	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 3:13 PM
196	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
197	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
198	The critical part of this intersection is how it relates to the harvard AV intersection and the traffic that is trying to get on to I-5 north	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
199	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM
200	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 2:36 PM
201	This would be a big improvement. Yes, please.	Oct 4, 2012 2:35 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
202	I support this option. This is a complex and relatively busy intersection that must accommodate safe bicycle connections. The I-5 shared-use path from preference one should be connected to this intersection to provide a bike-safe, continuous path crossing I5 between Eastlake and Capitol hill.	Oct 4, 2012 2:31 PM
203	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 2:20 PM
204	It seems ok as it is, not really sure what improvement would add. Generally I am for improvements though.	Oct 4, 2012 2:04 PM
205	Make sure that pedestrian and bicycle connections work with the design	Oct 4, 2012 1:53 PM
206	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
207	I love this and it must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:31 PM
208	lacks bike lane	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
209	Sorely needed. Good improvement idea.	Oct 4, 2012 1:23 PM
210	A great idea as long as it includes safe bicycle and pedestrian connections.	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM
211	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM
212	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
213	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
214	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 1:01 PM
215	Absolutely, the current intersection is scary coming down the hill	Oct 4, 2012 1:00 PM
216	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:56 PM
217	Preference 2: I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
218	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:39 PM
219	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:30 PM
220	As long as there are strong bicycle and pedestrian interchanges I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
221	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM
222	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:18 PM
223	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM
224	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
225	I support preference 2 as long as it has safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
226	I support this, so that children can access Roanoke park safely.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
227	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
228	Yes, with green bike turn lanes please.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
229	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
230	Again, Strongly Support! We need safe bicycle and pedestrain connections here.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
231	High priority connection from Harvard Ave and University Bridge to 10th Ave and connection to Broadway.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
232	I used to ride here every day when I lived on 10th avenue. The crossing can be really hairy, especially during the morning and evening commutes. Redesigning to better serve all road users will make for a safer, more effective intersection.	Oct 4, 2012 11:53 AM
233	Keep it simple and similar to other intersections in the area. A signalized T intersection is fine and make sure pedestrian and bike improvements are incorporated.	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
234	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:51 AM
235	Great idea - low priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
236	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
237	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
238	We support this preference. The intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
239	Not sure how this will help me as a cyclist.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
240	Yes! Please improve this intersection. This is a dangerous bike and pedestrian unfriendly intersection	Oct 4, 2012 11:40 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East

241	I support this. Connections for bicycles and pedestrians are important.	Oct 4, 2012 11:36 AM
242	Safe ped/vike connections, yes	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
243	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
244	This area must be accessible to bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
245	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
246	I endorse this. speeding down 10th on your bike while turning left is one of the more harrowing experiences one can have on a bike. this is a very heavily used bicycle corridor	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 AM
247	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
248	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
249	I think the definition of "improve" needs to be spelled out here. Improve for car traffic flow, pedestrian crossing, bike transit?	Oct 4, 2012 11:24 AM
250	Any improvement for ped/bicycle safety is good.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
251	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 11:21 AM
252	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:09 AM
253	I frequntly go through this intersection as a driver, pedestrian, and bicyclist--in each mode, I have experienced close calls. Improving the design for all modes of travel would be welcome.	Oct 4, 2012 11:08 AM
254	I support this preference with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections.	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 AM
255	easier bike connection when turning left (west) onto Roanoke when coming down (north) on 10th Ave E. This is an important connection for anyone commuting from Capitol Hill to the UW. Add a bike lane, or a more direct route for cyclists making this common turn.	Oct 4, 2012 10:50 AM
256	The traffic pattern from this intersection, across I-5 and heading toward Eastlake is weird--you have to keep switching lanes in order to go straight. Traffic backs up. The passive uses are importance, but so is flow of traffic, which is not a priority I see indicated in the plan.	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
257	I own our home a half mile from this location and support this to the extent that it helps walkers and cyclists.	Oct 4, 2012 10:38 AM
258	Take care to improve safety/access to this intersection for bikes and peds. If you	Oct 4, 2012 10:13 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	actually put a bike/ped lane on the PortageBayViaduct (I do NOT favor), you will have those 1000s of purported bike commuters going thru here to get to SLU via a "flat" Eastlake Ave.	
259	looks pretty much the same.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 AM
260	I like this preference.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
261	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 9:15 AM
262	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 AM
263	Support	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
264	Support - my son uses this park and the area can be intimidating to little ones	Oct 4, 2012 2:59 AM
265	The main problem for bikes/pedestrians in this currently a dangerous intersection is that cars are trying to change lanes twice while also making two 90 degree turns (in order to make free right turns/get to the I-5 entrance/avoid red lights.) It's not clear how the proposed design addresses this, but this seems like one place where full separation might make sense - maybe bike traffic heading downhill could just continue through roanoke park (parallel to ped-only path shown on page 37) and come out on harvard downhill from the I-5 north entrance?	Oct 4, 2012 1:49 AM
266	This absolutely must include improved connections to Roanoke Park. The existing crosswalks don't line up with the curb cuts, making access to and from the park pretty awkward. Northbound on 10th, the connection into the park really should be straightened out. Coming southbound, the signal timing for people on foot and on bikes is atrocious.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 AM
267	I support this preference. This intersection must accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 9:38 PM
268	Support	Oct 3, 2012 9:01 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
269	Pedestrian alternatives to avoid crossing the traffic lanes are the only improvements that make sense.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 PM
270	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
271	Good	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 PM
272	Yes, this is a no brainer as well. Make the facility work the best way possible for all modes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:13 PM
273	This gets pretty backed up at rush hour, so anything to improve the flow would be welcome.	Oct 3, 2012 4:20 PM
274	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
275	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 3:44 PM
276	Meh. Current intersection is fine, the bottlenecks occur to the west at the I-5 crossing.	Oct 3, 2012 2:34 PM
277	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 1:52 PM
278	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 3, 2012 1:48 PM
279	this could use some improvement; not sure what plan is though from this info	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
280	Make this better for pedestrians.	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
281	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection	Oct 3, 2012 1:04 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	
282	Seems to make sense	Oct 3, 2012 12:44 PM
283	Add a dedicated right-turn connecter at this corner that vehicles travelling northbound on 10th Ave. E. can use to turn right (east) onto Delmar.	Oct 3, 2012 12:10 PM
284	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 3, 2012 11:51 AM
285	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
286	to include pedestrian medians	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
287	I support this	Oct 3, 2012 11:33 AM
288	Please include pedestrian and bicycle elements.	Oct 3, 2012 11:28 AM
289	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
290	This intersection sees frequent red-light violations and backups blocking pedestrian, bike, and auto traffic. Something needs to be done to mitigate these issues, especially with regards to pedestrian/bike safety.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
291	Yes, and especially ensure that crossing to Roanoke Park is possible too for bikes and peds	Oct 3, 2012 10:28 AM
292	Please design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 3, 2012 10:27 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
293	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 9:43 AM
294	No opinion	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
295	I support the effort to improve this intersection, especially making it safer for people crossing from 10th avenue to Roanoke Park. A raised crosswalk, or separated barrier of some type would be ideal.	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM
296	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 3, 2012 9:28 AM
297	Yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:58 AM
298	OK	Oct 3, 2012 8:14 AM
299	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 8:01 AM
300	I support this.	Oct 3, 2012 7:59 AM
301	I support this preference. This intersection needs to accommodate safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. The goal should be to design an intersection that allows children to cross E Roanoke St and 10th ave safely and comfortably. Roanoke Park is commonly used by children and they need to have a safe access. The I-5 crossing needs to be seamlessly connected to this area. This intersection should incorporate a refuge island if the crossing is widened from today.	Oct 3, 2012 7:55 AM
302	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 3, 2012 7:38 AM
303	Make it a traffic circle	Oct 3, 2012 6:32 AM
304	That would be of importance, not just for cyclists, but also for pedestrians. It is difficult for pedestrians on Delmar to cross 10th Ave E on the South side of the	Oct 2, 2012 10:51 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	street because pedestrians are not allowed there. Pedestrianshave to croass the street three times, instead of just once, for the convenience of car drivers. The traffic lights also do not detect cyclists who are going straight across 10th AveE, towards Montlake. This intersection is way too car driver friendly, and very everyone else unfriendly.	
305	Neutral. No comment.	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
306	I can not tell much with this discretion. I want bicycle friendly intersections.	Oct 2, 2012 8:35 PM
307	At present this intersection is very difficult for bicycles, especially those northbound on 10th. Improvements are needed.	Oct 2, 2012 8:24 PM
308	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 2, 2012 6:13 PM
309	Yes, do this.	Oct 2, 2012 5:38 PM
310	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
311	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 2, 2012 4:14 PM
312	Lower priority	Oct 2, 2012 3:12 PM
313	Would improve traffic flow through a very rough intersection.	Oct 2, 2012 11:53 AM
314	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. I support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 AM
315	parks are always good, but all of these need to be merged into the design, along with easy access to the path across the bridge	Oct 2, 2012 11:01 AM
316	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 2, 2012 10:05 AM
317	How will traffic between the new park and Roanoke Park be handled? Can there be an overpass?	Oct 2, 2012 9:33 AM
318	Design should provide safe and efficient access through this intersection for	Oct 2, 2012 9:32 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	bikes and peds.	
319	I support this preference. Must make pedestrian and bicycle connections safe. Perhaps by reducing turning radius of intersection to slow vehicles making fast turns, adding bulb outs, raised crosswalks or other interventions. The goal should be to allow pedestrians to cross Delmar Drive safely. Roanoke Park is used by kids; they need to have a safe access. The E Roanoke Trail must connect as easily and visibly as possible with the paths on the lid.	Oct 2, 2012 9:28 AM
320	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 2, 2012 9:02 AM
321	Our coalition of neighborhoods supports this preference. In order for the lid to be used by the community, Portage Bay residents must be able to safely and enjoyably cross E Roanoke Street (north/south). While many may use the 10th ave underpass (and we applaud this idea), the T-intersection should also alow for pedestrians to cross 10th avenue (east/west).	Oct 2, 2012 8:22 AM
322	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 1, 2012 9:20 PM
323	safer	Oct 1, 2012 7:58 PM
324	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 1, 2012 2:16 PM
325	Great	Oct 1, 2012 1:16 PM
326	Yes, please improve this intersection, especially for safer cycle and ped movement	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
327	Not sure what this exactly means. Seems like a simple intersection and not much to do to improve it	Oct 1, 2012 12:30 PM
328	Very helpful, I've sat in this intersection often.	Oct 1, 2012 12:05 PM
329	I support this preference. Must make pedestrian and bicycle connections safe. Perhaps by reducing turning radius of intersection to slow vehicles making fast turns, adding bulb outs, raised crosswalks or other interventions. The goal should be to allow pedestrians to cross Delmar Drive safely. Roanoke Park is used by kids. They need to have a safe access. The E Roanoke Trail must connect as easily and visibly as possible with the paths on the lid.	Oct 1, 2012 11:26 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
330	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Oct 1, 2012 10:05 AM
331	Provide better routes for pedestrians and cyclists. It is a dangerous jungle where the pedestrian is the LAST of all transportation types that is accounted for. It is frustrating and dangerous. Runners, walkers, and children are all forced to make dangerous decisions while waiting for a light.	Sep 30, 2012 9:16 PM
332	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 30, 2012 7:41 PM
333	Not as critical if funding is a problem	Sep 30, 2012 2:55 PM
334	This intersection is dangerous at best, primarily because of the road conditions and grade of 10th Ave. Current street lighting is adequate. I strongly support a redesign of this interchange. If a 30-foot wide shared-use path transverses this area enroute to Portage Bay and the new bridge, a redesign should be simple to incorporate.	Sep 30, 2012 9:41 AM
335	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
336	Yes, facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 30, 2012 3:34 AM
337	Again, from personal experience, I'm not sure that this as described is needed. The illustrations do not match either what is currently on the ground or what is planned for the neighborhood.	Sep 29, 2012 11:30 PM
338	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 29, 2012 9:58 PM
339	Good	Sep 29, 2012 7:39 PM
340	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 29, 2012 7:24 PM
341	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	
342	would like bike/pedestrain shared-use path all the way across 520	Sep 29, 2012 4:54 PM
343	Please make this a safer intersection for bicyclists. Right now it's very treacherous in all directions.	Sep 29, 2012 4:25 PM
344	Support	Sep 29, 2012 2:34 PM
345	It depends on what "Improve" means. This intersection works pretty well today.	Sep 29, 2012 1:18 PM
346	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 29, 2012 1:12 PM
347	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 9:21 AM
348	It looks the same as today. Good.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 AM
349	Ensure T-intersection at 10th & Delmar is functional for all traffic.	Sep 28, 2012 10:47 PM
350	That area is so hostile right now that I don't ever even try to go there on my bicycle. Anything would be an improvement.	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 PM
351	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 28, 2012 9:44 PM
352	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 28, 2012 8:56 PM
353	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
354	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 28, 2012 7:17 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
355	This should be designed to reduce the bottleneck the current configuration can cause.	Sep 28, 2012 5:48 PM
356	No comment	Sep 28, 2012 5:38 PM
357	Here, like many cyclists, I often use the diagonal walkway through Roanoke Park if going north on the east side of I-5. The path could be improved for cycle use without a major impact on the other uses of Roanoke Park.	Sep 28, 2012 3:31 PM
358	Second most.	Sep 28, 2012 2:34 PM
359	don't care	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM
360	Also make sure that there are safe places for bicycles at the intersection and that it connects with the bicycle path.	Sep 28, 2012 2:08 PM
361	I like the bike access.	Sep 28, 2012 1:58 PM
362	This is long overdue. The design of the intersection needs improvement. But so do the facilities - there are treacherous cuts and uneven surfaces in the road on 10th as it approaches the intersection; drivers approaching from the east don't always recognize peds and cyclists using the crosswalk (with the signal) that crosses Roanoke on the west side of 10th. And as a cyclist, it's incredibly confusing using the marked bikeway heading south on Broadway East - it would be much easier to follow the preferred route if there were a path through the Roanoke Park to the crosswalk. As it is, the smoothest path I've found is to the use the crosswalk, and that conflicts with pedestrians.	Sep 28, 2012 1:13 PM
363	Avoid (dont use) Tee intersections in favor of British style elevated round-abouts for improved traffic flow.	Sep 28, 2012 12:45 PM
364	2	Sep 28, 2012 12:05 PM
365	I support this	Sep 28, 2012 11:30 AM
366	That could be important locally, but the bike lane connecting the Eastside to Seattle is my #1 priority.	Sep 28, 2012 11:08 AM
367	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 28, 2012 10:16 AM
368	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 28, 2012 9:51 AM
369	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
370	Current intersection seems ok	Sep 28, 2012 8:28 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
371	A very good idea, lower priority than bike paths.	Sep 28, 2012 7:11 AM
372	Great. However, this intersection works well now. the traffic challenge seems to be at Harvard and Roenoke	Sep 28, 2012 6:18 AM
373	Support this!	Sep 27, 2012 11:26 PM
374	Wider crossing is needed to give right turning cars easier access through area going northbound and providing better foot and bike access across bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 10:46 PM
375	Yes, and especially improved timing of crosswalk signals - currently nearly impossible to cross 10th on the south side.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 PM
376	Please design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:32 PM
377	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:00 PM
378	i like it	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
379	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 8:10 PM
380	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 7:31 PM
381	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM
382	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:02 PM
383	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 6:29 PM
384	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke,	Sep 27, 2012 6:27 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	
385	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 6:16 PM
386	Looks good	Sep 27, 2012 6:12 PM
387	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 5:57 PM
388	Not sure what this is	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
389	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 5:09 PM
390	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, I support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 4:50 PM
391	This intersection is currently very cyclist/pedestrian unfriendly. Improve this intersection to enable safe and rapid use by cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
392	Should be eliminated.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
393	YES Design to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians. Thus I support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
394	As long as it provides safe passage, crossing lights for cyclists and pedestrians	Sep 27, 2012 4:34 PM
395	Please make this a safe place for bicyclists and pedestrians. Currently it is very difficult get in the correct lane on E Delmar to cross I-5 at Roanoke. I support a seperate pedestrian/bike path and crossing lights that favor pedestrians and cyclists, especially because of the proximity to the school, rather than motorists who are sitting warm and dry in their heated vehicles. .	Sep 27, 2012 4:19 PM
396	This is a key intersection and it needs to be functional, but expense for landscaping is not really necessary.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
397	Agree	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
398	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, I support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 3:35 PM
399	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 3:27 PM
400	I support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
401	This is much needed.	Sep 27, 2012 2:43 PM
402	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:31 PM
403	Improvement of intersection design is great.	Sep 27, 2012 2:25 PM
404	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:21 PM
405	Yes, please do this!	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
406	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
407	Provide bicycle lane on the north side through this segment	Sep 27, 2012 2:02 PM
408	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
409	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
410	Definitely need improvements here as this will have the largest number of users to this area and the 520 trail overall.	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
411	2nd Preference...	Sep 27, 2012 1:41 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
412	Yes please!	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
413	YEs!	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
414	There needs to be better cross walks/bike sensors here...intersection takes forever to cross as a cyclist/pedestrian.	Sep 27, 2012 1:26 PM
415	This is a must also	Sep 27, 2012 1:15 PM
416	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
417	Preferences 1, 2 and 3 need to tied together and supported.	Sep 27, 2012 1:04 PM
418	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 1:02 PM
419	Fine	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
420	I use this intersection every work day and agree that it needs to be improved. The majority of the traffic in the morning turns left onto Roanoke and tries to get into the right-turn lane to turn onto Harvard Ave East. I've had many near-misses as folks jockey for position. Coming the opposite way in the evening, it's very confusing turning from Roanoke onto 10th. While I believe only one lane turns, it looks like 2 lanes turn.	Sep 27, 2012 12:29 PM
421	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
422	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:24 PM
423	good idea	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
424	improvement at 10th ave E is very important as this is an area used by all modes of transportation. making this more safe for bikes and cars will be a huge improvement	Sep 27, 2012 12:11 PM
425	Including safe bicycle and pedestrian paths as part of the project is crucial.	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
426	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions	Sep 27, 2012 12:05 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	
427	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
428	I support improving the design. I bicycle through this interesection regularly and it is hazardous in the traffic lanes because of heavy and impatient car traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
429	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:58 AM
430	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
431	Once again any improvements that keep peds, bikes, and autos apart would be best for safety and efficiency of traffic flow.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
432	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
433	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
434	(1) Improvements should be made so that westbound AM traffic from Delmar to Roanoake is not impeded by northbound traffic from 10th to Roanoake, to Harvard. (2) Improvements should be made so that northbound traffic on 10th turning right on Delmar is not impeded by northbound traffic queuing up on Roanoake for I-5. (3) East/West bike/pedestrian traffic should be able to bypass Roanoake, given the danger from high volume traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 11:34 AM
435	Safety and ease of flow for bicycles and foot traffic	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
436	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
437	Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East	Sep 27, 2012 11:28 AM
438	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:25 AM
439	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
440	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
441	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
442	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
443	Like that.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
444	That intersection seems fine to me (?).	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
445	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
446	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
447	Support this	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
448	No comments.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
449	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	
450	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
451	Keeping peds safe is always good	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
452	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
453	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
454	Also important as 10th is a way to get to Capitol Hill.	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
455	This intersection is an important gateway to the lid and should be a priority.	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
456	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
457	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
458	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
459	I thought they already did some work here	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
460	Please. This is a very congested intersection, unsafe for bikes, unsafe for pedestrians, with lots of rapid lane changes by cars in a compressed space that probably result in a lot of accidents.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
461	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	
462	I support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
463	Also fine, but again, please include a bike path.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
464	I support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
465	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
466	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
467	I think this needs to happen to make things flow better and safer	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
468	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 AM
469	cyclist level(accessible) crossing buttons and well marked crossing areas are critical!	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
470	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
471	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
472	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
473	investements in pedestrian and cycling safety are not wasted ! Smooth	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	transitions lead to greater use of what could be a destination resource for the city.	
474	This is a dangerous, highly used interesction for bicycles. Please improve!	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
475	2.Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
476	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
477	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
478	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
479	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
480	The current bicycle trail does not allow a safe traversion from the U district to capitol hill, any improvements on this intersection will make the bicycle route more appealing.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
481	This may be the most important of the five listed here.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
482	T-intersection always slow traffic. They are also difficult for bicyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
483	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
484	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
485	Some sort of traffic improvements are needed here. This area is a mess.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
486	Again, I have biked this many times and it is tricky for cyclists. This needs to be made safe. I have also run this and again it could be made a bit safer.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
487	easy bicycle infrastructure is key to transforming folks to start using bikes more.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
488	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
489	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
490	Great	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
491	include bicycle path and pedestrian safety	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
492	Definitely in favor of this. Today the intersection is a bottleneck. Getting traffic from the left turn lane on 10th off Roanoke and onto Harvard and Boylston quickly will be very helpful. Improving traffic flow from Boylston through Roanoke and past this intersection will also be very helpful. I really hope the new design makes exiting 520 at Harvard easier and reduces congestion on Roanoke.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
493	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
494	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
495	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
496	No opinion	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
497	Seems good	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
498	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
499	good	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 AM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
500	no opinion here	Sep 27, 2012 9:35 AM
501	This intersection is a chronic source of traffic accidents because the pavement is worn and slick and because the road bed is not conducive to making safe turns from 10th traveling westward onto Roanoke. Cars very frequently end up running across the sidewalk and into Roanoke Park -- endangering pedestrians and damaging trees and shrubbery in the Park. We have consistently had between 2 and 6 accidents per year intrding into the Park and damaging and/or killing trees in the Park. Please do what you can to improve the flow of traffic off 10th, both to the East and West on Roanoke and Delmar. This has been a chronic problem for the nearly 30 years I have lived in this neighborhood.	Sep 26, 2012 5:52 PM
502	Not sure what this means	Sep 26, 2012 11:15 AM
503	Well of course this intersection should be improved. There's too much traffic here for multiple lanes of vehicles going in the same direction, each jockeying for position trying to get ahead of one another, in too short of a travel distance. Single lane traffic with clearly marked turn lane indicators are what's needed.	Sep 26, 2012 11:07 AM
504	like this	Sep 25, 2012 8:14 PM
505	Yes, allowing easier access to 10th when coming north through roanoke park would be a great improvement	Sep 25, 2012 1:56 PM
506	It is about as good as it gets. I think the state is doing a great job by building community space and adding greenery to the area. This will improve livability and provide some sense of serenity in a chaotic urban environment. No changes to the intersection. Bus pull outs might be an option on 10th. Buses come every 15 minutes or so and block traffic. Adding a bus lane that is long enough for a good merge southbound would be cool.	Sep 25, 2012 9:20 AM
507	I don't use this route often so I will reserve my input.	Sep 25, 2012 9:02 AM
508	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:45 AM
509	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:16 AM
510	A. That intersection is a mess. B. It looks like this is a good design for fixing it?>	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
511	That intersection as it stands needs improving. This seems a reasonable approach.	Sep 24, 2012 9:10 PM
512	Easiest improvement here would be to remove or disable the extra traffic light (eastbound on Roanoke). It is an obvious safety hazard to have three traffic lights (including two right-turn arrows) when only one lane of traffic is allowed to make the right turn.	Sep 24, 2012 6:03 PM
513	I didn't know there was a problem there.	Sep 24, 2012 5:20 PM
514	better R turn markings and two lanes to turn onto 10th from E Roenoke	Sep 24, 2012 2:12 PM
515	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and	Sep 24, 2012 1:08 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E	
516	Yes, this is definitely needed.	Sep 24, 2012 12:54 PM
517	As a frequent driving as well as bicycling commuter through this intersection as it exists today, I do not see a large need for improvement at this intersection. I think it works well-enough as it is. One thing I would like to change, however, is an easier way for bicyclists coming up from University District via the Roanoke park to safely get onto 10th Ave east. Right now it's a bit of a mess, especially because right-most car lane turns right into the start of the bike lane on 10th, which is confusing to drivers and dangerous to everuone involved.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
518	Seems reasonable, but I don't have a strong opinion on this piece.	Sep 24, 2012 12:28 PM
519	I don't drive this area much, but that looks like it has all the makings of a bad intersection - major roads, cramped quarters thanks to 520, and multiple major options with each way to go. The new plan looks good, my one thought is that you may want to remove the northernmost trees flanking 10th, to increase visibility around those corners even more.	Sep 24, 2012 12:25 PM
520	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St.	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
521	I support this as a commuter cyclist.	Sep 24, 2012 12:05 PM
522	Need a on ramp from Harvard Avenue East down onto the ramp from I-5 to I-520 eastbound. Just as the westbound Roanoke exit serve westbound traffic. This would reduce traffic at 10th and Delmar and on the Montlake ramp eastbound. Also reduce high speed traffic on Delmar-Fuhrman-Boyer-Lynn-Montlake Streets. Better yet just eliminate the Westbound Roanoke exit and these people who need to commute to Bellevue would just move to Bellevue.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
523	I think option 3 and 5 is better than this.	Sep 24, 2012 12:01 PM
524	The biggest thing I see here is the pedestrian crossing experience between Roanoke Park and the new lid. Get that right and you're effectively doubling the size of Roanoke Park; get it wrong and you're effectively creating two small parks that don't work together.	Sep 23, 2012 6:40 PM
525	Good. I have seen cars going too fast and running up into the park.	Sep 23, 2012 2:28 PM
526	I frequently ride my bike through this intersection on my way to and from work and know firsthand that this important intersection needs improvement. I do not feel particularly safe on my bike at this intersection, as in one direction (Delmar to 10th Ave E), I am sitting out for long periods in a left turn lane with cars passing at fairly high speeds, and in the other direction (10th Ave E, turning right on Delmar), frequently stuck between a long line of cars waiting to turn left to get to I-5.	Sep 22, 2012 4:18 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
527	The landscaping on the south side of Roanoke Park at this intersection should be moved back to the north to improve sight-lines for the cars that head west.	Sep 22, 2012 10:43 AM
528	less important	Sep 22, 2012 9:56 AM
529	This intersection does not need to be re-designed. A few clearly marked signs will free the flow of traffic.	Sep 22, 2012 2:27 AM
530	This intersection definitely could use improvement.	Sep 21, 2012 3:27 PM
531	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
532	It would be fantastic if the grade evened out before the intersection.	Sep 20, 2012 3:00 PM
533	Bikes going north down the hill on 10th usually cut through Roanoke Park. Make this easier for bikes. Part of riding a bicycle, for me, is always keeping moving. Make it so that bikes don't have to wait for ever at the light. Keep bikes a part of the vehicle traffic. Keep us moving fast.	Sep 19, 2012 3:20 PM
534	Drastic changes to this intersection are required to make it safe for bikes and peds. I think this is a great place to put one of Seattle's first bicycle/pedestrian scramble intersections. THe volume of bicycles and pedestrians will definitely justify it.	Sep 19, 2012 12:21 PM
535	This seems like a decent idea as it adds more lanes.	Sep 18, 2012 3:12 PM
536	This is a bad intersection. Lights are wonky. Hard to know how many lanes, etc. Redesigning this intersection makes sense.	Sep 18, 2012 11:46 AM
537	Make the intersection safe, but try to make the flow of traffic to move smoothly	Sep 17, 2012 9:23 PM
538	This is an important improvement. The current intersection is extremely unpleasant for pedestrians and dissuades walking.	Sep 17, 2012 5:28 PM
539	Follow all references to the Olmsted Bros. at every opportunity and design to the greatest landscape advantage	Sep 17, 2012 5:04 PM
540	This is a pinch point in traffic flow -- improvements would be great.	Sep 17, 2012 11:13 AM
541	Definitely needs improvement. I have to wait 5-7 minutes for the light to change to cross E Roanoke to take my baby into the Roanoke Park. What are you going to do about all those cars? Build a tunnel or a ramp that goes over the road? I am half joking, but there are too many cars there...Honestly, see my #1 comments, you should build ANOTHER LID OVER I5!!! (Where the 520 comes to join I5)....That will provide amazing park area WITH INCREDIBLE VIEWS FOR EVERYONE TO ENJOY. Plus, you don't have to worry about all that awful traffice that I describe in #1 - the Harvard >E Roanoke > 10th Ave E traffic is brutal!!! Must find a way to limit the cars or make it safer for pedestrians to CROSS the STREET. It is too dangerous to get to those parks...	Sep 17, 2012 9:26 AM
542	Another area where bike/ped improvements are needed	Sep 17, 2012 6:08 AM
543	This would also be nice, but in my opinion is not as necessary as some of the	Sep 16, 2012 6:37 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East		
	other options addressed here.	
544	Bike lane on Delmar Drive is dangerous, steep and long. Using apace on the Portage Bay Bridge to add a bike lane to connect to eht new crossing of I-referred to above.	Sep 16, 2012 3:36 PM
545	This intersection is also a challenge at present, and I appreciate the improvements.	Sep 16, 2012 9:53 AM
546	W isn't there more to connectoanoke park with the lid? ill there be a walkway overpass to connect the two?	Sep 16, 2012 9:31 AM
547	The pedestrian connection between Roanoke park and the new lid must be addressed. This is a very busy intersection and the crossover between parks will be considerable. Is there no way to merge the 2? The intersection itself is a problem but how much of that traffic is going onto 1-5? will that traffic	Sep 16, 2012 8:56 AM
548	yes, safety for bikes is high priority	Sep 16, 2012 7:19 AM
549	The report does not mention what improvements are suggested for this intersection.	Sep 16, 2012 2:13 AM
550	This is an important bicycle connection point; please keep bikes in mind as this design is improved.	Sep 15, 2012 8:33 PM
551	This intersection is an important connection between U-District and Capitol Hill for bicycles and any redesign should involve improvements for bikes.	Sep 15, 2012 7:47 PM
552	Nice, but is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520?	Sep 15, 2012 7:43 PM
553	I'm not sure what could really be done differently there, but I suppose it's worth a shot	Sep 15, 2012 6:06 PM
554	Needed as more traffic is likely to come off Broadway.	Sep 15, 2012 12:47 PM
555	Provide physical separation between a) pedestrians, b) bikes and c) motor vehicles to ensure safety and a better experience for all	Sep 15, 2012 11:57 AM
556	Handling the high volume of traffic coming from 10th Ave East from both motorized and non motorized traffic should necessitate separation, however the bicyclists coming from 10th ave E going north to Eastlake need well defined solution to get to your bridge improvements.	Sep 15, 2012 10:51 AM
557	This intersection needs work.	Sep 14, 2012 5:49 PM
558	Not a critical need	Sep 14, 2012 4:37 PM
559	Whatever. This is a waste of an opportunity to do something more visionary.	Sep 14, 2012 4:25 PM
560	The new intersection should not take any of Roanoke Park. It must be entirely south of the current south property line of Roanoke Park/north right of way line of Roanoke St.	Sep 14, 2012 2:32 PM

Page 3, Q2. Preference 2: Intersection design: Improve T-intersection design at 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East

561	like it	Sep 14, 2012 1:47 PM
562	I don't have a particular problem with this intersection currently, but I rarely use it. I think it's important for people who bicycle from Capitol Hill to Roanoke via 10th ave. east to have easy access to any bike paths that will be on the new bridge (both east and westbound).	Sep 14, 2012 1:40 PM
563	OK	Sep 14, 2012 1:10 PM
564	This intersection has been a pain to get through for some time. The double-left turn from 10th Ave E to E Roanoke St is hard to make and everyone drives to quickly around it.	Sep 14, 2012 1:06 PM
565	A safer route for cyclists on E Roanoke St riding eastbound, such as a bike lane would be a great addition.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
566	no real comment - keep it simple. Does not have to be glossy.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
567	This is an improvement from original baseline design, which would have encouraged running left turns from vehicles heading north on 10th. This will be much safer for bicyclists and pedestrians, and likely for cars too.	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
568	Doesn't effect me but I do have a suggestion that might help traffic: there is a bus stop (NB) in front of the Pacliacci Pizza on 10th Ave & E Miller. right after the bus stop (to the north) are a couple of parking places. When they are occupied ... the bus has to exit the curb lane (provided traffic yield (which they usually don't) to get around these few cars ... just to return to the curb lane right after. if the stop were swapped with the parking things would run smoother for buses.	Sep 14, 2012 12:39 PM
569	I see a lot of drivers who barely even pay lip service to the stoplight here before making a right on red. If there's going to be a 2-way path please include a giant bucket of design features that will make drivers leaving the freeway actually STOP and LOOK for path users in both directions before proceeding.	Sep 14, 2012 12:32 PM
570	This is in desperate need of improvement, I like this move	Sep 14, 2012 12:20 PM
571	Not sure	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
572	Much appreciated.	Sep 14, 2012 11:55 AM
573	Seems good. Are there lots of accidents here? Do we need this?	Sep 14, 2012 11:53 AM
574	Love it	Sep 14, 2012 11:46 AM
575	Good design shown.	Sep 14, 2012 10:28 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
1	I strongly support the bicycle and pedestrian share-use paths on the Roanoke lid. These paths must be designed with good sight-lines, meaning they should be straight-forward to follow, include wayfaring signs to direct people towards the many connections surrounding the lid, and especially connect with a Portage Bay Multi-use trail, Federal Ave, and Interlaken Park. A connection to both sides of the Roanoke lid underneath 10th Ave should be highly considered in order to makes access to the public space safest and connections through the area most effecient.	Oct 5, 2012 11:35 PM
2	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Indeed!	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 PM
3	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 PM
4	great idea.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
5	Limited space for passive use on the east oriented part of the lid is reasonable for local residents, but through passage for cyclists and peds transiting the area should be not be impeded.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
6	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 PM
7	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 PM
8	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
9	I like this option	Oct 5, 2012 8:29 PM
10	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 7:38 PM
11	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 7:19 PM
12	This would be my preference.	Oct 5, 2012 7:14 PM
13	Looks good if the Delmar crosswalk at 11th is safe for pedestrians so we can cross there, then go under 10th to get to the bus stop. (And how steep is that climb after going under 10th?)	Oct 5, 2012 6:04 PM
14	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. It works really well on Mercer Island by the way - try to have enough width that bike/pedestrian interfaces are manageable.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
15	I support bike and pedestrian paths here as an important connector of Seattle neighborhoods. The lid offers an opportunity to add more greenspace to this area.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
16	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected	Oct 5, 2012 5:42 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	
17	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 5:35 PM
18	Yeah OK. But make sure the paths enhance bicycle mobility! Winding paths are not my favorite idea.	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 PM
19	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 4:42 PM
20	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the lid.	Oct 5, 2012 4:40 PM
21	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:02 PM
22	I love this new lid, thanks for including this great addition to green public space! My only concern is making sure the design of the 10th and Delmar intersection will allow pedestrians to safely connect with this new public space, walking across 10th Ave (see comments on Pref 2) and crossing Roanoke.	Oct 5, 2012 3:45 PM
23	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 3:32 PM
24	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 3:31 PM
25	Love this idea, that area now is being used by the homeless. A wide open and well lit tea would be very welcome. It is no fun walking strollers next to that busy street (lots of speeding there).	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
26	Lid is a great idea as long as it provides numerous, well-signed, and easily navigable connections across it.	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
27	Again, seems reasonable.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
28	This seems like a waste. Just make sure there's a way to get to/from the bridge and the local bike corridors.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
29	yes. provide full bike and pedestrian access.	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
30	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
31	Sounds good. Go for it.	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
32	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
33	good	Oct 5, 2012 2:47 PM
34	Strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-used paths on the 10th & Delmar lid.	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
35	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 2:40 PM
36	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 2:32 PM
37	Good plan.	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
38	Strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 2:19 PM
39	We really need good bike access with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:17 PM
40	I love the idea of having bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the lid.	Oct 5, 2012 2:08 PM
41	Great. Please provide good bicycle access from the lid to both Roanoke St., 10th Ave E, and Federal Ave E, as they are all important bicycle (with Federal being proposed for Greenway treatment).	Oct 5, 2012 2:03 PM
42	I support the bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths and I want you to preserve as many trees as possible.	Oct 5, 2012 1:54 PM
43	I strongly support the bike and pedestrian shared use paths	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
44	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 1:47 PM
45	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 1:46 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
46	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 1:17 PM
47	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 1:08 PM
48	Strongly support. This lid should be designed as a bike/ped transportation junction. It ties together Federal Ave, the Portage Bay Bridge trail, Delmar, Interlaken Park, Roanoke Park, and the I-5 crossing and should be treated as such. Consideration should be given to Federal Ave as a neighborhood greenway - north/southbound bicyclists may come through the park to access Federal.	Oct 5, 2012 1:02 PM
49	Yes, I support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths along with tree preservation and safe public spaces	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
50	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
51	Yes, this area is hard physically and uninviting.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
52	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:50 PM
53	Love the lid concept - the more parks the better.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
54	yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
55	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:35 PM
56	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
57	I support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
58	I do not support any passive uses, nor do I think bridge money should be spend on bicycle and pedestrian paths. They are superfluous to the needs of the communities involved.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
59	too expensive and not necessary	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
60	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
61	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
62	I support the most direct connection to Montlake, via a bike trail alongside SR520 over Portage Bay.	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
63	I strongly support the shared use of bicycle paths and shared use pedestrian/bicycle paths with the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
64	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
65	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 12:14 PM
66	If possible it would be ideal to create a link to Roanoke park.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 PM
67	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably.	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
68	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
69	Like this - pedestrian paths are important and there is a need to separate bikes from traffic too	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
70	If you're making a lid, it should be useful and safe as a park and for commuting	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
71	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM
72	Definitely like this. I live in the area and would use and enjoy a safe shared-use path for bikes.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
73	yes! the trees are great, and it's very important to give cyclists safe passage. peds too!	Oct 5, 2012 11:30 AM
74	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
75	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
76	The lid is oversized and the space is redundant with Roanoke Park. Wrong investment of dollars in the wrong place.	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
77	This "preservation idea should include a water feature to provide additional white noise to reduce vehicle noise and provide more natural preservation mitigation. This could be designed to manage rain water drainage into a more visual and environmentally effective attraction while providing a necessary erosion prevention capability.	Oct 5, 2012 11:20 AM
78	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just isolate SR 520 from the neighbors. It must allow pedestrians and cyclists from the neighborhood and beyond access to a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5. Additionally, the paths must be direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow signage. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space is not the goal, we need places to look out, and green space to move through.	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
79	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM
80	Yes, absolutely. This would be cheaper and easier than highway path.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 AM
81	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 AM
82	Strongly support share-use paths on the lid	Oct 5, 2012 11:05 AM
83	strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 AM
84	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 10:56 AM
85	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
86	ABSOLUTELY MY FIRST PREFERENCE!! must do this! #1	Oct 5, 2012 10:51 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
87	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
88	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
89	I think these lids increase the cost unnecessarily....especially if they don't have a functional use	Oct 5, 2012 10:36 AM
90	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 10:34 AM
91	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 10:26 AM
92	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 10:25 AM
93	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
94	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
95	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
96	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
97	Seems like a good idea	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
98	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM
99	This is a very good idea. I would like the design to be open as the current heavy underbrush attracts homeless and more importantly, a group of petty thieves who are living there.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
100	I strongly support the creation of a lid over 520 to allow for improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and more green space.	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 AM
101	This could be a beautiful addition to a rejuvenated area. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
102	The bicyle underpass beneath 10th is highly diserable.	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
103	The MPCC strongly supports this Preference. The residents of our communities, Madison Park, Washington Park, Canterbury, Denny Blaine and Broadmoor need the opportunity to have bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths to use by blending these amenities into the hillside.	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM
104	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM
105	Strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
106	I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car. Pedestrian facilities should not be an afterthought, nor should pedestrians be expected to go up and over or down and around to avoid cars. Pedestrians are like water, and if they see a flat route, they will take it, even if it is unsafe. Therefore, the pedestrian routes should be both safe AND direct.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 AM
107	I strongly support this. Pedestrian and bicycle safety is really important to me.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
108	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
109	Great idea to connect the neighborhoods	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
110	Neutral	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
111	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
112	Definitely support inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
113	This lid should be built so their is land to land connection, without high concrete wall on the capitol hill side. Details of the proposed plan should be funded before westside construction and long term maintenance funds included.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
114	No.	Oct 5, 2012 9:20 AM
115	This sounds nice but it's a little hard to visualize. I would almost certainly support this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
116	I would love a way up to Capitol Hill from the U district on a bicycle that doesn't smell like car exhaust during rush hour. Yes to this!	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
117	Agree.	Oct 5, 2012 9:18 AM
118	Good idea. Make sure the paths are efficient.	Oct 5, 2012 9:06 AM
119	It is important to me that this lid include accessible, easy to find, and direct shared-use paths. I value preserving natural areas, but my top priority is that this area is easy for those not in cars to pass through. I travel with my young children, which means that I am either pulling a heavy trailer on my bike or holding the hands/carrying two toddlers. The ease of access of this area will make or break whether we are able to go here - an indirect route at toddler speed is a deal breaker. We would love to make use of this green space if we can safely and easily access it from UW and Montlake.	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
120	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
121	Would be cool, but is it necessary? Would a tunnel slow things down as it does on I-5 south?	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
122	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
123	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 8:41 AM
124	this would increase safety on bikes	Oct 5, 2012 8:31 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
125	yes	Oct 5, 2012 8:11 AM
126	This lid needs to be designed to allow easy pedestrian and bike use (not just cars) to make a safe connection between Montlake and the UW .... this will have daily impact on me. Having well-designed green space here would be a major accomplishment.	Oct 5, 2012 8:10 AM
127	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 8:04 AM
128	I strongly support this to help renovate that wasted space. Also, it a greenbelt loop, it will help beautify the neighborhood.	Oct 5, 2012 8:02 AM
129	Preference 3: I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 5, 2012 7:49 AM
130	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 AM
131	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 7:36 AM
132	I would support this.	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
133	yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
134	This is a great idea. Roanoke Park works very well. The lid is more challenging to activate. Although it will have the advantage of nice view lines, the expanded freeway is an eyesore and noise sewer.	Oct 5, 2012 7:05 AM
135	I support both bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 6:44 AM
136	If this is anything like the lid on Mercer Island, I think it's great.	Oct 5, 2012 6:33 AM
137	I strongly support.	Oct 5, 2012 6:15 AM
138	Yes to passive uses.	Oct 5, 2012 6:01 AM
139	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside

	Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	
140	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 5:19 AM
141	High priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
142	Support. A lid's a good opportunity for community. Consider the Mercer Island lid.	Oct 5, 2012 5:13 AM
143	Good	Oct 5, 2012 5:03 AM
144	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 5, 2012 4:48 AM
145	Unless we provide safe walking and cycling routes, we will not be able to dimish the use of private vehicles on our streets. This is a good move.	Oct 5, 2012 3:55 AM
146	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 AM
147	YES - BICYCLES	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 AM
148	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 AM
149	This is a nice idea but seems like an expensive undertaking. I think making sure there are good bike lanes and sidewalks on 10th and Delmar would be sufficient.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 AM
150	Sure, that wlll look attractive, I think.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
151	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 PM
152	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
153	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
154	The only point of the lid I see is to have something on top, like paths or a viewpoint. The lid for the sake of hiding the road/noise seems pointless to me. Yes to bike paths!	Oct 4, 2012 10:43 PM
155	This open space would be a huge boon to an area that is otherwise not worth pausing at currently	Oct 4, 2012 10:37 PM
156	Extend the lid further to the west. Remove the Dept. of Transportation building and in it's place have the traffic from Capitol Hill have an entrance onto the 520 Bridge. This will give a longer on ramp to the Portage Bay bridge compensating for the grade requirements. It will also provide more direct access for the fire department to access 520 and the Montlake area.	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
157	Federal Way should connect seamlessly to the bike path to the east side.	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM
158	Some active uses should be incorporated into the space to enliven it. Generally I am for tree preservation, but access to Federal Ave is higher priority than the	Oct 4, 2012 10:02 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	alder trees on that slope.	
159	Strongly support	Oct 4, 2012 10:01 PM
160	I support bicycle, pedestrian and multi-use access on the lid. It is already a very busy intersection with bicycles, and will only continue to serve more users. A lid should not just be a space that keeps drivers on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood and bus users accessing UW, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, and a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:00 PM
161	Blending the lid into the hillside is essential for the safety of the lid. People need to be able to walk through this area and not to encounter a drop off behind a highway wall.	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 PM
162	Strongly support. Please provide good bicycle and ped ways.	Oct 4, 2012 9:35 PM
163	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 9:30 PM
164	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
165	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid: A lid should be easily enjoyable (easy to access, good sightlines, safe, lit well-enough at night) to be functional. The trees and greenery/etc will calm and quiet the effect of noise and traffic through this historic neighborhood. This areas needs to have safe, easy access from the surrounding neighborhoods and Roanoke Park.	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
166	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 PM
167	As a daily bicycle commuter in this area I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
168	i like this alot too, but it seems expensive.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
169	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM

	comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	
170	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 8:55 PM
171	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably	Oct 4, 2012 8:50 PM
172	Fantastic.	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
173	Passive use is all well and fine, but don't let this amorphous goal be a blockage for access across 520 for foot and bicycle using this in the multiple directions where all these routes will intersect. Blending the lid is all well and fine, especially if that can improve access. Trees are good but can block access or lead to undesired activity including assaults.	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
174	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
175	A lid in this area would be great, so I strongly support this preference. It would need to be designed for safe shared use by both bicycles and pedestrians. It would need to allow pedestrians and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, as well as to provide direct, safe connections to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, to the entrance of Interlaken Park, and to the path over I-5. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 8:33 PM
176	Yes!	Oct 4, 2012 8:23 PM
177	How noisy will this park be? How can you increase sound attenuation?	Oct 4, 2012 8:22 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
178	I like this	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
179	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths.	Oct 4, 2012 8:13 PM
180	Need to have good bicycle and pedestrian access from bridge to neighborhood roads. Bicycle and pedestrian traffic should be kept separate for safety.	Oct 4, 2012 8:07 PM
181	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:00 PM
182	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 7:59 PM
183	I like the grass field. It should be big enough to play casual games of soccer/football/frisbee on.	Oct 4, 2012 7:30 PM
184	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 7:19 PM
185	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian connections across the lid.	Oct 4, 2012 7:10 PM
186	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 PM
187	Agree with passive uses and paths. Most important are the tree preservation and safe public spaces blending the lid into the hillside.	Oct 4, 2012 6:28 PM
188	No - more room for cars, less for bikes and peds.	Oct 4, 2012 6:23 PM
189	We need the bike-pedestrian paths. Turning this space into more green spae and saving trees is good design.	Oct 4, 2012 6:01 PM
190	NO taxpayers money -we do not need the extra fluff when taxpayers are not able to afford anything more than food and mortgage payments	Oct 4, 2012 5:48 PM
191	This is great - the lid on Mercer Island works great	Oct 4, 2012 5:30 PM
192	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 5:30 PM
193	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 5:21 PM
194	This would be a great place for a playfield.	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
195	Yes! This would improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
196	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
197	LIDS are too expensive. shared paths don't work	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
198	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 5:07 PM
199	Make it easy easy easy for me to get my bike across 520	Oct 4, 2012 4:53 PM
200	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
201	I am all for this!!	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
202	Retain as much public space as possible. I support this preference.	Oct 4, 2012 4:34 PM
203	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
204	Pedestrians and bicycle shared paths should be given priority on the lid.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
205	Nice.	Oct 4, 2012 3:59 PM
206	#1 The single biggest improvement for the entire project is the park/lid here. It will have substantial positive benefits for the entire neighborhood, and truly connect Roanoke and North Capital Hill (we live in North Capital hill and feel that our neighborhood is very cut-off. It should also drastically reduce the noise from the free way. Please Build this!! =)	Oct 4, 2012 3:40 PM
207	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 3:36 PM
208	trees and sidewalks are good, but don't need an excess of park space with expensive upkeep	Oct 4, 2012 3:31 PM
209	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 4, 2012 3:18 PM
210	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
211	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
212	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 3:13 PM
213	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
214	Yes, please, I very much support this. Easy-to-follow shared use paths would go a long way to providing a solid pedestrian/bike connection between the UW/Montlake/etc.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
215	Lid isn't the best use of resources. If bike and ped connectivity can be acheived with wider overpasses (see item #1) maybe we can get more bike ped connectivity, especially across Portage bay to Montlake.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
216	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside

	520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	
217	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 2:44 PM
218	Multi-mode transportation options are critical, particularly when designing transportation elements that will be with us for many years to come.	Oct 4, 2012 2:41 PM
219	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 2:36 PM
220	Yes, yes, yes! Please build this.	Oct 4, 2012 2:35 PM
221	I strongly support bicycle paths on the Roanoke lid linking Roanoke Park, a connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 .	Oct 4, 2012 2:31 PM
222	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 2:20 PM
223	This would be awesome! A lid park would be very lovely and reduce traffic noises and connect the area better.	Oct 4, 2012 2:04 PM
224	I am very much in favor.	Oct 4, 2012 1:59 PM
225	Providing a bicycle path would be helpful and hopefully trees can be preserved	Oct 4, 2012 1:53 PM
226	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
227	The lid must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:31 PM
228	Excellent improvement!!!	Oct 4, 2012 1:23 PM
229	Strongly support a bike/pedestrian path on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM
230	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. I	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	strongly support separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities, with design consideration given to the peculiar method of movement for both groups.	
231	Lid parks cost extra to build and maintain and usually are on freeway margins where they don't do much good... this one isn't as isolated as most, but... meh.	Oct 4, 2012 1:13 PM
232	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
233	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
234	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns	Oct 4, 2012 1:01 PM
235	Some means of getting off 10th south of Roanoke would be strongly preferred	Oct 4, 2012 1:00 PM
236	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:56 PM
237	Preference 3: I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM
238	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:39 PM
239	Support	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
240	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:30 PM
241	This is an excellent proposal. Ensure that bicycles and pedestrians can coexist safely--a shared-use path must be wide enough for this	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
242	I urge the preservation of as many trees as is possible without compromising the paths. Also, I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
243	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:18 PM
244	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM
245	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
246	I strongly strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
247	I support bike/pedestrian shared use paths, so that the lid area is used and enjoyed.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
248	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
249	I strongly support multi-use paths through here.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
250	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
251	Strongly support shared use paths. Tree preservation is also really great, but shouldn't be the first priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
252	Lower personal priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
253	This would be awesome, though I can't say it is a top priority over the more access-oriented projects. There is a park right across the street that serves as great community space.	Oct 4, 2012 11:53 AM
254	I agree with the approach stated. Make sure the design is activated enough so it does not become a waste land where undesirable events occur.	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
255	I strongly support this preference. A lid should optimally provide benefit to the people above the lid instead of merely hiding traffic; providing pedestrian and cyclist access would be a big boon to the neighborhood.	Oct 4, 2012 11:51 AM
256	Great idea - low priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
257	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
258	I strongly this	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
259	We support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.Keep as simple and easy to navigate as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
260	This sounds like a good way to handle non-motorized traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
261	Yes! Strongly agree	Oct 4, 2012 11:40 AM
262	Shared-use paths for bikes and peds are important. I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:36 AM
263	Strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
264	I live in Roanoke and I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
265	This area must be accessible to bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
266	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
267	Increased greenspaces are always nice.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 AM
268	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
269	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
270	I like blending into the hillside.	Oct 4, 2012 11:24 AM
271	Yes for bike/ped paths!	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
272	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 11:21 AM
273	I strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:09 AM
274	See my answer to Preference 1. Anything to increase mobility is welcome. Making the area easy as well as beautiful to travel through would greatly enhance the neighborhood.	Oct 4, 2012 11:08 AM
275	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid.	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 AM
276	Same as above.	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
277	I own our home a half mile from this location and support this preference.	Oct 4, 2012 10:38 AM
278	Favor some quiet, view spaces here. Worry that proposed bike path on Portage Bay viaduct will land here and if heavily used, will make paths unsafe for peds and families. Beware of grades, vegetation, drainage from N Capitol hill - Make Views and grade to maximize them, ala something like the hill viewing downtown at Gasworks Park.	Oct 4, 2012 10:13 AM
279	This is my favorite part of the plan- I love the idea of a park with bicycle options. I do have a concern, which is that most bicycles use 10th ave for commuting because it has better pavement than the parallel roads. If Federal Ave was repaved this could encourage bikes to use this route with the new lid and help avoid negative bike-car interactions on 10th.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 AM
280	YES!	Oct 4, 2012 9:43 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
281	Good idea	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
282	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 9:15 AM
283	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 AM
284	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
285	This costs too much money.	Oct 4, 2012 7:01 AM
286	Want walking coonections to the neighborhood.	Oct 4, 2012 6:41 AM
287	The more greenery the better, but it should be as functional as possible - with access for pedestrian/ biker travel as well as spots for relaxation and reflection.	Oct 4, 2012 2:59 AM
288	It appears that the Delmar lid is part of any scenario. This ship may have already sailed, however my feeling is that it seems like it would be very expensive for the relatively small amount of area. With the reality of limited budgets, I'd happily trade the entire lid project in favor of transportation improvements, especially a	Oct 4, 2012 1:49 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	portage bay bicycle path. But then, I don't own a house in the adjacent neighborhoods. No doubt the immediate neighbors are ecstatic about the plan.	
289	Love it. Make the pedestrian and bicycle connections direct, safe, connected, and comfortable.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 AM
290	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 9:38 PM
291	Important	Oct 3, 2012 9:24 PM
292	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 9:01 PM
293	How about adding an under-10th-Ave ped/bike path from the lid to the west along E Roanoke.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 PM
294	Make sure the lid is blended into the hillside. Tall concrete walls are not good design.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
295	Terrific	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 PM
296	Wouk be great as well. I hope these options are not either or, but rather all inclusive. If the state can build a tunnel for billions of dollars just for motorists, it certainly needs to invest in and have non-motorized priorities.	Oct 3, 2012 8:13 PM
297	This would certainly help to retain the residential character of the neighborhood and enable alternative commuting from Cap Hill to U district and other neighborhoods, and improve the safety of this area.	Oct 3, 2012 4:20 PM
298	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
299	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 3:44 PM
300	Mini-playfield to support Capitol Hill Youth Soccer (does not have to be full-size field here to support younger ages) and Central Seattle Youth Lacrosse! Bike paths can be routed to edges of this space to accommodate multiple interests.	Oct 3, 2012 2:34 PM
301	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 1:52 PM
302	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 1:48 PM
303	This should connect with a shared-use trail on the Portage Bay-spanning road segment.	Oct 3, 2012 1:13 PM
304	yes, please!	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
305	Support this.	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
306	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 1:04 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
307	Seems to make sense	Oct 3, 2012 12:44 PM
308	Avoid features--such as sports fields--that will attract large-event crowds. Avoid work bridges and any other construction tactics that destroy mature trees. Design park details with the views, privacy and security of bordering homes in mind.	Oct 3, 2012 12:10 PM
309	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 11:51 AM
310	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
311	Connecting to future pedestrian foot paths from Interlaken Park with existing boulevard systems inked to Interlaken Park	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
312	I support this	Oct 3, 2012 11:33 AM
313	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
314	Strongly support, bike and pedestrian paths please.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
315	I like it :-)	Oct 3, 2012 10:28 AM
316	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 10:27 AM
317	Having a safe bike crossing here would be helpful.	Oct 3, 2012 9:47 AM
318	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR	Oct 3, 2012 9:43 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside

	520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	
319	This would be a tremendous improvement to the current situation. It is really ugly and noisy right now, despite being located in one of the most scenic vistas in the city.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
320	Priority.	Oct 3, 2012 9:34 AM
321	I support this preference, as this is a cool view in either direction. The bike and walking paths should be clearly marked and separated from the cars.	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM
322	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 9:28 AM
323	Absolutely.	Oct 3, 2012 9:01 AM
324	Yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:58 AM
325	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:36 AM
326	Agreed and this lid must then connect a pedistrian /bicycle path down to Boyer Avenue using WSDOT and Seattle Prep property . As part of mitigation 2400 and 2500 blocks of Boyer Ave must then be configured to be safe for bicycles and connect to Greenways designated streets in Montlake connecting to the Bill Dawson trail and onto the UW.	Oct 3, 2012 8:25 AM
327	OK	Oct 3, 2012 8:14 AM
328	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 8:01 AM
329	I support this.	Oct 3, 2012 7:59 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
330	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths on the Roanoke lid. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, a direct, safe connection to the UW and Montlake via the Portage Bay Bridge, the entrance of Interlaken Park, and the path over I-5 safely and comfortably. Additionally the paths should be laid out in such a way that they are direct, easy to follow, and with clear and easy to follow sightlines. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail in order to fully connect to the neighborhood, city, and region. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to end up underutilized and a cause of public safety concerns.	Oct 3, 2012 7:55 AM
331	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 7:38 AM
332	Let it change into native growth wild park land with dirt trails	Oct 3, 2012 6:32 AM
333	Shared use paths are unsafe. Bikes move much faster than pedestrians. Accidents can happen very easily. Separate bike and pedestrian paths are the way to go. Vancouver, BC has traditionally done a good job of separating both types of traffic on itsSeawall system, making it safer and more peaceful for all.	Oct 2, 2012 10:51 PM
334	This would be great! Bicycle and pedestrian access is lacking in this area and needs to be improved.	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
335	This looks like a wandering path which is not good for transportation. I am interested in using my bicycle for transportation.	Oct 2, 2012 8:35 PM
336	Make sure it connects to the 520 bridge bike path. There is one right?	Oct 2, 2012 6:53 PM
337	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 6:13 PM
338	Yes!	Oct 2, 2012 5:46 PM
339	I like this a lot. Safety and bicycle use sounds great.	Oct 2, 2012 5:38 PM
340	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
341	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 4:14 PM
342	I don't know that the cost of the lid is necessary.	Oct 2, 2012 3:12 PM
343	In favor of preserving trees and having public space.	Oct 2, 2012 12:20 PM
344	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 AM
345	parks are always good, but all of these need to be merged into the design, along with easy access to the path across the bridge	Oct 2, 2012 11:01 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
346	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 10:05 AM
347	Please make sure that the entry from Federal Ave to the lid park is not just a path, susceptible to ambush and is safe for older people and parents with strollers. Many neighborhood people of all ages will be using the park by entering from Federal.	Oct 2, 2012 9:33 AM
348	Support shared-use paths.	Oct 2, 2012 9:32 AM
349	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path on lid. Must ensure shrubbery does not obstruct sight lines and that paths are paved and easy to follow. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, the entrance of Interlaken Park and the path from the lid to Boyer safely.	Oct 2, 2012 9:28 AM
350	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 9:02 AM
351	Our coalition of neighborhoods strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path on lid. This path must connect to the E Roanoke St overpass connector, Federal Ave E, Harvard Ave E, and a Portage Bay Bridge Trail. This preference is backed up by our 346 neighborhood supporters in our original letter. Isolated green space that is not well connected to the community has been shown again and again to cause public safety concerns.	Oct 2, 2012 8:22 AM
352	I prefer this option as the most balanced.	Oct 2, 2012 8:06 AM
353	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 1, 2012 9:20 PM
354	agree with blending the greenery and providing shared use path	Oct 1, 2012 7:58 PM
355	bicycle connections will be increasingly important as the climate warms; good idea	Oct 1, 2012 7:13 PM
356	Bikes! Good.	Oct 1, 2012 4:05 PM
357	To the extent that this design includes bicycle connection from 520 bridge to points west, yes. Highly desirable.	Oct 1, 2012 2:26 PM
358	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 1, 2012 2:16 PM
359	Great. Seems similar to what was deployed on Mercer Is.	Oct 1, 2012 1:16 PM
360	Yes, passive and paths. Include connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
361	Like this idea but would prefer money went into much more highly used Montlake interchange	Oct 1, 2012 12:30 PM
362	Excellent	Oct 1, 2012 12:05 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
363	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path on lid. Must ensure shrubbery does not obstruct sight lines and that paths are paved and easy to follow. A lid should not just be a space that keeps people on city roads from seeing SR 520. It has to allow pedestrians from the neighborhood, and cyclists to access Roanoke Park, the entrance of Interlaken Park and the path from the lid to Boyer safely.	Oct 1, 2012 11:26 AM
364	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Oct 1, 2012 10:05 AM
365	Absolutely. It looks great. I would encourage greater continuity with the Eastlake neighborhood so it is more of a world class amenity (like the Mercer Island Lid)	Sep 30, 2012 9:16 PM
366	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 30, 2012 7:41 PM
367	High Priority	Sep 30, 2012 4:53 PM
368	Not as critical if funding is a problem	Sep 30, 2012 2:55 PM
369	Essential that a path along Roanoke toward Portage Bay incorporate arm that connects to Delmar Dr. Many cyclists enjoy ascending E Interlaken Blvd instead of 10th Ave E. A smooth connection between Harvard Ave E and E Interlaken Blvd would be much appreciated in the cycling community.	Sep 30, 2012 9:41 AM
370	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
371	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 30, 2012 3:34 AM
372	Waste of money that will not add much, at the expense of current uses and development.	Sep 29, 2012 11:30 PM
373	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 29, 2012 9:58 PM
374	Make sure there is an efficient and safe passage for bike commuters across the multi use area	Sep 29, 2012 9:06 PM
375	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling. Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 29, 2012 7:39 PM
376	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 29, 2012 7:24 PM
377	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
378	would like bike/pedestrian shared-use path all the way across 520	Sep 29, 2012 4:54 PM
379	This is important. However the combination of Miller / 11th also provides a reasonable bike path for this area.	Sep 29, 2012 4:25 PM
380	Support	Sep 29, 2012 2:34 PM
381	Emphasize the bicycle and pedestrian shared use paths.	Sep 29, 2012 1:18 PM
382	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 29, 2012 1:12 PM
383	A lid here will completely transform this area in a positive way. If I had to pick one and only one thing on this page, it would be this lid. I especially like the emphasis on tree preservation, and hope that trees are favored over grass	Sep 29, 2012 1:06 PM
384	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 9:21 AM
385	Excellent improvement. This lid will vastly improve the home values in the adjacent neighborhoods. Who can complain? Your statement of purpose looks good. I do wonder about the tunnel under 10th. It doesn't really tie to anything. It could end up being a hang out for vagrants. If you put in a path across portage bay, then it might make sense. If you build a tunnel, try to mimic the tunnels in Kenmore. They are wide, well lit, on long straight sections...safe feeling.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 AM
386	Provide shared use paths and blend lid into hillside to enhance landscaping & liveability.	Sep 28, 2012 10:47 PM
387	That would be a great route for me!	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 PM
388	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 9:44 PM
389	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 8:56 PM
390	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
391	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 7:17 PM
392	While potentially a very nice park, please ensure this will not be a haven for criminal activity. Again, endeavor to reduce any unnecessary costs.	Sep 28, 2012 5:48 PM
393	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:38 PM
394	YES!	Sep 28, 2012 5:07 PM
395	It is not clear to me if you imply that this would be the path for transit from Roanoke eastbound to Delmar Dr. If so, it seems useful, if not, I have no comment.	Sep 28, 2012 3:31 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
396	Third most.	Sep 28, 2012 2:34 PM
397	don't care	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM
398	Yes!	Sep 28, 2012 2:08 PM
399	Very exciting.	Sep 28, 2012 1:13 PM
400	3	Sep 28, 2012 12:05 PM
401	I support the provision of bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 11:30 AM
402	Yes, it will make the area more attractive	Sep 28, 2012 11:18 AM
403	Lids are good and help recover green space. I'm not convinced tree preservation in that area is critical, however. I would favor bike and pedestrian paths over tree preservation, assuming new trees can be planted.	Sep 28, 2012 11:08 AM
404	I like this because of the size.	Sep 28, 2012 10:48 AM
405	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 10:16 AM
406	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 9:51 AM
407	Like this one	Sep 28, 2012 9:36 AM
408	Yes, definitely	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
409	Like	Sep 28, 2012 8:28 AM
410	beautiful, but lower priority than bike paths and improved traffic use.	Sep 28, 2012 7:11 AM
411	Expensive usefull and will benifit locals and those traveling through	Sep 28, 2012 6:18 AM
412	Yes, This makes sense	Sep 27, 2012 11:26 PM
413	Huge benefit for neighborhood which removes bikes from 10th and Delmar intersection, encouraging bike usage on east side of I-5, south of 520, and provides better access from Montlake to Eastlake and South Lake Union. Neighborhood gets great park, green space and noise lessening.	Sep 27, 2012 10:46 PM
414	I am all for new and improved bicycle lanes/paths.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 PM
415	Paths are valuable!	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 PM
416	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 PM
417	yes!	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 PM
418	Please provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and	Sep 27, 2012 9:32 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside

	Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	
419	Great plan.	Sep 27, 2012 9:24 PM
420	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:00 PM
421	This looks like a great idea.	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
422	i like it	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
423	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 8:10 PM
424	Have a lid in this sea would be a real asset to this part of Mountlake. The city won't ever again have a chance like tis to build something special high transportation use and park atmosphere with trails that link to take across the new 520 bridge. An amazing asset for commuters to and from the east side.	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
425	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 7:31 PM
426	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM
427	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:02 PM
428	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 6:29 PM
429	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 6:27 PM
430	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 6:16 PM
431	Yes please.	Sep 27, 2012 6:12 PM
432	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 5:57 PM
433	This is really pretty	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
434	Shared use paths without segregation are best inside the park itself.	Sep 27, 2012 5:25 PM
435	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 5:09 PM
436	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E	Sep 27, 2012 4:50 PM
437	Ensure that bicycle traffic has a clear and safe crossing of the lid. Eliminate or reduce "wandering" to provide straight-through cyclist route(s).	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
438	Yes, should be included	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
439	YES - Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
440	safe passage for cyclists and pedestrians	Sep 27, 2012 4:34 PM
441	Support for bicycle and pedestrain shared-use paths is key. Because it's a small freewa lid, people won't come here to enjoy it like a park and it doesn't need to be developed like one. New trees grow quickly, so preservation should not modify design considerations.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
442	Agree	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
443	Forget trees and viewpoints, spend the $ on efficiently moving cars, bikes, and peds.	Sep 27, 2012 3:52 PM
444	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 3:35 PM
445	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 3:27 PM
446	Again - seems like the appropriate decision for future commuters.	Sep 27, 2012 2:52 PM
447	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
448	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:31 PM
449	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:21 PM
450	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
451	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
452	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
453	This is needed, but pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be separated.	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
454	A lid for this area is a great concept, to me it is more park oriented versus transitional for the bicyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
455	Would be a big improvement.	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
456	Indifferent	Sep 27, 2012 1:26 PM
457	Excellent - maximizing pedestrian and bicycle paths is essential.	Sep 27, 2012 1:19 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
458	Providing alternatives to bike and pedestrian but mainly bike will lessen chance of accidents and congestion with Bike ,car, Bike, car	Sep 27, 2012 1:15 PM
459	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
460	Preferences 1, 2 and 3 need to tied together and supported.	Sep 27, 2012 1:04 PM
461	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 1:02 PM
462	I perfer this lid option.	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
463	this looks great, a major improvement over today. Lighting will be helpful to avoid it being a homeless haven that would make it intimidating at night time. If we can do everything to avoid it being like Occidental Park in Seattle that would make it usable	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM
464	Lid is cool, especially path that cuts under 10th	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
465	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
466	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:24 PM
467	No lid. Too much construction	Sep 27, 2012 12:15 PM
468	Better separation of bikes and cars needed. Painted lane markers (like Ravenna between Greenlake Way and Eastlake), or physical barriers between bikes and cars (like Dexter Ave. N. between Fremont and South Lake Union) would work.	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
469	this sounds great!	Sep 27, 2012 12:11 PM
470	Including safe bicycle and pedestrian paths as part of the project is crucial.	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
471	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:05 PM
472	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
473	A community garden here would be nice as it is sunny.	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
474	Yes - this should be a priority	Sep 27, 2012 11:59 AM
475	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:58 AM
476	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
477	Through a public space, shared use is acceptable, but markings to keep peds	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	and bikes separated would help with safety.	
478	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
479	Please design the bike path connections over the lid as if they are meant for actual transportation, and not with a lot of aesthetically pleasing but pointless curves. Please take the shortest line between points A & B and avoid sharp 90 degree turns when not necessary. And if the bike paths are meant to be shared with pedestrians, please provide sufficient width for safe passing.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
480	more bike safe areas please!	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
481	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
482	Bike/pedestrian access should be able to avoid high traffic of 10th/Roanoake/Delmar.	Sep 27, 2012 11:34 AM
483	good	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
484	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
485	10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside	Sep 27, 2012 11:28 AM
486	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:25 AM
487	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
488	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
489	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
490	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
491	yes, highly recommended	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
492	I think this lid is a great idea but it's not clear how bikes will be able to get from the bridge below up to the park if they had come from 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
493	See above comments (preference 1) on bicycle and pedestrian paths.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
494	Go Lid!	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
495	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
496	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
497	Should also be a high priority to support bike commuting	Sep 27, 2012 11:04 AM
498	Very important	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM
499	I fully support this	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
500	Bike path needs to feed into bike arterial to downtown core, and also north to U-district.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
501	Strong support/preference for bicycle/ pedestrian paths	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
502	Sounds like the existing plan is the best design.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
503	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
504	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
505	This sounds beautiful, fun, and in line with melding city and nature. Love it!	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
506	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
507	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
508	The Delmar Lid would have the biggest positive impact on the area, most use by the biggest variety of citizen, and strongest esthetics.	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
509	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
510	Agreed.	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
511	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
512	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
513	this looks nice, but it's also so close to the arboretum which is already a gorgeous green space. I am not opposed to green space, but feel like we need to understand how much this would actually be used by the community to know if it makes sense.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
514	yes to preserving trees and providing for all users	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
515	This would be highly desireable to mitigate the impact of the roadway, and improve the environment and 'feel' of that very busy area.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
516	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
517	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
518	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
519	Include small commercial space (restaurant/bar/cafe) on lid adjacent to 10th ave and opening up to the park. Make sure to include ped/bike connection from lid to Federal.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
520	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
521	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
522	this is invaluable	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
523	yes!! Tax me.	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
524	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 AM
525	This would provide good access towards the lake for a connection to the Burke Gilman Trail	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
526	shared-use paths need to be well marked, wide, and with a strait line option for bicycle commuters.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
527	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
528	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
529	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
530	Would make a beutiful legacy and enhance the project mirroring the developtment on the east side of the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
531	Great land use proposal!	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
532	3.Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
533	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid,	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	
534	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey. Required we need a bike trail dedicated on the new lid.	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
535	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
536	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
537	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
538	This is the nicest looking design but may not be a good use of funds compared to the Option 5 path	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
539	This will also increase the soundproofing for the houses that are next to here, and I reside in one of them this is a great idea, that will make the parks far more appealing, only if it can be done to I-5 more.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
540	This seems like the most well thought out preference, but again dumps bicycles off at the beginning of a span they shoul be able to cross. The idea that Seattle is building a major span without bicycle access is embarrassing.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
541	agree	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
542	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
543	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
544	A lid seems like a really expensive way to achieve these goals.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
545	Absolutely, please do as much as possible to support bicyclists in that area	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
546	Yes, again please support cycling as a safe option here.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
547	As Seattle and the Eastside grow more together into a more connected, dense and vibrant city/metro area, it would be foolish not to maximize the potential for bike and pedestrian usage. The workers who are fueling our growth (and will continue to do so) think beyond the automobile.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
548	Important to the aesthetics of the project; lids are an important method of reducing the noise and visual pollution of large highways (a la Mercer Island)	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
549	This is a great idea to lessen the impact of the road building and provide an asset for years to come. The Olmsted Brothers would approve. Connections up through interlakken should also be investigated.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
550	parks need to support bicycle use which creates a desirable destination as well	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	as a nice place to take a break on a longer ride.	
551	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
552	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
553	Love this!	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
554	include bicycle path	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
555	Similar comment as above	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
556	...AND a lid.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
557	Love it!	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
558	I would like to see separate bike & pedestrian path by Delmar lid.	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
559	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
560	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
561	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
562	This is essential.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
563	excellent	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
564	Yes please -	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
565	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
566	I'm not familiar with this area.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
567	good	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 AM
568	I would like this very much.	Sep 27, 2012 9:35 AM
569	Good again on the pedestrian and bike access	Sep 27, 2012 9:34 AM
570	Activate this space by making it a better option for cyclists!!! This would be a key rout for cyclists who use Federal to get to Roanoke park (later, paralleling Harvard Ave until Shelby, on the way the University bridge.) Make the path wide and safe enough for commuters (not joy riders) with good sight lines approaching the intersection. The path should accomodate cyclists riding down hill: banked curves, taking the cyclist from the down hill part to a more level area before approaching the intersection.	Sep 26, 2012 11:44 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
571	Please include an off-leash dog park either in this area or in preference 5 the connection from Boyer to Delmar.	Sep 26, 2012 5:52 PM
572	looks like the heart of the project	Sep 26, 2012 11:15 AM
573	These questions all seem like no-brainers. Of course we'll want park space and uses on the lid that preserve trees and safety. What kind of feedback are you looking for here?	Sep 26, 2012 11:07 AM
574	like this	Sep 25, 2012 8:14 PM
575	No comment, I haven't been through these paths	Sep 25, 2012 1:56 PM
576	Wow! This is terrific. I can't wait to see this completed. It will vastly improve the neighborhoods, improve home values, improve livelihood, give space for relaxation...excellent. I saw a tunnel going under 10th and wonder if that is needed. Could be scary tucked up against a slope and near a corner. It could also be a space for lingering transients or other potential thugs. Could a crosswalk be provided nearby? I don't imagine a lot of people want to cross 10th there anyway. Maybe if that bike path crosses the water from Montlake. Then more width, lots of lighting, and very visual. The tunnels on the Burke in Kenmore are terrific. Maybe use that model if you must put in a tunnel.	Sep 25, 2012 9:20 AM
577	This looks beautiful and I believe it contributes to the vision of Seattle. I also like the bicycle and pedestrian support. I am in favor of this preference.	Sep 25, 2012 9:02 AM
578	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:45 AM
579	make this a city park for many uses. Yes: open space for kids and play. No: dog off leash area. Yes: community helps with garden maintenance as is currently done with Roanoke park	Sep 25, 2012 8:16 AM
580	This looks like a win. make a nice park and create some open space that people can enjoy.	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
581	Yes, yes, yes!	Sep 24, 2012 9:10 PM
582	Openwork and/or "skylights" need to be included in this design to ensure light for the area which will be covered by the lid.	Sep 24, 2012 6:03 PM
583	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 24, 2012 5:47 PM
584	I currently use Delmar as my way across 520, and it works fairly well. The bigger issue is connection of any path with existing (or re-routed) bike routes (1) from the north, which is currently either on 10th or broadway (2) from the south conenctions to interlaken (toward volunteer park), Harvard (toward downtown). My current southbound route would be Delmar, 11th, Miller, Harvard. It would be nice to avoid the steep hill at 11th. Note that I do not want to ride on 10th..too many cars.	Sep 24, 2012 5:20 PM
585	Great use of space	Sep 24, 2012 2:12 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
586	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 24, 2012 1:08 PM
587	excellent	Sep 24, 2012 1:01 PM
588	Love it.	Sep 24, 2012 12:54 PM
589	Public use spaces are always nice, but this sounds expensive and it's not clear how much this is needed.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
590	I fully support this improvement.	Sep 24, 2012 12:28 PM
591	Looks really good - I like the paved connection to Federal Ave!	Sep 24, 2012 12:25 PM
592	Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E.	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
593	Great idea and improvement over the current state.	Sep 24, 2012 12:05 PM
594	I support passive use for people to sit and enjoy a artistic design Cable Stay bridge design view to the east.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
595	This looks like the best option.	Sep 24, 2012 12:01 PM
596	I imagine this would be good for the local population as well as bicycle commuters.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
597	The I90 lid on mercer is very nicely done, with good greenery, combined with a good bike/pedestrian path. Let's continue that example.	Sep 24, 2012 11:55 AM
598	This sounds great, but will be much more widely used if it has good access from across Portage Bay, putting it on the way for many bike commutes.	Sep 23, 2012 6:40 PM
599	Good.	Sep 23, 2012 2:28 PM
600	The site will be too noisy to be of any value as a passive park. The noise of I-5 it the problem and not 520. This should be an active space (small soccer field).	Sep 22, 2012 10:43 AM
601	less important - there's a nice park nearby in roanoke park	Sep 22, 2012 9:56 AM
602	Trees should be fully maintained in this area. A good mixed use path along I-5 and Delmar Drive East will render another path redundant.	Sep 22, 2012 2:27 AM
603	I think the lid is a grea idea; however it is also a 'nice-to-have' that should be revisited if there are budget constraints.	Sep 21, 2012 3:27 PM
604	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
605	I like the bicyle and pedestrian and lid ideas the best	Sep 20, 2012 9:13 PM
606	Once again, without at bike path from Montlake on the new bridge, why bother with bike paths on the lid? Where would they come from? Why would they be there in the first place?	Sep 20, 2012 3:00 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
607	Keep the homeless out! These bike trails should be for slow moving bikes. If bikes want to ride fast they should use the street. These trails should meander and not be a direct "short cut" for fast bikes. Lets keep these trails quiet, and good for beginning cyclists.	Sep 19, 2012 3:20 PM
608	Love it! A greenspace with bike/pedestrian paths to get non-motorized users safely through it. We definitely need to focus on the entrances to this area to make sure you can safely get in and out of it.	Sep 19, 2012 12:21 PM
609	For people who live in the directly adjacent neighborhoods, this will be a nice feature. It won't really benefit people who do not live near by.	Sep 18, 2012 3:12 PM
610	would be pleasant.	Sep 18, 2012 11:46 AM
611	Please keep as much level area's as possible, please give priority to keeping a good open veiw Please no tall large trees that will grow to take over the area, and keep the sun light out.	Sep 17, 2012 9:23 PM
612	This is a wonderful concept and one I believe many in the neighborhood support. By essentially semi-joining the new lid with existing Roanoake park, the area can be very positively transformed.	Sep 17, 2012 5:28 PM
613	Excellent idea	Sep 17, 2012 5:04 PM
614	The tunnel under 10th should be srtaight and well lit.	Sep 17, 2012 4:18 PM
615	THIS ONE!!!!!!!	Sep 17, 2012 3:15 PM
616	Improve surface (repave) on Federal Ave which connects to lid and which is used by many cyclists as a North-South alternative to Broadway and which currently has really terrible pavement. Designate Federal as neighborhood Greenway.	Sep 17, 2012 2:54 PM
617	Please make Federal Ave E into a genuine greenway -- install traffic management devices that prevent Federal being used as an alternate arterial to 10th Ave E. Create clear demarcation between any park space and residents' property.	Sep 17, 2012 11:13 AM
618	Park is a terrific idea - just make sure people can get to it. It is a nightmare having to cross 10th Ave. So much traffic. I propose in my earlier comments that we really should consider building a LID OVER I5 (where 520 connects). That will be accessed by MORE people and CONNECT TWO once-vibrant neighborhoods!!!! Plus, it won't interfere with the massive traffic jams on E Roanoke >10th Ave East. Lid is great though. BIGGEST concern would be the NOISE from the highways. It might be so noisy that no one will want to hang out there. The i5 lid would be better since the VIEWS would be so much nicer and it would connect two neighborhods. Make that one big too to reduce the noise.	Sep 17, 2012 9:26 AM
619	Support this	Sep 17, 2012 6:08 AM
620	I am in support of this - great use of space.	Sep 16, 2012 6:37 PM
621	Lid will reduce the noise of truck brakes and shifting gears on the Portage Bay	Sep 16, 2012 3:36 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	bridge grade, and add open space that should be connected to Roanoke Park open space in a safe crossingfor peds/bike users.	
622	We like the green space and tree preservation and would like pedestrian and bike paths.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
623	This would be an improvement.	Sep 16, 2012 9:53 AM
624	Why isn't there parking for the park? How about a soccer fied or play area?	Sep 16, 2012 9:31 AM
625	a park space is critical.. Take some time at look at the use. Is there a playground? ballfield? If this space does not have active use, I think it will have issues with homeless and teens from Seattle Prep.	Sep 16, 2012 8:56 AM
626	Allow lid surface to slope with topography.	Sep 16, 2012 2:13 AM
627	I think I like this option the best.	Sep 15, 2012 9:18 PM
628	much needed	Sep 15, 2012 7:47 PM
629	Nice, but is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520?	Sep 15, 2012 7:43 PM
630	This sounds like an excellent idea	Sep 15, 2012 6:06 PM
631	No need for the park paths to be bike friendly. Bikes should be on 10th and Delmar, not the park. This would cause unneeded merging into traffic as bikes merge onto 10th and Delmar. Most won't use it. Those who do would be a nuisance.	Sep 15, 2012 1:31 PM
632	Yes, if we are (finally) building, let's do it right from the get go. Making sure that this structure blends in is important.	Sep 15, 2012 12:47 PM
633	Provide physical separation between a) pedestrians and b) bikes to ensure safety and a better experience for all. Find space for more BIG trees. In 200 years people in this QUIET forest need to be 'wowed' by the preservation of a 200 year old forest.	Sep 15, 2012 11:57 AM
634	Support the passive use of the lid's green space. Maximize tree preservation..	Sep 15, 2012 11:34 AM
635	Yes	Sep 15, 2012 11:19 AM
636	Excellent improvement.	Sep 15, 2012 10:51 AM
637	Most important	Sep 15, 2012 1:09 AM
638	A lid is expensive and more disruptive to construct with little benefit to traffic flow. The govt should spend the budget on the most benefit for the most people not coddle a small number of nearby homeowners.	Sep 14, 2012 5:49 PM
639	This will help create a multi use path and help keep trees and nature apart of our city, which are crucial for a healthy environment. Providing safe areas for bikes help promote a healthy active lifestyle as well as provide routed for	Sep 14, 2012 5:47 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
	transportation. Also people in wheelchairs, with strollers, or other wheels will have important access.	
640	This has the opportunity to be a really nice space. Still need to ensure safe, comfortable north/south access for people who are riding a bike. This is such a great connection between Capitol Hill and Eastlake/U District. It's exciting!	Sep 14, 2012 5:14 PM
641	Good use of space	Sep 14, 2012 4:37 PM
642	Yes, this one. But, where's the rail transit going to go?	Sep 14, 2012 4:25 PM
643	The lid as a whole is a great feature. De-emphasizing cars for peds and bikes will help create a public space.	Sep 14, 2012 4:12 PM
644	Seattle Prep students should be attracted by a half basketball court. Broad public use prevents the open space from becoming a hangout place for inappropriate uses.	Sep 14, 2012 2:32 PM
645	Great idea!	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
646	great way to get extra open space--there is none nearby	Sep 14, 2012 1:47 PM
647	I support the development of more green space in Seattle. I support tree preservation and planting in Seattle.	Sep 14, 2012 1:40 PM
648	The more green space the better - it seems like a reasonable compromise	Sep 14, 2012 1:34 PM
649	Bicycle riders, passive users and pedestrians are not paying for it. Need to increase area property taxes significantly to satisfy their demands for these needless amenities, such as trees, lids and public spaces.	Sep 14, 2012 1:10 PM
650	More green space, yay! It would be nice to continue the lid to the west more and integrate the existing fire station and state patrol building into the green area.	Sep 14, 2012 1:06 PM
651	Open park space is always appreciated.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
652	A little too much beautification for the area and long term maintenace of the systems (lighting, HVAC, etc for the real use this lid will see is too much.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
653	Well done. A good balance for both passive and active uses. Shared use path should be wide enough to provide adequate space for both pedestrians and bicyclists, keeping in mind that even children on bikes will come down the hill at a pretty fast clip.	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
654	Lids over horrid freeways are always great	Sep 14, 2012 12:39 PM
655	This could create a fantastic bike connection between Eastlake and Montlake. Please make sure there is a solid connection to Delmar as well as any bike facilities built on the bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 12:32 PM
656	exponentially too expensive	Sep 14, 2012 12:30 PM
657	Top priority. This would be great!	Sep 14, 2012 12:22 PM

Page 3, Q3. Preference 3: 10th and Delmar lid: Support passive uses as well as bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths; balance tree preservation and safe public spaces by blending the lid into the hillside		
658	I would like to see some activation of this space, not just vacant grass, but something like a dog-park, crossfit outdoor space, workout facilities or even some sort of seattle prep/seattle schools addition or historic neighborhood interpretive display	Sep 14, 2012 12:20 PM
659	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
660	ok	Sep 14, 2012 11:55 AM
661	This looks cool. The other preferences look like "best available under the circumstances",	Sep 14, 2012 11:54 AM
662	Looks nice but the park is so close that it seems mildly unnessesary.	Sep 14, 2012 11:53 AM
663	Please make it easy for people who walk and bike to use this bridge and please connect multiple communities to the bridge. The 520 bridge serves the region and many people will use it on foot and on bicycle!	Sep 14, 2012 11:51 AM
664	Love it	Sep 14, 2012 11:46 AM
665	The small remnents of lid to the west of 10th Avenue and to the east of Delmar Drive will be useless as pedestrian facilities. They will be noisy from traffic on SR 520 and unpleasant for pedestrians - do not place pedestrian improvements at these areas other than a sidewalk to get from one side of the lid to the other. Please minimize the lid extension much past the sidewalks to reduce tax dollar waste. All other lids over freeways do not get pedestrians sitting and enjoying the views when they are so noisy - it's an architects idea that is never used by real people (looks nice on paper but impractical). The green space in the center of the lid between 10th Avenue and Delmar Drive is great.	Sep 14, 2012 10:28 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
1	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St. Ditto on that!	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 PM
2	This viewpoint should be adjusted height-wise to give best view around and through the cable stayed bridge towers.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
3	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
4	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 PM
5	The viewpoint and street parking are fine, please accommodate bicyclists as well.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 PM
6	I like this option	Oct 5, 2012 8:29 PM
7	OK but not high priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
8	I have no preference on this.	Oct 5, 2012 5:35 PM
9	2.6 billion for view points and parking while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:02 PM
10	Expanding this viewpoint and adding more green space by moving the parking onto the street sounds like an awesome improvement. I think it's a great idea!	Oct 5, 2012 3:45 PM
11	Great idea!!! beautiful view, hope you will consider a pedestrian overpass to connect the two.	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
12	Viewpoints are always a nice feature worth enhancing.	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
13	Don't interrupt the automobile traffic flow, preferably by moving the bicycle traffic to a different grade than the automobile traffic and don't allow street parking to obstruct oncoming traffic lanes. Maximize visibility for oncoming traffic to see pedistrians and bicycles.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
14	Sounds good. Go for it.	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM
15	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
16	good	Oct 5, 2012 2:47 PM
17	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
18	Don't really care about the view. Street parking? meh	Oct 5, 2012 2:40 PM
19	Not terribly worried about street parking.	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
20	We really need good bike access with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:17 PM
21	It's impossible to say from the image, but seems good. However, street parking should not come at the expense of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure.	Oct 5, 2012 2:03 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
22	No preference on the street parking.	Oct 5, 2012 1:54 PM
23	I don't have enough context to comment	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
24	I support expanding Bagley Viewpoint	Oct 5, 2012 1:47 PM
25	Supported. Anecdotally, existing parking there is little-used and expanding it is probably not a high priority.	Oct 5, 2012 1:02 PM
26	everyone loves a viewpoint!	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
27	Great idea. Not sure we need to improve street parking. Not that busy except for Seattle Prep. I would want to see parking restrictions during school hours to limit the student use of street parking.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
28	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
29	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
30	no interest	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
31	This adds nothing to bridge safety and usage.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
32	agree with this	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
33	Parking is nice and the viewpoint can create a destination for pedestrians and cyclists if shared use paths are included.	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
34	no preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
35	I don't really care about this.	Oct 5, 2012 12:14 PM
36	Street parking is at a premium and increasing available spaces is preferable.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 PM
37	This may result in congestion on the street	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
38	Viewpoints are nice for the city. Commuting is better.	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
39	I like.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM
40	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
41	Good, cost-effective idea	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
42	Expansion of this view point should only be east, any west expansion would only reduce an already narrow passage from Delmar to Roanoke. This could be accomplished with an improvement to the pedestrian passage on the south side of the view point and the construction of a graduated "switch back" bicycle and pedestrian path on the south side providing better more well lit access between Roanoke, Del Mar and Boyer Ave. It would also enhance the access to the play and court area proposed under the 520 pass through.	Oct 5, 2012 11:20 AM
43	I support this idea. Include transition/access to northside Portage Bay Bridge	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
	Bike/Ped Trail.	
44	Not a priority for me.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 AM
45	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 AM
46	strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 AM
47	nice idea! #4	Oct 5, 2012 10:51 AM
48	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
49	No opinion	Oct 5, 2012 10:36 AM
50	Support. The neighborhood should be a better place because of the 520 not a less desirable place with more noise and traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:25 AM
51	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
52	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
53	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
54	Another good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 AM
55	I don't think it is necessary to create additional street parking	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 AM
56	Ensure that street parking does not conflict with the Delmar bicycle facility.	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
57	The MPCC does not have a Preference regarding Preference 4.	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM
58	I support this	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM
59	I strongly Support this preference.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
60	Street parking is not a right. It may or may not be possible or available. People will be grumpy at first and then move on with their lives.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 AM
61	I enjoy viewpoints such as the one on the I-90 seattle lid.	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
62	Not high priority for me.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
63	Neutral	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
64	If this area is expanded it should remove any vegetation that blocks the view from all passerby, but allow for more low level vegetation around the area, less concrete and asphault. Parking for cars on the street and a bench to sit and look at the view. Make it like a mini park-like setting.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
65	Thank you no. More parking does not improve the situation.	Oct 5, 2012 9:20 AM
66	Do not care.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East

67	I didn't even know that existed.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
68	Not necessary. Cost will exceed benefit.	Oct 5, 2012 9:18 AM
69	The existing viewpoint has far too much paved area for parking than is justified.	Oct 5, 2012 9:06 AM
70	no opinion. viewpoint sounds nice.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
71	Unnecessary. Maybe just cut back the trees that make it less of a view point.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
72	I support creating opportunities for passive activities such as viewing.	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
73	While a nice idea, I'd be concerned about additional out of town drivers in a residential area.	Oct 5, 2012 8:41 AM
74	Viewpoints are great.	Oct 5, 2012 8:30 AM
75	yes	Oct 5, 2012 8:11 AM
76	No strong opinion on this issue.	Oct 5, 2012 8:10 AM
77	NO COMMENT	Oct 5, 2012 7:49 AM
78	I am indifferent to this change.	Oct 5, 2012 7:36 AM
79	okay	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
80	I do not believe that a viewpoint is a high priority use of limited resources. The viewpoint area at the West end of the Mercer Island Bridge is not used much and I doubt one here would be different.	Oct 5, 2012 7:09 AM
81	Great.	Oct 5, 2012 7:05 AM
82	Medium priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
83	Low priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:03 AM
84	I have no idea how you plan to provide parking on Delmar Drive East while still maintaining a functional bike lane on such a narrow and windy street. I keep thinking of Boyer/Fuhrman Ave's bike lanes which all have cars parked in them most of the time and it forces bikes that want to use the bike lanes where there aren't cars to weave in and out, which is probably more dangerous for the bikers than staying in the street.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
85	Support.	Oct 4, 2012 10:43 PM
86	Not sure how important this is. Rather see more put toward safe passage through this area.	Oct 4, 2012 10:37 PM
87	not necessary	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
88	We don't need more parking. We need more facilities for bikes and pedestrians to make up for the problems caused by the freeway.	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
89	Reduce parking on Delmar. Reduce the street width to communicate to drivers that they are driving through a park and that a stop light is approaching	Oct 4, 2012 10:02 PM
90	I do not support this, since I don't think it has much impact and is an unnecessary use of funds.	Oct 4, 2012 10:00 PM
91	Not sure I'd ever use this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:35 PM
92	No opinion	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
93	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 PM
94	This is not a priority improvement for me	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
95	in my opinion this is the least important part of the plan.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
96	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 8:55 PM
97	not important	Oct 4, 2012 8:50 PM
98	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
99	Not enough time to read the tradeoffs of this.	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
100	The viewpoint should be designed to accommodate use, so enlarging it and providing street parking seem appropriate. This preference seems a lesser priority than those that enhance pedestrian and bicycle travel. Providing a "destination" like a viewpoint, however, will increase the need for the other design ppreferences that improve access.	Oct 4, 2012 8:33 PM
101	I do not support expansion of parking for cars.	Oct 4, 2012 8:23 PM
102	What for?	Oct 4, 2012 8:22 PM
103	Viewpoint is nice but why encourage parking in an area rich with biking and walking options.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
104	nope. this one is silly.	Oct 4, 2012 8:12 PM
105	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:00 PM
106	No preference	Oct 4, 2012 7:10 PM
107	No - more room for cars, less for bikes and peds.	Oct 4, 2012 6:23 PM
108	no taxpayers money - Seattle can support this with a bond if they feel it is required	Oct 4, 2012 5:48 PM
109	Sure, it's pretty	Oct 4, 2012 5:30 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
110	Agree	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM
111	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
112	More parking is better	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
113	No more parking please!!	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
114	On street parking is not a priority to me. It is generally inefficient use of public space.	Oct 4, 2012 4:34 PM
115	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
116	Is this really necessary?	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
117	No street parking.	Oct 4, 2012 3:59 PM
118	Love the idea of taking advantage of a great view point, I don't really see a need for more parking, but not against it either	Oct 4, 2012 3:40 PM
119	no opinion. reduce street parking	Oct 4, 2012 3:31 PM
120	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 4, 2012 3:18 PM
121	Meh. I don't care much about this one.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
122	See number 3, I prefer connectivity over viewpoints	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
123	Yes!	Oct 4, 2012 2:44 PM
124	Absolutely love this.	Oct 4, 2012 2:35 PM
125	Street parking is not a priority for me.	Oct 4, 2012 2:04 PM
126	could be a nice view if it is easy to get to	Oct 4, 2012 1:53 PM
127	Forget street parking. Give people safe walking routes	Oct 4, 2012 1:31 PM
128	no parking!	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
129	Also better use of what is largely unused space currently.	Oct 4, 2012 1:23 PM
130	There's a bike lane on Delmar. Please don't put street parking there, casting the bike lane into the shadow of the door zone. What about crossing the street between the Bagley Viewpoint and the lid?	Oct 4, 2012 1:13 PM
131	do not support parking on delmar	Oct 4, 2012 1:00 PM
132	Preference 4: No comment	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
133	Expanding Bagley viewpoint would be nice, but I do not believe we need to clutter the streets with further parking.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
134	I support this	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM
135	strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
136	Not important to me one way or the other.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
137	Viewpoints are great, but need to be designed so that they are well activated and don't just become another hangout spot for those without better places to go. Street parking should be limited, and ideally be used as a buffer for a bike lane.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
138	Lower personal priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
139	I think there are plenty of viewpoints nearby already. Again, this would be a neat improvement, but I wouldn't consider it a priority. Street parking is not needed, unless it is done in a way that provides added safety by slowing down traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:53 AM
140	I agree	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
141	Great idea - low priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
142	Do not support	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
143	Don't care.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
144	No, we do not need more street parking.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
145	This area must be accessible to bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
146	don't care	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
147	No opinion.	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
148	Nuetral	Oct 4, 2012 10:38 AM
149	Great - but have not seen a detailed design of this yet.	Oct 4, 2012 10:13 AM
150	nice!	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 AM
151	Yes and maintain public stairway down to Boyer	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
152	I have no preference on this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:15 AM
153	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 AM
154	I support designated parking for the enjoyment of the area	Oct 4, 2012 2:59 AM
155	Why do we need to add street parking here? The current viewpoint has minimal parking and even that limited capacity is underutilized. Why create additional conflict points on the overpass? This is a silly idea. Throw it out.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
156	Not as important	Oct 3, 2012 9:24 PM
157	Support	Oct 3, 2012 9:01 PM
158	Make it a viewpoint instead of a landscaped barrier.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 PM
159	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
160	Terrific	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 PM
161	Parking along there would be great -- esp. if there is a small playfield in the nearby lid. But building out the viewpoint seems like a waste to everyone but the contractors.	Oct 3, 2012 2:34 PM
162	Unimportant; a very low priority.	Oct 3, 2012 1:52 PM
163	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 3, 2012 1:48 PM
164	sure, if you want to; not a highly-used viewpoint and I doubt it will become one	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
165	Can not comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:04 PM
166	Seems to make sense	Oct 3, 2012 12:44 PM
167	Any "gateway" design of the portal for westbound vehicles entering under the 10th & Roanoke/Delmar lid should be executed in a manner consistent with the historic nature of the surrounding neighborhoods.	Oct 3, 2012 12:10 PM
168	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 3, 2012 11:51 AM
169	I am indifferent to this.	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
170	some street parking limited to 2 hour so as not to encourage all day parking.	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
171	I don't really care about this one	Oct 3, 2012 11:33 AM
172	This has less impact to me.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
173	Cool!	Oct 3, 2012 10:28 AM
174	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 3, 2012 10:27 AM
175	No opinion	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
176	Please with parking.	Oct 3, 2012 9:34 AM
177	Is street parking necessary here? What about expanding Bagley Viewpoint with	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
	more benches, chess tables or other amenities?	
178	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 3, 2012 9:28 AM
179	Yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:58 AM
180	agree and the Bagley steps must be built to offer a wide stairway well lit in the dark	Oct 3, 2012 8:25 AM
181	OK	Oct 3, 2012 8:14 AM
182	I support this.	Oct 3, 2012 7:59 AM
183	No comment	Oct 3, 2012 7:55 AM
184	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 3, 2012 7:38 AM
185	Sounds like wasted resourses to me. Don't do it.	Oct 3, 2012 6:32 AM
186	Why parking? Seattle already has too many cars. The pollution levels here are very high. It is important that care use be discouraged. You can do that by offering good alternative choices for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users. But also by creating public spaces that car drivers cannot easily drive to.	Oct 2, 2012 10:51 PM
187	A nice viewpoint would be cool.	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
188	More street parking is OK, but I would rather not promote automobiles. Can the space used to park cars be used to have better bicycle lanes?	Oct 2, 2012 8:35 PM
189	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 2, 2012 6:13 PM
190	No comment	Oct 2, 2012 5:38 PM
191	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 2, 2012 4:14 PM
192	Dislike. Adding parking only adds to congestion, as it encourages driving rather than alternate uses	Oct 2, 2012 3:12 PM
193	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 AM
194	parks are always good, but all of these need to be merged into the design, along with easy access to the path across the bridge	Oct 2, 2012 11:01 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
195	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 2, 2012 10:05 AM
196	I have seen the parking plans and am leary of trying to pull out of such parking places with traffic from the 10th/Roanoke coming downhill and around that corner. People move pretty quickly on that stretch of road.	Oct 2, 2012 9:33 AM
197	No comment.	Oct 2, 2012 9:28 AM
198	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 2, 2012 9:02 AM
199	The active transportation coalition has no current opinion on the viewpoint.	Oct 2, 2012 8:22 AM
200	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 1, 2012 9:20 PM
201	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 1, 2012 2:16 PM
202	ok	Oct 1, 2012 1:16 PM
203	Don't think anything should be done here. Limited parking that is there hardly gets used and not sure need to improve.	Oct 1, 2012 12:30 PM
204	No comment.	Oct 1, 2012 11:26 AM
205	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Oct 1, 2012 10:05 AM
206	No comment	Sep 30, 2012 9:16 PM
207	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 30, 2012 7:41 PM
208	Not important	Sep 30, 2012 2:55 PM
209	Ensure street parking does not interfere with safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian traffic.	Sep 30, 2012 9:41 AM
210	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
211	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 30, 2012 3:34 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
212	No! Not good use of money.	Sep 29, 2012 11:30 PM
213	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 29, 2012 9:58 PM
214	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 29, 2012 7:39 PM
215	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 29, 2012 7:24 PM
216	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 PM
217	would like bike/pedestrian shared-use path all the way across 520	Sep 29, 2012 4:54 PM
218	Sounds great!	Sep 29, 2012 4:25 PM
219	Focus on the transportation, not the viewpoints.	Sep 29, 2012 1:18 PM
220	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 29, 2012 1:12 PM
221	I like this idea too, that parking lot is almost always empty it seems and street parking could easily accommodate everyone. Plus, if the lid/pedestrian improvements are done, even less people will be driving here anyway	Sep 29, 2012 1:06 PM
222	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 9:21 AM
223	Ok.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 AM
224	Expand Bagley viewpoint.	Sep 28, 2012 10:47 PM
225	This could easily be improved for bicycles and pedestrians.	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 PM
226	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 28, 2012 9:44 PM
227	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 28, 2012 8:56 PM
228	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
229	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new	Sep 28, 2012 7:17 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East

	Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	
230	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:38 PM
231	Looks like a nice place to stop and take in the view from a bicycle. Will there be a chance of a restroom somewhere in this general area? Gas Works Park seems to be about the only place in the general area for a cyclist to make use of public facilities that are open all year. Sometimes I get the impression that we are not expected to get full bladders in winter.	Sep 28, 2012 3:31 PM
232	Not at all.	Sep 28, 2012 2:34 PM
233	don't care	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM
234	4	Sep 28, 2012 12:05 PM
235	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 28, 2012 11:30 AM
236	View point good	Sep 28, 2012 11:18 AM
237	Really don't care about this relative to the lid and most especially the bike lane.	Sep 28, 2012 11:08 AM
238	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 28, 2012 10:16 AM
239	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 28, 2012 9:51 AM
240	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
241	May be nice compromise if larger cap is out of budget.	Sep 28, 2012 7:11 AM
242	Minimal benefit to project, current overlook rarely used.	Sep 27, 2012 10:46 PM
243	eh.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 PM
244	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 PM
245	Please ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:32 PM
246	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:00 PM
247	not sure of the point	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
248	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St	Sep 27, 2012 8:10 PM
249	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 7:31 PM
250	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:02 PM
251	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 6:29 PM
252	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 6:27 PM
253	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 6:16 PM
254	Sounds good	Sep 27, 2012 6:12 PM
255	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 5:57 PM
256	Not sure what this is	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
257	While the idea of a viewpoint seems nice on paper, at the Bellevue Square park I rarely see this area used for viewing. Most folks are down in the park itself or make use of the benches along park pathways.	Sep 27, 2012 5:25 PM
258	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 5:09 PM
259	Create convenient connections for bicycles / trail users between the new Portage Bay trail and the surrounding roads / trials.	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
260	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 4:50 PM
261	Only provide street parking if a bicycle friendly route both up and down the hill is provided. Restrict on-street parking to residents.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
262	If parking is not provided there should be comparable parking available nearby.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
263	Please be sure to ensure seamless and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
264	Lowest priority but would be lovely as a part of the lid.	Sep 27, 2012 4:19 PM
265	This is not necessary and a waste of money. People won't really want to relax at a viewpoint on top of a freeway.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
266	Agree	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
267	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 3:35 PM
268	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 3:27 PM
269	Boooo...why more parking? Just leads to more cars.	Sep 27, 2012 2:52 PM
270	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
271	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 2:31 PM
272	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 2:21 PM
273	Street parking is not that important to me if it means not having that space for transit.	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
274	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
275	This area would be the "trailhead" for a bike path across the Portage Bay Brdge	Sep 27, 2012 2:02 PM
276	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
277	Street parking should not be a priority	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
278	More parking for this would be nice, but not at the sacrifice of bicylce path widths, or wider sidewalks as there will be larger numbers of cyclists passing through her simultaneously with pedestrians and cars should be at the bottom of the priority list.	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
279	This would ensure visitors via car.	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
280	Doesn't apply to me.	Sep 27, 2012 1:26 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
281	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
282	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 1:02 PM
283	Where the heck is the connection to a bike trail over Portage Bay via 520 from Montlake? This would absolutely not fly down here in Portland. Whoever neglected to put the bike trail on there needs to be fired.	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
284	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
285	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 12:24 PM
286	No more street parking.	Sep 27, 2012 12:15 PM
287	seamless transitions and clear connections between trails and local streets are very much needed.	Sep 27, 2012 12:11 PM
288	Including safe bicycle and pedestrian paths as part of the project is crucial.	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
289	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 12:05 PM
290	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
291	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:58 AM
292	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
293	Street parking is good, but space for cyclists should be taken into consideration.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
294	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
295	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
296	Street parking should not be provided on Delmar Drive East, as Delmar is already high traffic, high congestion with Seattle Prep commuters, regular car commuters	Sep 27, 2012 11:34 AM
297	good	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
298	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
299	Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East	Sep 27, 2012 11:28 AM
300	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:25 AM
301	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
302	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
303	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
304	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
305	Like that.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
306	don't know	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
307	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
308	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
309	If the street parking is designed to facilitate a park 'n' ride system to mitigate west-bound congestion in the late afternoons, then this is a good idea. You should interface with companies in Bellevue and Redmond to ensure there is enough public transit support as well as awareness of the facility.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
310	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
311	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
312	not familiar with this street but more parking is always welcome	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
313	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
314	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
315	A low priority, low impact, non critical improvement	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
316	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
317	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
318	In doing so, ensure safe, seamless bike connections between proximal routes.	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 AM
319	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
320	I am not familiar with the bagley viewpoint	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
321	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
322	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
323	Street parking unnecessary and would widen roadway.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
324	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
325	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
326	view point would give another vantage to take in the city and enjoy annual events such as maybe fireworks	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
327	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
328	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
329	low priority	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
330	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
331	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
332	Would benefit those wanting to bike or walk across the bridge on the new bike/pedestrian path. All of these ideas are an improvement to Seattle's quality	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
333	4.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
334	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
335	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
336	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
337	Lets move away from parking! Prioritize room for bicycle infrastructure instead, we need to look to a new future of transportation alternatives to cars.Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
338	Parking is dumb, Adding parking to a already hard uphill climb for bicyclists will just create more problems.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
339	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
340	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
341	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
342	Not as important as shared use paths.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
343	You need to make it easy for cyclists to transition between trails and roads. Needs to reduce the liklihood of collisions.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East

344	Viewpoints should be lowest priority investments.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
345	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
346	Most likely, yes.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
347	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
348	include bicycle path	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
349	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
350	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
351	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
352	Unnecessary	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
353	Great	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
354	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
355	I'm not familiar with this area.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
356	I'm not sure what benefit this provides. The only vehicles I ever see here are police or city trucks taking a break	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 AM
357	no opinion here	Sep 27, 2012 9:35 AM
358	Currently a favorit lunch spot for contractors. Make the view a quiet one by extending a light weight shelf out over the highway (with green roof type plants) So viewers see that 10 feet below them is some sort of vegetated thing that sticks out and blocks sound, but is not growing a hedge that will obstruct the view. The view point may also have a slight slope to the west with a couple of banks of seating so that their is a slight "theater" effect, which would direct the viewers eastwards, and also block out the visual effects of the traffic on Roanoke.	Sep 26, 2012 11:44 PM
359	Low priority.don't need parking here	Sep 26, 2012 11:15 AM
360	Expand Bagley Viewpoint, yes and please. Why would we need street parking on Delmar Drive East?	Sep 26, 2012 11:07 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
361	like this	Sep 25, 2012 8:14 PM
362	No comment, don't use.	Sep 25, 2012 1:56 PM
363	Yes.	Sep 25, 2012 9:20 AM
364	I don't use this route often so I will reserve my input.	Sep 25, 2012 9:02 AM
365	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:45 AM
366	Te only parties that use this now are off duty ambulances, police hangout, and a few cars. Who would the new users be? I'm not sure this is a good place to spend more money.	Sep 25, 2012 8:16 AM
367	I'm confused .. whats the point	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
368	No preference but sounds nice.	Sep 24, 2012 9:10 PM
369	Strictly limit parking time for these spaces to ensure visitor use rather than overflow parking for area residents and live-in vehicles.	Sep 24, 2012 6:03 PM
370	No opinion.	Sep 24, 2012 5:20 PM
371	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St	Sep 24, 2012 1:08 PM
372	I don't think there is a need for any more street parking in this area, or for a larger viewpoint. Prefer not to invest into this.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
373	This would be nice.	Sep 24, 2012 12:28 PM
374	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
375	Needed for the shutter bugs who would want a picture of the cable stayed bridge.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
376	I think street parking here should be de-prioritized.	Sep 24, 2012 12:01 PM
377	good, that parking area is hardly ever used.	Sep 23, 2012 2:28 PM
378	I would rather see more emphasis on improving bike and pedestrian paths and connections than this viewpoint.	Sep 22, 2012 4:18 PM
379	It would be good to add a water fountain similar to the one originally installed by the Bagleys. It could help with the noise from 520.	Sep 22, 2012 10:43 AM
380	less important -better views and parks nearby	Sep 22, 2012 9:56 AM
381	Expanding Bagley Viewpoint and adding street parking on Delmar Drive East is unnecessary nor cost effective. Creating street parking will encourage more	Sep 22, 2012 2:27 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
	congestion, contrary to the entire project.	
382	This would be a nice addition to the lid.	Sep 21, 2012 3:27 PM
383	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
384	I think that this should be the access point for the Portage Bay Bridge Bicycle Trail.	Sep 20, 2012 3:00 PM
385	This is one of my favorite places to smoke weed. Can we get a bench, but Fuck the homeless. Make sure its well viewable from the street, because you can smoke weed discreetly. There is a nice view of bellevue, and you can watch the traffic roll by. Parking for the park/lid is important.	Sep 19, 2012 3:20 PM
386	If the additional parking can be provided that will allow access to the transit systems that go through the overpass then I would be more worthwhile.	Sep 18, 2012 3:12 PM
387	This does not seem very important. The street parking might require destruction of trees and natural areas.	Sep 18, 2012 11:46 AM
388	Waste of money, not many people use...	Sep 18, 2012 6:35 AM
389	open up the beautiful veiw, remove all trees, plant nothing that will eventully block.the veiw Retain the off street parking and add more street parking on Demar Dr. East.	Sep 17, 2012 9:23 PM
390	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:04 PM
391	View of the highway? Not sure what people would be looking at other than the 6 lane highway! I would NOT waste money on a viewpoint onto the highway. I would spend it on an I5 lid since the views will be better there and will connect two once-thriving neighborhoods!! Bring life back to North Capitol HIll and Lake View area.	Sep 17, 2012 9:26 AM
392	No comment	Sep 17, 2012 6:08 AM
393	I am also in support of this - great viewpoint!	Sep 16, 2012 6:37 PM
394	Bagley Viewpoint expansion is needed and support expansion and some limit parking, and provide safe public access from Boyer and Roanoke.	Sep 16, 2012 3:36 PM
395	I don't think you need to expand the viewpoint, just landscape it and make it a nice place. seating, picnic tables would be great.	Sep 16, 2012 8:56 AM
396	I support this.	Sep 16, 2012 2:13 AM
397	Nice, but is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520?	Sep 15, 2012 7:43 PM
398	I am ambivalent to this	Sep 15, 2012 6:06 PM
399	Yes, but also put in signage so people can find this little (unknown) gem by Montlake.	Sep 15, 2012 12:47 PM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East		
400	More BIG trees	Sep 15, 2012 11:57 AM
401	The Bagely Viewpoint needs to be redone and the connection to the stairs going to Boyer Ave needs improvement. (Mainly improving the openness and views to the east)	Sep 15, 2012 10:51 AM
402	A parking lot does not help traffic.	Sep 14, 2012 5:49 PM
403	Street parking is also very important!	Sep 14, 2012 5:47 PM
404	Love the overlooks.	Sep 14, 2012 5:14 PM
405	Nice but not critical	Sep 14, 2012 4:37 PM
406	While an expanded viewpoint sounds good, the rest is more of the same old auto-oriented mess.	Sep 14, 2012 4:25 PM
407	I wouldn't provide any extraordinary amount of street parking. Either typical street parking or at the most back-in parking. People should walk or bike here.	Sep 14, 2012 4:12 PM
408	very nice amenity	Sep 14, 2012 1:47 PM
409	I had no idea there was a viewpoint in this area. Is the parking for people using the viewpoint? Make sure there are places to lock up bicycles.	Sep 14, 2012 1:40 PM
410	Expanding viewpoints are needless expenses - why in the world do that? Who has the money for needless stuff? Street parking is needed! More street parking! Cars pay taxes. Bikes don't pay anything.	Sep 14, 2012 1:10 PM
411	No preference for this.	Sep 14, 2012 1:06 PM
412	Open park space is always appreciated.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
413	opposed to this. this is expensive parking, for whom. better to build a specific parking lot/structure rather than having it on the bridge/lid crossing over 520. The lid should focus on moving traffic across, and some land scaping.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
414	Stepped portals are a good idea.	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
415	never been there	Sep 14, 2012 12:39 PM
416	Don't actually care about this one.	Sep 14, 2012 12:32 PM
417	This will be great, the viewpoint now is underused and a bit frightening	Sep 14, 2012 12:20 PM
418	No	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
419	ok	Sep 14, 2012 11:55 AM
420	Love it	Sep 14, 2012 11:46 AM
421	Don't need one more "view point", but the parking spaces along Delmar are good for the green space in the center of the lid. Make sure these parking	Sep 14, 2012 10:28 AM

Page 3, Q4. Preference 4: Bagley Viewpoint: Expand Bagley Viewpoint and provide street parking on Delmar Drive East

spaces are limited to 2 hours only so no residents take the spaces for their personal parking 24/7 - these spaces are for everyone!

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
1	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling. Yep1	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 PM
2	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 PM
3	Very appropriate.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
4	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 PM
5	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 PM
6	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling and connections to other nearby corridors such as Boyer.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 PM
7	I like this option	Oct 5, 2012 8:29 PM
8	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise	Oct 5, 2012 7:38 PM
9	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 7:19 PM
10	Yes, please!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 6:04 PM
11	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks. - see above note about needing to get the connections in place at the start.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM
12	I support safer pedestrian crossing here.	Oct 5, 2012 5:59 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
13	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 5:42 PM
14	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 5:35 PM
15	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 4:42 PM
16	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 4:40 PM
17	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:02 PM
18	Yes to the key words here: "accessible and safe". Thank you!	Oct 5, 2012 3:45 PM
19	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 3:32 PM
20	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 3:31 PM
21	Exactly what i stated above...wonderful!	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
22	This would be great, as it would help create a loop around Montlake.	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
23	Move pedestrian connection off the grade used by automobile traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
24	yes. provide full bike and pedestrian access.	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
25	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
26	Yes, but DO NOT SLOW DOWN CARS.	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM
27	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
28	good	Oct 5, 2012 2:47 PM
29	Support pedestrain access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
30	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 2:40 PM
31	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 2:32 PM
32	Pedestrian access needed, will there be a bike lane?	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
33	We really need good bike access with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:17 PM
34	I definitely think that we need better pedestrian access to the parks in this area	Oct 5, 2012 2:08 PM
35	If you do not build a per/bike lane along 520 all the way to the Roanoke area (which you really, really should), consider alternative ways for bicycles to safely get from Boyer up to Roanoke.	Oct 5, 2012 2:03 PM
36	I strongly support a pedestrian AND BICYCLE connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East.	Oct 5, 2012 1:54 PM
37	Yes! People need ways to move around safely.	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
38	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 1:47 PM
39	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 1:46 PM
40	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 1:17 PM
41	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 1:08 PM
42	Strongly supported! Linking these areas together provides useful connections between both areas.	Oct 5, 2012 1:02 PM
43	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
44	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
45	Again, as a pedestrian and bicycle rider as well as a driver I use these, and improving them is important.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
46	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 12:50 PM
47	Agree. That hill can be tough on pedestrians and bicycles. Cars travel too fast.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
48	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
49	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 12:35 PM
50	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
51	I support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
52	Bridge should be for auto uses, not pedestrians who are few and far between.	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
53	agree with this	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
54	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
55	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St. Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
56	I strongly support this pedestrian access to various parks and local neighborhoods.	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
57	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
58	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 12:14 PM
59	Only do this if the cost is insignificant. This would not likely get used much.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 PM
60	I strongly support this - It creates a greenbelt loop.	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
61	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
62	Like this - pedestrian paths are important and there is a need to separate bikes from traffic too	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
63	Very good idea!	Oct 5, 2012 11:49 AM
64	Parks should be walkable by locals, not require driving.	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
65	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM
66	Yes! I enthusiastically support.	Oct 5, 2012 11:40 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
67	absolutely - make this walkable! (and bikable!)	Oct 5, 2012 11:30 AM
68	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
69	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
70	Absolutely important for connectivity	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
71	As identified in Preference 4: Improvement in the current north pedestrian stairway and the development of a graduated "switch back" Bicycle and Pedestrian pathway on the south of the Bagley viewpoint would greatly improve accessibility and safety between these streets and provide good access to proposed play areas and courts under the 520 pass through.	Oct 5, 2012 11:20 AM
72	I support this. We need enhanced pedestrian/bike access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It makes the greenbelt loop around Montlake, as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stairs not only make pedestrians connections, they are also recreational stairs for exercise. This connection will bring life to an area close to SR520 that needs light and activity.	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
73	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM
74	Yes, absolutely. This would be cheaper and easier than highway path.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 AM
75	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 AM
76	support	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 AM
77	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 10:56 AM
78	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
79	Yes, very preferable! #3	Oct 5, 2012 10:51 AM
80	Yes, very important to provide safe connects for bikes and pedestrians through this area	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
81	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
82	No opinion	Oct 5, 2012 10:36 AM
83	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 10:34 AM
84	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a	Oct 5, 2012 10:26 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
	greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	
85	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 10:25 AM
86	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
87	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
88	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
89	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
90	Good Idea	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
91	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM
92	Much needed good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 AM
93	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 AM
94	I strongly support this. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
95	Avoid engineering handstands to make this path ADA accessible. Explore other less complicated or expensive means to provide accessible connections.	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
96	The MPCC strongly support this Preference so that there will be proper access to the surrounding areas.	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM
97	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East

98	Support	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
99	I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car. Pedestrian facilities should not be an afterthought, nor should pedestrians be expected to go up and over or down and around to avoid cars. Pedestrians are like water, and if they see a flat route, they will take it, even if it is unsafe. Therefore, the pedestrian routes should be both safe AND direct.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 AM
100	I support this; safe pedestrian access is really important to me.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
101	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
102	Not a high priority for me, but if is needed, then I wouldn't be against it.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
103	This has been needed for a long time. Please keep it in this plan.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
104	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
105	Yes, a pedestrian connection is needed	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
106	I support safe pedestrian connections as long as the solution does not add more concrete, impact homes in the area of connection and adds landscape buffers between homes peds and traffic	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
107	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
108	This would be a wonderful addition to #1 (I-5 crossing.)	Oct 5, 2012 9:20 AM
109	This is a no-brainer. Pedestrians should come FIRST before ANY special provisions are made for cars or parking. Design for the poorest among us first.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
110	That looks like it would be helpful. It's so frustrating to be yards away from something I can't walk to.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
111	The green ped/bike corridor is a much needed improvement and should extend to the shores of Portage Bay with public access. Bike Lanes on Delmar should	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East

	be upgraded.	
112	Not necessary. Cost will exceed benefit.	Oct 5, 2012 9:18 AM
113	Good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 9:06 AM
114	Strongly support. We have visited the park by Montlake community center only once, though we don't live far away. It is just too much of a challenge to get our children there without a car at its current setup, We would also feel safer going there if there were more/easier pedestrian access, as it was deserted and empty when we last went.	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
115	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
116	A lot of dough being spent for very few people.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
117	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
118	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 8:41 AM
119	It makes sense to compensate Boyer Ave for building a freeway on their bay.	Oct 5, 2012 8:30 AM
120	yes	Oct 5, 2012 8:11 AM
121	This is important to create a green-belt loop around Montlake to facilitate pedestrian access.	Oct 5, 2012 8:10 AM
122	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 8:04 AM
123	Preference 5: I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 7:49 AM
124	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 AM
125	I strongly support pedestrian access to all the parks east of Roanoke.	Oct 5, 2012 7:36 AM
126	okay	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
127	This is good, Delmar and Boyer are both good possible bike routes, though the terrain is challenging, and the level of traffic can be extremely high for city streets.	Oct 5, 2012 7:05 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
128	I support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 6:44 AM
129	Good bike infrastructure is important around this area. Right now it seems like a bit of a mess.	Oct 5, 2012 6:33 AM
130	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM
131	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 5:19 AM
132	Low priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
133	Support. Gotta have non-car access.	Oct 5, 2012 5:13 AM
134	More important to create a connection from Delmar to montlake, since that would actually serve more pedestrian generators	Oct 5, 2012 5:03 AM
135	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 5, 2012 4:48 AM
136	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 AM
137	Good bike lanes and sidewalks would improve safety.	Oct 5, 2012 12:11 AM
138	Like the stairs that are there now? This is very vague and I really can't comment on it.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
139	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 PM
140	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
141	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
142	Support, although I'd rather see an on-bridge bike path.	Oct 4, 2012 10:43 PM
143	Connections! continuity is the key here.	Oct 4, 2012 10:37 PM
144	not necessary	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
145	Provide a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay bridge. Need many active ways to enliven the Boyer connection. Could be a good area for youth/adult play structures (i.e. zip line, climbing wall, large slide, mountain biking route, skate park, water feature, outside racket ball court, etc.)	Oct 4, 2012 10:02 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
146	Yes for walkers!	Oct 4, 2012 10:01 PM
147	I support Preference 5 for improved pedestrian access. Children and adults alike should have safe pedestrian access to these streets.	Oct 4, 2012 10:00 PM
148	This connection is extremely vital for our neighborhood. We have already been divided by the current SR-520, and we will be severely impacted by the wider design for the new highway. If the property below the bridge can be purchased from or exchanged with Seattle Prep, it would provide a much more favorable and safe and accessible area for a connection between Delman Drive East and Boyer Avenue East. It might also be more cost effective to use that area for the connection than directly under the bridge structure.	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 PM
149	Strongly support. This would be the way my family would be able to access this area.	Oct 4, 2012 9:35 PM
150	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 9:30 PM
151	Would be nice, but currently Boyer is high use, high speeds (for what it is) and in poor surface condition, making it currently unsafe/unpleasant for biking and walking along.	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
152	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 PM
153	Support. This will improve safe foot traffic through the neighborhood	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
154	i hope this will have access for bikes.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
155	The car traffic on Boyer is insanely fast. I am scared to get out of a parked car and cross the street. I can't imagine biking on Boyer as it currently is. There definitely needs to be a safe pedestrian and bike connection through here ASAP before someone gets killed. I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
156	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 8:55 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
157	I support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood	Oct 4, 2012 8:50 PM
158	Please connect any new construction with the surrounding neighborhoods so that people can get anywhere and everywhere by bike or on foot!	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
159	Without this, the lid is a lot less useful.	Oct 4, 2012 8:45 PM
160	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
161	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 8:33 PM
162	YES!	Oct 4, 2012 8:23 PM
163	This section needs a safe pedestrian area. I would very much like this part to provide a connection to the 520 bike trail. It seems a shame to build a great lid and 520 trail without including a connection from Delmar to Montlake. This connection would also activate the park nearby.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
164	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 8:13 PM
165	yep	Oct 4, 2012 8:12 PM
166	Important missing link in the current pedestrian network. I support this idea.	Oct 4, 2012 8:07 PM
167	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:00 PM
168	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 7:59 PM
169	This is key to linking pedestrian and bicycle traffic from the Montlake area.	Oct 4, 2012 7:57 PM
170	good, reconnect the (askew) grid	Oct 4, 2012 7:46 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
171	Looks steep. Will it be bicycle accessible?	Oct 4, 2012 7:30 PM
172	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 7:19 PM
173	It would be great to have this connection for bicycles and pedestrians to access local parks and nearby attractions.	Oct 4, 2012 7:10 PM
174	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 PM
175	Boyer connection must be made safe and accessible for pedestrians. Avoid heavily forested paths and overwhelming presence of highway passing overhead as much as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 6:28 PM
176	No - more room for cars, less for bikes and peds.	Oct 4, 2012 6:23 PM
177	There should be a safe pedestrain connection -however it should be minimal and for safety purposes - no extras that are not required	Oct 4, 2012 5:48 PM
178	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 5:30 PM
179	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 5:21 PM
180	Agree	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM
181	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
182	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 5:07 PM
183	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
184	If we can have a accessible and safe bicycle/pedestrian connection that would be nice. I am all for any type of "connector" as long as it connects pedestrians and bicycles NOT only cars.	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
185	Pedestrian safe access is a must.	Oct 4, 2012 4:34 PM
186	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
187	I am very much in favor of this.	Oct 4, 2012 4:17 PM
188	Good. I use this every day.	Oct 4, 2012 3:59 PM
189	Would be nice, that side of the hill is really kind of dumpy today, would be great to have a nature trail and better sidewalks (the sidewalks going down Delmar Drive are extremely tight, not optimal at all)	Oct 4, 2012 3:40 PM
190	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 3:36 PM
191	very good.	Oct 4, 2012 3:31 PM
192	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 4, 2012 3:18 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
193	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
194	I strongly support this pedestrian access	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
195	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 3:13 PM
196	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
197	Support. This would provide a great link between parks.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
198	See number 3, I prefer connectivity over viewpoints	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
199	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM
200	Multi-mode transportation options are critical, particularly when designing transportation elements that will be with us for many years to come.	Oct 4, 2012 2:41 PM
201	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks	Oct 4, 2012 2:36 PM
202	Yes, please for new pedestrian connections.	Oct 4, 2012 2:35 PM
203	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks	Oct 4, 2012 2:20 PM
204	Sounds good to me.	Oct 4, 2012 2:04 PM
205	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
206	We must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections!	Oct 4, 2012 1:31 PM
207	what about bikes?	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
208	This is critical. I cross this intersection on foot every workday and it is dangerous for pedestrians. Cars start around the traffic circle and then slam on their brakes when they see you on the west ped xing. Also, you have to go out into the street to start the S-N crossing on the West side. This will address safety issues for pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 1:23 PM
209	This is a great idea. Really connects the local parks.	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM
210	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 1:20 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
211	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
212	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
213	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 1:01 PM
214	strongly support some connection between the path and boyer	Oct 4, 2012 1:00 PM
215	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 12:56 PM
216	Preference 5: I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM
217	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 12:39 PM
218	Support	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
219	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 12:30 PM
220	I strongly support this connection.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
221	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 12:18 PM
222	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM
223	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
224	I strongly support this pedestrian access to our many local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
225	I support this, as it enhances access to the Montlake CC trail, from which one can easily and safely access Burke Gilman and the UW.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
226	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
227	Support this strongly.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
228	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
229	YES! Please! Do this! I'll send cookies! Anything!	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
230	Lower personal priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
231	This route is currently very unfriendly to pedestrians, adding a safe, accessible connection would improve the neighborhood.	Oct 4, 2012 11:53 AM
232	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park.	Oct 4, 2012 11:51 AM
233	Great idea - low priority.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
234	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
235	I strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
236	We support this. It is our understanding that this will enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront and the Montlake Community Center.	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
237	I can support this idea as a cyclist.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
238	Yes! Stongly agree	Oct 4, 2012 11:40 AM
239	Pedestrian access to parks is important. I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:36 AM
240	Yes please	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
241	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
242	This area must be accessible to bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
243	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
244	I endorse this as well. bicycling from interlaken heading towards the university district would be improved.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 AM
245	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
246	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM
247	I definitely support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:24 AM
248	yes, please prioritize safe pedestrian access, it will help pedestrians walk from park to park. so awesome for families!	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
249	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 11:21 AM
250	I strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:09 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
251	This general area, cut off by freeways, is challenging to traverse on foot. Any improvement to pedestrian access would be great.	Oct 4, 2012 11:08 AM
252	I strongly support this pedestrian access to multiple local and regional parks.	Oct 4, 2012 10:58 AM
253	Good!	Oct 4, 2012 10:50 AM
254	This intersection is a total hazard. Keeping traffic slow on Boyer should also be a priority.	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
255	I own our home a half mile from this location and support this.	Oct 4, 2012 10:38 AM
256	Very important! This path activates and makes safer the under-bridge area, and provides important "Safe Routes to Schools" access/ordinance for kids walking to Seward School from Boyer Fuhrman. If bike/ped lane on Portage Bay Viaduct (never had EIS for this - bad process) is built, I fear grade will be so steep if offramp is on Delmar lid. I hear (no WSDOT analysis or draft EIS done) that bike/ped lane on Portage Bay Viaduct will land on the Boyer connection path to avoid such a steep grade (going from 520 surface to the high Delmar lid. Doing so (landing the bike/ped lane on Boyer connection) should provide safety for peds and school if the purported bike traffic is fast and large. Boyer connection underbridge sketches are good as far as they go, but suggest the Frolund properties add to this active connection by having waterfront access (WAY MORE than a viewpoint). We Boyer Fuhrman residents will suffer 4-6 years of construction traffic by WSDOT's own truck trip estimates. We ask for this waterfront park and access as "adverse impact mitigation" - we have a history of maintaining parks, and will do it!	Oct 4, 2012 10:13 AM
257	no comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 AM
258	YES!	Oct 4, 2012 9:43 AM
259	Yes, strongly support	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
260	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 9:15 AM
261	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 AM
262	I strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
263	I do not support spending money on pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 7:01 AM
264	The most important!	Oct 4, 2012 6:41 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
265	I like the concept, not sure if this will solve the problem that is Boyer with speeding	Oct 4, 2012 2:59 AM
266	Do it. If this were Facebook, I'd Like it.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 AM
267	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 .	Oct 3, 2012 9:38 PM
268	Support	Oct 3, 2012 9:01 PM
269	Safe means lighting and visibility. Freeway Park path from downtown to east of the freeway is something of a model though it is a bit spooky after dark.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 PM
270	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
271	Terrific	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 PM
272	Needs to encompass both pedal and bikes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:13 PM
273	Would add to the accessibility and beauty of the neighborhood.	Oct 3, 2012 4:20 PM
274	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
275	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 3:44 PM
276	Nice idea but not as high a priority as other improvements such as lid space.	Oct 3, 2012 2:34 PM
277	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 1:52 PM
278	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 3, 2012 1:48 PM
279	that would help	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
280	Strongly support.	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
281	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 1:04 PM
282	Seems to make sense	Oct 3, 2012 12:44 PM
283	Improve this connection by expanding it into the property just east, reducing the grade of the connector path and taking it out from under 520.	Oct 3, 2012 12:10 PM
284	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 3, 2012 11:51 AM
285	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmstead plan for the neighborhood. Stair climbs can not only provide pedestrians connections, they can also become recreational stairs for people wishing to exercise. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
286	Connect to Sea Prep/Delmar site open space with pedestrian medians on Delmar	Oct 3, 2012 11:50 AM
287	I support this	Oct 3, 2012 11:33 AM
288	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
289	This is a scary pathway at times. Very much in favor of improving this.	Oct 3, 2012 10:43 AM
290	Wow. that would be awesome!	Oct 3, 2012 10:28 AM
291	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 3, 2012 10:27 AM
292	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 9:43 AM
293	This would be a huge improvement and really connect our neighborhood.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
294	This sounds great. A space for bikes to easily get up and down the stairs would be a good addition too.	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM
295	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 3, 2012 9:28 AM
296	Yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:58 AM
297	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:36 AM
298	Agreed and this lid must then connect a pedistrian /bicycle path down to Boyer Avenue using WSDOT and Seattle Prep property . As part of mitigation 2400 and 2500 blocks of Boyer Ave must then be configured to be safe for bicycles and connect to Greenways designated streets in Montlake connecting to the Bill Dawson trail and onto the UW.	Oct 3, 2012 8:25 AM
299	OK	Oct 3, 2012 8:14 AM
300	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 8:01 AM
301	This is a good idea.	Oct 3, 2012 7:59 AM
302	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 3, 2012 7:55 AM
303	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 3, 2012 7:38 AM
304	Yes, make it a safe one.	Oct 3, 2012 6:32 AM
305	Sure, repave the downhill Delmar towards Lynn, make the bike lane wider and keep it clean, or move the bike lane to the uphill side, and have sharrows for the downhil side.	Oct 2, 2012 10:51 PM
306	This would be nice, but is not a must-have.	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
307	Pedestrian safety is good, but I think the future is also in bicycle use.	Oct 2, 2012 8:35 PM
308	YES!	Oct 2, 2012 8:24 PM
309	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 2, 2012 6:13 PM
310	Not particularly necessary.	Oct 2, 2012 5:38 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
311	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
312	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 2, 2012 4:14 PM
313	Sounds like a great idea.	Oct 2, 2012 3:12 PM
314	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 AM
315	parks are always good, but all of these need to be merged into the design, along with easy access to the path across the bridge	Oct 2, 2012 11:01 AM
316	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 2, 2012 10:05 AM
317	If this connection is right beside the huge new highway overpass, it's going to be very hard to convince people that it is safe. Even with the current smaller bridge, that area is not friendly on overcast days or after dark.	Oct 2, 2012 9:33 AM
318	Support	Oct 2, 2012 9:32 AM
319	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create an almost loop in the Olmsted designed greenbelt around Montlake. It will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 2, 2012 9:28 AM
320	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 2, 2012 9:02 AM
321	Our coalition of neighborhoods supports a pedestrian path between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East. This connection is an important connection for Montlake and Portage Bay residents as well as children trying to get to safely school. We urge WSDOT to examine ways to make sure this pedestrian connection is safe and easy and thus inviting its use rather than community neglect.	Oct 2, 2012 8:22 AM
322	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 1, 2012 9:20 PM
323	agreed	Oct 1, 2012 7:58 PM
324	bicycles too?; maybe a good idea	Oct 1, 2012 7:13 PM
325	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 1, 2012 2:16 PM
326	Where is the mention to include an entrance for bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths along the bridge span? Is this in the plan?	Oct 1, 2012 1:16 PM
327	Yes, include this connection, as well as a good bicycle connection to a bike path	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
	on the Portage Bay bridge.	
328	This would be useful for getting east/west across corridor safely.	Oct 1, 2012 12:30 PM
329	Great!	Oct 1, 2012 12:05 PM
330	I strongly support. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create an almost loop in the Olmsted designed greenbelt around Montlake. It will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 1, 2012 11:26 AM
331	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Oct 1, 2012 10:05 AM
332	No Comment	Sep 30, 2012 9:16 PM
333	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 30, 2012 7:41 PM
334	High Priority	Sep 30, 2012 4:53 PM
335	Not important	Sep 30, 2012 2:55 PM
336	Upgrade the bicycle lanes on Boyer.	Sep 30, 2012 9:41 AM
337	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
338	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 30, 2012 3:34 AM
339	Again, personal experience in the area makes me question the wisdom of this. I am not in favor.	Sep 29, 2012 11:30 PM
340	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 29, 2012 9:58 PM
341	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 29, 2012 7:24 PM
342	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 PM
343	would like bike/pedestrian shared-use path all the way across 520	Sep 29, 2012 4:54 PM
344	Yes, I will cycle this route. Please provide a trail that is adequately wide and uses ramps, not stairs for access.	Sep 29, 2012 4:41 PM
345	I would prefer to see a bicycle path on 520 between Roanoke and Montlake.	Sep 29, 2012 4:25 PM
346	Pedestrian and bike improvements are paramount.	Sep 29, 2012 1:18 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
347	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 29, 2012 1:12 PM
348	This area is sketchy right now, it will be a challenge to make this feel safe. The proposed improvements should help - especially if the high school is enlisted to host activities	Sep 29, 2012 1:06 PM
349	Please yes	Sep 29, 2012 9:21 AM
350	This is an important link in the overall system of bike trails. I bike through here with my kids periodically and it is not pleasant.	Sep 29, 2012 6:36 AM
351	Is this the stairs that exist today? If so then yes. No need to build more. Expensive. Who would use it. If there are stairs, a trail on 520, and another path, all for similar connections. Seems a bit much.	Sep 29, 2012 6:29 AM
352	Provide safe pedestrain connection.	Sep 28, 2012 10:47 PM
353	This is another great area for bike/ped improvements.	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 PM
354	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 28, 2012 9:44 PM
355	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 28, 2012 8:56 PM
356	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
357	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 28, 2012 7:17 PM
358	Make design consistent with existing or realistically expected future infrastructure.	Sep 28, 2012 5:48 PM
359	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:38 PM
360	YES!	Sep 28, 2012 5:07 PM
361	Please include bicycle connection as well.	Sep 28, 2012 4:56 PM
362	Nice.	Sep 28, 2012 3:31 PM
363	Fourth most.	Sep 28, 2012 2:34 PM
364	prefer	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM
365	As well as a safe bicycle corridor on Delmar	Sep 28, 2012 2:08 PM
366	Ensure bicycle access as well to Boyle.	Sep 28, 2012 12:45 PM
367	5	Sep 28, 2012 12:05 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
368	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 28, 2012 11:30 AM
369	Also important that the new freeway not disrupt the neighborhood accesibility.	Sep 28, 2012 11:18 AM
370	This is only important if there is a good lid. My priority is the shared use path from Seattle (west of I-5) all the way across the bridge followed by a nice lid that helps connect the neighborhoods, but I'd drop the lid in a heartbeat if it conflicted with the connectivity for bicycles across the bridge.	Sep 28, 2012 11:08 AM
371	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 28, 2012 10:16 AM
372	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 28, 2012 9:51 AM
373	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
374	Like	Sep 28, 2012 8:28 AM
375	Would like this, but lower priority than opt. 1 and 2.	Sep 28, 2012 7:11 AM
376	Great!	Sep 28, 2012 6:18 AM
377	Yes. Is there room for bikes, too? That would be good if so.	Sep 27, 2012 11:26 PM
378	as much as possible, keep pedestrian and bicycle paths seperated.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
379	Very big improvement for neighborhood and pedestrian access. Provides needed connection between top and bottom of hill.	Sep 27, 2012 10:46 PM
380	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 PM
381	Please upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling	Sep 27, 2012 9:32 PM
382	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:00 PM
383	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 8:34 PM
384	i like it	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
385	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 8:10 PM
386	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 7:31 PM
387	Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
388	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:02 PM
389	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 6:29 PM
390	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 6:27 PM
391	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 6:16 PM
392	Yes please	Sep 27, 2012 6:12 PM
393	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 5:57 PM
394	Not sure what this is	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
395	All for providing better and safer pedestrian access, especially across heavily trafficked roads.	Sep 27, 2012 5:25 PM
396	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 5:09 PM
397	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 4:50 PM
398	Modify the existing traffic circle, all-way stop at Delmar Drive and Boyer to provide seamless and safe bicycle travel. Auto traffic currently whips around the circle without regard to the control that should be provided by the traffic circle.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
399	Yes should be included	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
400	Also, please upgrade existing bicycle corridors	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
401	Upgrading the existing bicycle facilities	Sep 27, 2012 4:34 PM
402	I support safe routes for bicyclists and pedestrians. It is hard to be seen when eastbound on a bike at this intersection.	Sep 27, 2012 4:19 PM
403	It is important to maintain transportatio connections for bikes and pedestrains.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
404	Agree	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
405	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 3:35 PM
406	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 3:27 PM
407	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East

408	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 2:31 PM
409	Excellent idea.	Sep 27, 2012 2:25 PM
410	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 2:21 PM
411	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
412	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
413	Bike lanes both sides in this segment	Sep 27, 2012 2:02 PM
414	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
415	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 2:01 PM
416	Definitely needed.	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
417	Do it!	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
418	Bycicles too	Sep 27, 2012 1:32 PM
419	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 1:26 PM
420	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
421	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 1:02 PM
422	Good	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
423	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
424	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 12:24 PM
425	also great. upgrading the existing bicycle corridor will improve this as well.	Sep 27, 2012 12:11 PM
426	Including safe bicycle and pedestrian paths as part of the project is crucial.	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
427	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 12:05 PM
428	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
429	Yes- this is high priority	Sep 27, 2012 11:59 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
430	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:58 AM
431	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
432	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
433	I strongly support this idea. Please design the path to so that it is not too steep while keeping the number of sharp switchback turns to a minimum.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
434	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
435	a minimum	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
436	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
437	Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East	Sep 27, 2012 11:28 AM
438	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:25 AM
439	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
440	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
441	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
442	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
443	like that.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
444	See above comments (preference 1) on bicycle and pedestrian paths.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
445	sure.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
446	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
447	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
448	Very important	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM
449	Support this option	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
450	Pedestrian access is good; I assume this will also cover bicycles.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
451	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
452	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
453	Enabling people to connect with more areas via bicycles and walking is fantastic	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
454	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
455	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 AM
456	A low priority	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
457	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
458	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
459	Yes!!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 AM
460	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
461	not sure	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
462	Keep pedestrians safe with slowed traffic and visible ped. connectors	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
463	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
464	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
465	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
466	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
467	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
468	pedestrian/bicycle seperation is pivotal for safety in this day and age of smart phones	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
469	Seems to make sense as well. Buld it right the first time (not like so many other bad compromises)	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
470	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East

471	This seems to relate to relate to item 3 and would be good.	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
472	Also more defined signage and wider bike route to the E. Lynn/Boyer intersection.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
473	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
474	Highest priority (seems to me that 1,2,3 would do that and more). Main thing is safe and convenient BIKE and pedestrian connection.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
475	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
476	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
477	Very important improvement!	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
478	Obviously good to make the connection for safe travel to what may become a destination recreation and ped / cycle commuting area.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
479	5.Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
480	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
481	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
482	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
483	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
484	This looks like it could work well to move people across the obstacle that 520 presents at a lower cost than a lid would.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
485	This will help for a quieter walk from my house on Lakeview Blvd E to the U district, a nice idea.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
486	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
487	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
488	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
489	Seems important in order to maintain a connection to other paths.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
490	Again needs to be safe for both cyclists and pedestrians	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East

491	Given the accident history related to Boyer this seems like a good option to me.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
492	any pedestrian crossing should also have a bicycle solution as well!	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
493	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
494	...as well as safe access for cyclists (commuters).	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
495	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
496	include bicycle path	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
497	Update existing bicycle corridors	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
498	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
499	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
500	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
501	This can wait.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
502	excellent	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
503	Great	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
504	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
505	I'm not familiar with this area.	Sep 27, 2012 9:38 AM
506	good	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 AM
507	yes please. This is a pedestrian/bike heavy area and for cars and people out of cars to co-exist well we need to give them all a way to get around without getting into each other's way.	Sep 27, 2012 9:35 AM
508	Elevated staircase over a shrub forest canopy. This would feel safer than being amongst the tree trunks and trash. It would also provide beter views and could have a minor vantage point below the bridge - provided it did not look into neighbors homes too much...	Sep 26, 2012 11:44 PM
509	Please make this connection as large as possible and incorporate an off-leash dog area into it. The currently existing dog park under I 5 near the Eastlake neighborhood is so poorly surfaced that it is almost unuseable. Please do not repeat the errors included in that area.	Sep 26, 2012 5:52 PM
510	Crossing the street is the key issue here.....rather see it connect to a bike path on the bridge	Sep 26, 2012 11:15 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
511	Again, yes, please. It's already too difficult and dangerous to get around this neighborhood; we need more safe and accessible infrastructure like this.	Sep 26, 2012 11:07 AM
512	like this	Sep 25, 2012 8:14 PM
513	Yes please.	Sep 25, 2012 1:56 PM
514	I would use the one that is there today. Maybe improve it some, but no need to make another.	Sep 25, 2012 9:20 AM
515	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:45 AM
516	Not sure where this is. Some funds to make space look decent under hte E portion of 520 would be good. Looks green on your map now but not listed as a zone in these questions.	Sep 25, 2012 8:16 AM
517	I have to vote a big YES on safe pedestrian connections. Nothing is worse than being on foot and not having a safe place to walk.	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
518	Terrific! I support walkability!	Sep 24, 2012 9:10 PM
519	Keep the small-scale appearance of this connection to avoid unnecessarily increasing through-traffic on Delmar.	Sep 24, 2012 6:03 PM
520	Would this be for bicycles also? This would make it of value to anyone who rides the area, otherwise its only of value to those who live in the neighborhood.	Sep 24, 2012 5:20 PM
521	We need both a safe path for pedestrians between the Delmar lid and Boyer. The Hill side cannot remain the home of homeless people and the location of drug deals. It needs to be activated. This said, it cannot be construed as a valid commuting route. It's too steep, too long, requires navigation through Montlake. However, we also need a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge also to serve commuting needs between downtown, Capitol and First Hill and NE Seattle, the UW, the 2 hospitals and of course Bellevue and Redmond. It is needed to complete the regional bike network, and it will pay dividends in several ways: more bike and pedestrian commuting mean less cars on the street, less pollution, better functioning roads and interchanges. It helps everybody.	Sep 24, 2012 3:09 PM
522	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 24, 2012 1:08 PM
523	Please ensure bike safety as well.	Sep 24, 2012 12:54 PM
524	Sounds nice, but why only pedestrian and not bicycling?	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
525	This improvement is very important.	Sep 24, 2012 12:28 PM
526	This is good. Easy access to Boyer, along with active community space, will make the under-bridge area much more than just an empty, shadowed lot.	Sep 24, 2012 12:25 PM
527	Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling.	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
528	I run and bike through this area for exercise so a new pedestrian connection would improve the safety over the current state.	Sep 24, 2012 12:05 PM
529	Very much needed.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
530	I think that this would be among the best options you could do.	Sep 24, 2012 12:01 PM
531	Will the stairs on the north side of 520 remain?	Sep 23, 2012 2:28 PM
532	There must be a join agreement between Prep, the Seattle Parks Department and WSDOT to activate the space. The stairs under 520 and a sand volleyball court will not increase the sense of safety under the Viaduct. The demographics are such that no one will regularly use the suggested court. The proposed design is not in the spirit of WSDOT's requirement to meet the standards of CPTED. The only practical solution is to use both the Prep property and the space under the Viaduct. The open space of the Prep site creates a sense safety if there are active uses. The Colonnades under I-5 is an example of what will increase the use of this area.	Sep 22, 2012 10:43 AM
533	less important - people go use East Roanoke	Sep 22, 2012 9:56 AM
534	This is very important for elderly and children alike. Without it, a person needs to run to make a connection to the I-5 shared-use path and cross dangerous traffic.	Sep 22, 2012 2:27 AM
535	Regardless of the final design, pedestrian safety should always be kept as an important concern.	Sep 21, 2012 3:27 PM
536	What will be done to mitigate noise levels beneath the bridge for the under-bridge courts and walkways? Decibel limits for long term exposures should be considered due to people being beneath the structures for extended periods. Children playing sports for example. Consider providing more explanation on how transient populations will be reduced by the measures described in this initiative. What will help people feel safer, and parents feel their children will be safer because of the improvements? My experience is, wherever there is overhead cover, transients and gangs will congregate. What about these improvements will keep them away?	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
537	Being well lit will help as will a gentle spiral or switchback up the mountain in addition to stairs with runnels.	Sep 20, 2012 3:00 PM
538	This is going to be a good bicycle hill climb (wheel chair ramp) for cyclists to slowly and easy climb the hill. Make sure its wide enough for bicycles to safely pass wheelchairs/strollers. And keep the corners tight to slow the bicycles down.	Sep 19, 2012 3:20 PM
539	This seems like a fine idea.	Sep 18, 2012 3:12 PM
540	This would be awesome and should be a priority.	Sep 18, 2012 11:46 AM
541	Good idea if not to expensive...	Sep 18, 2012 6:35 AM
542	We must make sure for pedestrian safety.	Sep 17, 2012 9:23 PM
543	Maximize bike and ped connections at all opportunities	Sep 17, 2012 5:04 PM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
544	The project should include the Prep property as a way to safely activate the space under the viaduct.	Sep 17, 2012 4:18 PM
545	Again, not sure what this would be accomplishing, but always nice to make things safer. Again, though, the safety is a problem on 10th ave east!!! not at #5!	Sep 17, 2012 9:26 AM
546	Support	Sep 17, 2012 6:08 AM
547	I have not personally tried to cross here so I do not feel like I can accurately comment on this, however, I am always in favor of improving pedestrian safety.	Sep 16, 2012 6:37 PM
548	Agee amd support.	Sep 16, 2012 3:36 PM
549	Again an improvement I support.	Sep 16, 2012 9:53 AM
550	If this is for seattle prep, perhaps you should ask them. Their kids walk to the Montlake Playfield in a VERY unsafe manner. the walk in the street on curvey roads where cars have no where to do. A student is going to get killed. I don't understand it. If you put up a street light, they won't use it anyway.	Sep 16, 2012 8:56 AM
551	Pedestrian paths in underbridge areas are not safe. Do not repeat this 1960s mistake! Negotiate a deal for the Seattle Prep property to put path in an open air, green, and visible space. "NATURE MEETS THE CITY"	Sep 16, 2012 2:13 AM
552	Careful design will be necessary to make this steep under-bridge area appear safe and attractive ; if poorly designed it will not be used. It appears to be primarily recreational rather than a connection between destinations.	Sep 15, 2012 8:33 PM
553	in order to be safe and accessible this path on a steep hillside would need careful design; I'm not sure the destinations connected by this path would attract much use. Is this thought of more as a nature trail for recreation than a connective route?	Sep 15, 2012 7:47 PM
554	Nice, but is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520?	Sep 15, 2012 7:43 PM
555	I'm not interested in this, I don't see it as being terrifically important	Sep 15, 2012 6:06 PM
556	Need more details about the ped/bike connections from the Portage Bay bridge to 10th/Delmar.	Sep 15, 2012 1:31 PM
557	Yes, if we are (finally) building, let's do it right from the get go. The more traffic that is moving over to bicycles, the better the 520 bridge will work.	Sep 15, 2012 12:47 PM
558	More BIG trees. Make the connection an ADA (wheel chair) accessible winding pathway - not stairs	Sep 15, 2012 11:57 AM
559	Limit waterfront access. Preserve/restore native plantings in the area to support continued use by wildlife.	Sep 15, 2012 11:34 AM
560	This connection might serve to alleviate the homeless presence but things other than just lighting need to be added to eliminate safety concerns, consider the connection to the stairs and sidewalk on the north side of the highway, there	Sep 15, 2012 10:51 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East		
	might even be an old buried sidewalk near the bottom.	
561	A boyer connection makes sense if it is usable by cyclists.	Sep 14, 2012 5:49 PM
562	This is a high traffic area for pedestrian and vehicle. A safe new crossing will be well used!	Sep 14, 2012 5:47 PM
563	Again, nice but not critical	Sep 14, 2012 4:37 PM
564	This should be part of #3, with massive greenspace. Therefore, as it is described here, this option is another great waste of an opportunity to do something more visionary.	Sep 14, 2012 4:25 PM
565	Safe for pedestrians is key.	Sep 14, 2012 4:12 PM
566	Great idea	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
567	not important to me	Sep 14, 2012 1:47 PM
568	I've never needed to walk between these areas, but I am in favor of pedestrian infrastructure.	Sep 14, 2012 1:40 PM
569	Need to increase area property taxes significantly to satisfy pedestrians need for safety! More taxes right now!	Sep 14, 2012 1:10 PM
570	Yes!	Sep 14, 2012 1:06 PM
571	I think this will be a good connection.	Sep 14, 2012 12:46 PM
572	Shared use path would be good, but it does not serve as an adequate replacement for bike path on Portage Bay Bridge itself. Recreational court underneath bridge is a good idea.	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
573	yes please	Sep 14, 2012 12:39 PM
574	Top priority. This would be great!	Sep 14, 2012 12:22 PM
575	this seems a good idea, can the space be activated similar to the collonade park, so as to make it safe to use at all times and not during the day only?	Sep 14, 2012 12:20 PM
576	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
577	ok	Sep 14, 2012 11:55 AM
578	I like this one.	Sep 14, 2012 11:53 AM
579	Please make it easy for people who walk and bike to use this bridge and please connect multiple communities to the bridge. The 520 bridge serves the region and many people will use it on foot and on bicycle!	Sep 14, 2012 11:51 AM
580	Love it	Sep 14, 2012 11:46 AM
581	Stairwell connection is fine, not necessary to make wheelchair or bicycle	Sep 14, 2012 10:28 AM

Page 3, Q5. Preference 5: Boyer connection: Provide a new, accessible and safe pedestrian connection between Delmar Drive East and Boyer Avenue East

accommodations at this exact location since existing Delmar Drive sidewalks connect to Boyer Avenue sidewalks.

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
1	Concerned if this has long term disadvantages.	Oct 5, 2012 10:33 PM
2	How much to the north? Will it have even more negative long term impact on QCYC? Hey: Wouldn't using the Cable Stayed design have the further advantage of mitigating long term impact (shadowing in particular) on QCYC?	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 PM
3	No strong opinion. Have you dropped that silly planted median? I would much rather see that space displaced to one edge and used for a ped/bike path.	Oct 5, 2012 9:16 PM
4	No Comment	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
5	no	Oct 5, 2012 8:30 PM
6	Likely a business call on impact to construction costs - could go either way	Oct 5, 2012 6:02 PM
7	I have no preference on this.	Oct 5, 2012 5:37 PM
8	Sounds great.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
9	Sure!	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
10	seems reasonable	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
11	Alignment consideration should be to accommodate the straightest line through portage bay to maximize traffic safety.	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
12	Sounds good. Go for it.	Oct 5, 2012 3:01 PM
13	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM
14	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 2:49 PM
15	Agreed if bike access is included.	Oct 5, 2012 2:28 PM
16	The plan needs to add a bike lane across Lake Washington. It is silly to implement such an expensive project while leaving out this basic feature.	Oct 5, 2012 2:22 PM
17	What do we sacrifice to do this? Better to do it right the first time if that means longer construction rather than going through an expensive and painful project and compromising on anything	Oct 5, 2012 2:11 PM
18	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 2:09 PM
19	As long as you don't impact the houseboat community.	Oct 5, 2012 2:01 PM
20	This sounds sensible.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
21	I don't support a shift in alignment to reduce construction duration.	Oct 5, 2012 1:53 PM
22	support	Oct 5, 2012 1:14 PM
23	ok, but low priority. would rather see design for the best long term location.	Oct 5, 2012 12:57 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
24	OK - neurtal opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 PM
25	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
26	I prefer this option. The goal should be to have a usuable bridge without all the extras that sound nice in theory but get little use for the money expended.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
27	no preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM
28	No Comment	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 PM
29	sure	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
30	This sounds reasonable	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
31	No preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
32	Build what makes long term sense, not what goes up faster.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
33	Shorter construction is always desireable in an effort to save money. If it is a trade off between biker access across the area and several more years and dollars in studies etc. I opt for the shortest and cheapest.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
34	Not sure I understand impact of 6 but reduced construction would be favorable	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
35	ok.	Oct 5, 2012 12:00 PM
36	No comment, I'm sure the engineers know what they're doing	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
37	OK, we haven't seen much about this.	Oct 5, 2012 11:36 AM
38	Any design shift need to be fully vetted and compliant with shoreline environmental requirements. Also, if the "re alignment should include any additional encroachment into the neighborhood footprint outside of the current 520 right of way would be an adverse impact to the communities and should be avoided.	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
39	yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
40	Minimizing construction duration is defintiely important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
41	I agree with this.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
42	sure	Oct 5, 2012 10:59 AM
43	The alignment should be chosen to best connect with the rest of the bicycle and foot infrastructure.	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 AM
44	I have no opinion of this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:41 AM
45	Whatever makes sense	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
46	Strongly support.	Oct 5, 2012 10:29 AM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration

47	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
48	Neutral	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
49	I support the option that creates the least footprint and impact on the existing homes and infrastructure in the area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
50	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 AM
51	Bridge alignment should be away from homes as much as possible and not detract from the neighborhood.	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 AM
52	Neutral.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
53	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
54	The MPCC has no recommendation other than it would be better to reduce construction time.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
55	don't know	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 AM
56	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM
57	no opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
58	No preference.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
59	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
60	Great idea to reduce the construction duration.	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
61	No. I believe we should get it right to reduce unnecessary revisions in the future.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
62	No. Need to maximize for future traffic flow, not construction timelines.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
63	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
64	That sounds good? But what does it do to Foster Island? I'd need to know about that before I formed an opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
65	Seems okay.	Oct 5, 2012 9:11 AM
66	Uncertain, curves on wet bridges though seem like traffic nightmares.	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM
67	if another country can build an entire building in a few months, surely Americans can get this done quickly. I doubt that, the way you all work.	Oct 5, 2012 8:57 AM
68	I'd prefer to see the bridge centerline remain where it is and concentrate on efficient 24 hour construction - there's a lot of prep, layout, and resurveying that could be done during "quite hours" - via construction planning and efficient use of GIS.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
69	good. also, include a multi-use trail on the south side of the bridge and consider reducing the width of the bridge dedicated to motor-vehicle use.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
70	no opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
71	Definitely. This option will also have the least impact on residences.	Oct 5, 2012 8:48 AM
72	No strong opinion, I vote for the most functional option and that we should not compromise on this for a temporary inconvenience of construction duration	Oct 5, 2012 8:23 AM
73	NO COMMENT	Oct 5, 2012 7:51 AM
74	oaky	Oct 5, 2012 7:30 AM
75	If reducing construction duration is cheaper, then I prefer that.	Oct 5, 2012 7:23 AM
76	minimized construction time is not a reason to choose an alignment that will determine how the bridge works for at lest 50 years. We should build the best and most useful connection.	Oct 5, 2012 7:13 AM
77	The bridge alignment should be considered in the context of the fact on portage Bay and the Montlake playfield. The existing bridge is already imposing structure that contains this area. Every effort should be made to minimize the effect of the newly expanded bridge rather than worrying about short-term construction duration.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
78	Good idea	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM
79	High priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:20 AM
80	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 AM
81	Don't care, whichever way helps the bridge bike path cause.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
82	Not sure.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
83	yes	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 PM
84	Against this if it impacts the Queen City Yacht club and any houses North of the Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
85	Like the idea of reduced construction duration	Oct 4, 2012 10:02 PM
86	The Queen City Yacht Club needs to be compensated for the loss of their dock area if the bridge is moved to the north at the west end of the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:49 PM
87	Not a big deal to me.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
88	No opinion	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
89	no opinion, but a shorter construction time seems preferable	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
90	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 9:22 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration

91	ok	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
92	make it happen	Oct 4, 2012 9:11 PM
93	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:01 PM
94	I'm fine with that, but why irritate the rich yacht owners? Is it really going to get the bridge open that much sooner?	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
95	Ok	Oct 4, 2012 8:47 PM
96	As long as no capacity is lost for the gain.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
97	Place the bridge to minimize the long time impact on the landscape.	Oct 4, 2012 8:35 PM
98	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 8:25 PM
99	Please speed up the construction process!	Oct 4, 2012 8:24 PM
100	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
101	Making long-term design decisions based on short-term construction needs seems foolish.	Oct 4, 2012 7:52 PM
102	Sensible.	Oct 4, 2012 7:34 PM
103	Please continue to explore barging of construction materials rather than hauling countless double truckloads on city streets on the Fuhrman/Boyer residential corridor. If shifting the alignment to the north will address the duration of construction disturbance, I would favor it.	Oct 4, 2012 7:18 PM
104	More room for cars.	Oct 4, 2012 6:33 PM
105	Don't do this.	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
106	I prefer the most econimical and lowest cost to taxpayers -if this is the lowest cost and meets the purpose this should be the answer	Oct 4, 2012 5:56 PM
107	Add a bike lane.	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM
108	Agree/ support	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
109	Please do not do this.	Oct 4, 2012 4:55 PM
110	If time was a issue then I would go for this, but as it is right now I don't think it makes a difference. It's Seattle there is construction on all of the time. Make it once and make it right. No shortcuts!!!	Oct 4, 2012 4:50 PM
111	I don't have an opinion on this.	Oct 4, 2012 4:23 PM
112	Great I guess.	Oct 4, 2012 4:02 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
113	no comment	Oct 4, 2012 3:46 PM
114	do anything necessary to reduce cost and traffic impact	Oct 4, 2012 3:35 PM
115	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 3:24 PM
116	If quicker means it costs less, then absolutely yes.	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
117	Don't care much.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
118	Sure?	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
119	Sure, OK.	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
120	I would favor a longer construction duration in order to minimize impact on the land.	Oct 4, 2012 2:12 PM
121	Don't reduce the life cycle costs and benefits of the bridge just to shorten construction.	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
122	No concerns.	Oct 4, 2012 1:30 PM
123	Preference 6: No Comment	Oct 4, 2012 12:45 PM
124	I support this but are there negative implications in the shift?	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM
125	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
126	No opinion.	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
127	Assuming it doesn't increase the environmental impact on Portage bay and the arboreatum, sure.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
128	I agree. Saving duration saves costs.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
129	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
130	Seems like a good idea if it reduces construction duration without costing more.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
131	Don't care,	Oct 4, 2012 11:44 AM
132	I do not support this. I effectively reduces the usage size of portage bay.	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
133	not a priority	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
134	don't care	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
135	Sounds like a good idea.	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
136	I own our home a half mile from this location and support this.	Oct 4, 2012 10:40 AM
137	Agree, but please,please make bridge as narrow as possible. This So Portage Bay shoreline is a sensitive natural area (note herons, beaver lodges, birds,	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 AM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration

	salmon) and needs the light and few pylons. We prefer no median strip, and no bike/ped lane. It is doubtful that this bike lane will be used if grade to land on or near Delmar lid is steep.	
138	Sounds fine	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 AM
139	No preference	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 AM
140	I have no preference on this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:18 AM
141	No Comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:09 AM
142	no preference - but I think we should do what makes the most ecological and practical sense	Oct 4, 2012 3:05 AM
143	Seems sensible, basically an engineering decision.	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 AM
144	Good idea.	Oct 3, 2012 9:26 PM
145	If that saves money it is a good idea.	Oct 3, 2012 8:42 PM
146	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:29 PM
147	Ugly	Oct 3, 2012 8:27 PM
148	Absolutely do not like this option. Impact would be too too great for neighborhood!!!	Oct 3, 2012 6:59 PM
149	Any concept must include sound barriers and should be as narrow as possible.	Oct 3, 2012 2:40 PM
150	This seems like an excellent way to get the project done as quickly as possible.	Oct 3, 2012 2:30 PM
151	Unimportant.	Oct 3, 2012 1:54 PM
152	It is more important to (a) save money and (b) have a good design at the west end. Shortening construction duration should only be done if it does not conflict with those two goals.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
153	fine	Oct 3, 2012 1:13 PM
154	Seems sensible.	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
155	no comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:06 PM
156	Seems to make sense	Oct 3, 2012 12:55 PM
157	This is good.	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 PM
158	Sure	Oct 3, 2012 11:53 AM
159	Shorter duration sounds great!	Oct 3, 2012 10:36 AM
160	No opinion	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 AM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
161	No preference	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
162	Absolutely critical and preferred by impacted homeowners living on Boyer	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
163	Either option is fine with me.	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 AM
164	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:05 AM
165	no commet	Oct 3, 2012 7:57 AM
166	This sounds like a good idea. Why wouldn't it be done this way if it saves time/money?	Oct 3, 2012 6:57 AM
167	Don't worry about construction duraion. Do it right for cyclists and pedestrians	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 PM
168	Sounds like a good plan. No comments.	Oct 2, 2012 8:52 PM
169	Where is the bicycle lane?	Oct 2, 2012 8:41 PM
170	Reduced construction duration is excellent.	Oct 2, 2012 5:40 PM
171	No opinion.	Oct 2, 2012 3:14 PM
172	Is this cheaper? If it costs more to shift things, I don't think it is worth it and that money can be put towards better things.	Oct 2, 2012 12:25 PM
173	I'm sure the majority of 520 users would prefer this. Seattle doesn't seem to like sustained construction projects.	Oct 2, 2012 11:58 AM
174	seems stupid if all this is being done cause they think the old bridge is week why reuse it	Oct 2, 2012 11:04 AM
175	As long as this is functional.	Oct 2, 2012 10:07 AM
176	Sounds like a good idea	Oct 2, 2012 9:51 AM
177	OK	Oct 2, 2012 9:39 AM
178	No comment.	Oct 2, 2012 9:38 AM
179	The active transportation coalition defers to the preferences of the impacted residents on this design issue. Since sound intensity falls off with the inverse square of distance, moving the bridge alignment northward will reduce the traffic noise for neighbors who live south of the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 8:37 AM
180	agree to allow construction to occur more quickly	Oct 1, 2012 8:00 PM
181	what's the trade-off? sounds good, I think ...	Oct 1, 2012 7:15 PM
182	I don't understand what this means; images would help	Oct 1, 2012 2:19 PM
183	I support.	Oct 1, 2012 2:07 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
184	ok	Oct 1, 2012 1:21 PM
185	Keep light rail and or mono rail in mind for all of these questions. This bridge should support rail based mass transit.	Oct 1, 2012 1:17 PM
186	Don't understand the long term impact of this. Would prefer to do it right the first time and not make tradeoffs for short term construction which will affect long term adversely.	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
187	Good choice. I'm hoping that the existing beaver dam (and presumed beaver population) will remain intact.	Oct 1, 2012 12:10 PM
188	Favor the shift north	Sep 30, 2012 4:55 PM
189	Yes	Sep 30, 2012 3:02 PM
190	Reducing construction time is always a good thing, but if SEPA doesn't support it, don't waste the money on design.	Sep 29, 2012 11:34 PM
191	Reducing construction time has significant benefit to users and neighbors.	Sep 29, 2012 9:12 PM
192	I am not sure of the best bridge alignment. Focus on the most cost effective approach.	Sep 29, 2012 7:32 PM
193	Sounds good.	Sep 29, 2012 4:26 PM
194	No strong preference	Sep 29, 2012 1:13 PM
195	The bridge should be designed to support rail transit.	Sep 29, 2012 10:07 AM
196	Yes. Shorten construction and save money as much as possible. Please construct this project as soon as possible. Safety is king.	Sep 29, 2012 6:44 AM
197	Move the bridge to the north to get the job done early and well.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 PM
198	Make everything bike/ped accessible. It's more useful and cheaper that roads for cars.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
199	Good idea. Anything that reduces construction duration would be welcomed.	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
200	While shorter term impacts should be mitigated, the ultimate long term benefits of a design should take top priority.	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM
201	Slow down and do it right	Sep 28, 2012 5:47 PM
202	I would need more information on how much further north. The orignal EIS said no houses would be condemned because the project was entirely on WSDOT property. Does a northern alignment change this?	Sep 28, 2012 2:52 PM
203	Always a plus to reduce construction duration, but will it make traffic flow better? I'm not sure.	Sep 28, 2012 2:36 PM
204	don't care	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
205	Use box girder and segmental construction technique to speed construction.	Sep 28, 2012 2:00 PM
206	good	Sep 28, 2012 1:47 PM
207	As long as this doesn't interfere with any wildlife habitats, I see no reason not to do it.	Sep 28, 2012 1:17 PM
208	Encourage cut & cover wherever possible, maintain bicyle access across SR520.	Sep 28, 2012 12:49 PM
209	The main consideration should be what will work best in the long run. Taking more time and doing it right would be more important to me.	Sep 28, 2012 11:39 AM
210	Done sooner is good.	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
211	Yes, this is okay if it will reduce construction costs and duration	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
212	Seems reasonable	Sep 28, 2012 8:31 AM
213	No comment, does this invade private property?	Sep 28, 2012 7:15 AM
214	What impact wil this have on Queen City Yacht Club?	Sep 28, 2012 6:21 AM
215	Shorter construction duration usually means lower cost. Good idea if it can be done in a lower cost, more efficient manner than other alternatives	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 PM
216	Meh. I commute every day on I5-to-520, and I'm willing to tolerate construction if the final outcome is better (or a lot cheaper).	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 PM
217	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 PM
218	don't care about duration, just make it easy and pleasent to navigate on	Sep 27, 2012 8:29 PM
219	Do it right...good things take time,and short cuts will give us 80% of what we could have!	Sep 27, 2012 7:51 PM
220	sounds good	Sep 27, 2012 7:36 PM
221	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:03 PM
222	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 6:14 PM
223	I can't tell the difference	Sep 27, 2012 5:45 PM
224	I have no particular preference here, so if it will reduce construction costs and duration it is worth doing.	Sep 27, 2012 5:32 PM
225	OK	Sep 27, 2012 4:44 PM
226	Reducing construction duration is not important in the long run. It's not worth changing design considerations or adding cost to achieve that.	Sep 27, 2012 4:02 PM
227	shorter duration should be less expensive. Go with the least expensive option	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
228	Do what costs less	Sep 27, 2012 3:52 PM
229	I'd rather that we do it right the first time and not have a sub-optimal design that will have to be redone later	Sep 27, 2012 3:46 PM
230	Duration of construction is less important than providing an enduring solution	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
231	Shifting with as little disruption to existing neighborhoods.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
232	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
233	Anything that speeds construction while not impacting usability is good	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
234	Yes, if you can isntall the new lines to the north side and decrease the construction duration the better, this project is so longer overdue lets get it done and in use ASAP.	Sep 27, 2012 1:55 PM
235	The benefits of reduced construction duration are definitely appealing	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
236	Whatever takes faster and cost less. as long as you include bike trail	Sep 27, 2012 1:34 PM
237	construction duration we should learn from the Mercer mess that this is a must if the end state is a improvement.	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
238	No comment	Sep 27, 2012 12:56 PM
239	Fine, but where is the bike path?	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
240	if there is little negative impact and if this reduces duration of the project - yes!	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
241	OK	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
242	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
243	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
244	Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM
245	No, please leave the rowers some room to row.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
246	Seems fine	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
247	don't know--seems fine.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
248	No comment	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
249	would prefer a longer construction time if it means a better completed project	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
250	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration

251	Not an important factor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
252	Agree.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
253	what is the cost? I think reducing duration is good, but I am unsure of what I am agreeing too...	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
254	This seems a short term consideration. The long term issues of neighborhood impact would seem to be more important.	Sep 27, 2012 10:40 AM
255	I agree with this.	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
256	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
257	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
258	Seems there might be environmental issues, not sure. Reducing construction duration would be good but possibly keep old construction for bike/ ped park? as in NewYork city elevated park?	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
259	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
260	Supported	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
261	I would not be in favor of this option. This is infrastructure for generations to come and we shouldn't take short-cuts to pull the date in a bit.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 AM
262	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
263	I dont really understand this preference personally	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
264	Seems like a good idea, and a non-issue. MOST IMPORTANTLY: Include a shared use path along this section of bridge!!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
265	If you think it's best then yes. Though I imagine the file folk at the yacht club won't like it.	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
266	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
267	anything that will bring project completion sooner without compromising usefulness should be done.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
268	what's that going to cost?	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
269	Yes for reduced construction duration. Keep old bridge structures to the south and turn into park like the highline in New York	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
270	include bicycle path	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
271	not important	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
272	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
	connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	
273	My main concern here is that you PLEASE integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. Biking is a ever growing in this area for both recreation and commuting. Please do not be shortsighted here.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
274	Too bad Montlakers. If this costs more, it shouldn't be done.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
275	Great	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
276	I prefer option 8.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
277	I think this is the tail wagging the dog. Do what is better for the community.	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
278	This could significantly reduce the amount of blessed sunlight that reaches the floating homes. I would understand if they wanted to be able to float out a little further. I would let them do this in return for the shadow effect. Basically this is a "taking" of sun (winter sun!! the most important kind). Who cares about construction durration? I thought that this was about jobs!!	Sep 26, 2012 11:59 PM
279	Don;t care	Sep 26, 2012 11:16 AM
280	This sounds good; what's the downside? Would it be more expensive?	Sep 26, 2012 11:12 AM
281	no opinion	Sep 25, 2012 8:15 PM
282	Get it done as fast as possible. It's is crucial to show the taxpayers that money is wisely spent. Delays are dollars.	Sep 25, 2012 9:34 AM
283	It's not clear to me what the impact of shifting the bridge to the north would cause. I am in favor of doing it the right way the first time rather than cost cutting if that is a factor.	Sep 25, 2012 9:16 AM
284	no opinion -- too many "technical" variables	Sep 25, 2012 8:48 AM
285	Good	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 AM
286	If it really works, it sounds good. Is it much more expensive to shift the alignment? Construction is going to be a pain, and I would vote for saving cost here.	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
287	Would support if there is not an environmental impact to consider.	Sep 24, 2012 9:14 PM
288	Good.	Sep 24, 2012 6:13 PM
289	Going faster is good. What's the downside?	Sep 24, 2012 5:41 PM
290	Reducing construction duration is important. From the information provides, I see no down-side to shifting the alignment of the bridge to the North.	Sep 24, 2012 12:39 PM
291	No thoughts here - that one's a question for the engineers.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
292	The longer the construction takes the better. Than the commuters who work in Seattle but live in Bellevue may move to Seattle. The commuters who work in Bellevue but live in Seattle may move to Bellevue, no need of a bigger bridge, live where you work. The state needs to toll I-90 and increased the toll to $10 for both floating bridges. Just send 5 free pass coupons to the residents of Seattle & the Eastside to quell the masses.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
293	Either way a bike path would help	Sep 24, 2012 11:58 AM
294	reduce width and scale of the bridge by reducing the number of lanes; tolling suppresses demand; four lanes are sufficient.	Sep 23, 2012 6:50 PM
295	no opinion, I would go for the best long term solution	Sep 23, 2012 2:33 PM
296	We have a unique opportunity to create a wonderful gateway into the City and should focus on getting the design right; the design should not be compromised based on concerns about construction duration.	Sep 22, 2012 4:31 PM
297	This is a good solution.	Sep 22, 2012 11:03 AM
298	yes	Sep 22, 2012 10:01 AM
299	Good idea.	Sep 21, 2012 3:31 PM
300	There is no discussion about the pros and cons of a shifted alignment, so there is not enough information for me to comment. Reduced construction duration is always a bonus for projects. What are the other pros and cons?	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
301	Construction duration is not a concern. My thinking is that creating the width necessary to have two bridges next to one another for the duration of construction has the side effect of an esthetically compromised bridge.	Sep 20, 2012 3:09 PM
302	Ok	Sep 20, 2012 10:33 AM
303	Do it!	Sep 19, 2012 3:22 PM
304	No real comment.	Sep 18, 2012 3:16 PM
305	I don't know enough about the pros and cons to comment.	Sep 18, 2012 11:48 AM
306	I would prefer not to extend the bridge further North	Sep 17, 2012 9:28 PM
307	Yes!	Sep 17, 2012 11:16 AM
308	A shorter construction duration is best for everyone.	Sep 17, 2012 10:41 AM
309	Don't skimp on quality just do get the thing done faster. this is going to be up for 100+ years. just do it right.	Sep 17, 2012 9:29 AM
310	No comment	Sep 17, 2012 6:11 AM
311	Shift only if no homes are taken, and try to reduce design costs and construction duration.	Sep 16, 2012 4:01 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
312	Keeping the construction period short would be good. This is worth pursuing.	Sep 16, 2012 10:00 AM
313	I think there is a best place for a bridge. I think a longer construction length to have the best bridge possible for 100 years is wiser.	Sep 16, 2012 9:02 AM
314	MUST ACCOMODATE 14' REGIONAL PATH.	Sep 16, 2012 2:19 AM
315	makes sense	Sep 15, 2012 9:24 PM
316	no comment.	Sep 15, 2012 7:48 PM
317	Doesn't bother me, if that's what needs to get done then so be it	Sep 15, 2012 6:10 PM
318	Make an EXTRA Lane for the WEST bound/UPHILL traffic.	Sep 15, 2012 1:38 PM
319	No preferences	Sep 15, 2012 12:52 PM
320	Do what is required to get a good design built for a reasonable amount of money, but WHATEVER YOU DO, make sure it is wide enough to accommodate 2 full lanes of traffic, AND in addition, a HOV/Transit late, AND on and off ramps. IF you add light rail, DO NOT take any of these lanes, design the thing so that it can accommodate the addition of light rail without reducing ANY pedestrian, bike, or motor vehicle, or transit/HOV lanes. This may require more width than some people want - but WHY would you build something that would no accommodate the volume of traffic that is already there?	Sep 15, 2012 12:31 PM
321	No	Sep 15, 2012 11:21 AM
322	Whatever works.	Sep 15, 2012 10:54 AM
323	Please speed up construction.	Sep 14, 2012 5:52 PM
324	Steps to reduce the contruction duration are good	Sep 14, 2012 4:42 PM
325	hints that can be done to speed up construction are good -but not to the detriment of the neighborhood.	Sep 14, 2012 4:29 PM
326	The plan should provide for transfer of the Frolund site to the City of Seattle for park purposes. The terms of the transfer may be negotiated as part of an over all settlement of right of way issues.	Sep 14, 2012 2:41 PM
327	OK	Sep 14, 2012 2:01 PM
328	Whatever seems like a good idea	Sep 14, 2012 1:52 PM
329	I'm not sure what the downside to this is. I'm in favor of shorter construction times, but what are the drawbacks?	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
330	Yes, since this should also reduce the construction costs.	Sep 14, 2012 1:48 PM
331	OK	Sep 14, 2012 1:14 PM
332	Um... sure, less time is good.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM

Page 4, Q1. Preference 6: Bridge alignment: Shift the alignment to the north on the west end of the bridge, in order to reduce construction duration		
333	this is good - in and out with far less less traffic control needed - safer for the contractor and all those SOV drivers that are driving, talking, texting, eating, rushing to get somewhere, late to class, got a meeting, I'm late to day care, the football game's starting, etc.	Sep 14, 2012 12:55 PM
334	Reduced build time is important, even if it slows traffic significantly..	Sep 14, 2012 12:52 PM
335	have no preference ... would prefer it done right, not fast	Sep 14, 2012 12:41 PM
336	Will this force compromises in the bike & pedestrian features for the Roanoke area? If so, don't do it! If not, eh, okay.	Sep 14, 2012 12:36 PM
337	Shorter construction is a winner, less pain will be one of the foremost benefits people can tangibly understand	Sep 14, 2012 12:24 PM
338	THe impact of the alignment shift to the North on the existing marina (Queen City Yacht Club) is not detailed enough to determine if the realignment is acceptable. QCYC has been in that location for more than 80 years and serves boat owners of mederate means. Preservation of this marina should be given a high priority.	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
339	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:04 PM
340	It looks like there are only four lanes here, and the horrible on ramp/blind spot heading west directly by the number 8.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
341	The bridge won't be as congested if you realign the 520 WB to I-5 to drop cars in the right lanes of I-5 SB.	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
342	makes sense	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
343	YES! Great idea!	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
344	Love it	Sep 14, 2012 11:50 AM
345	Great idea, reduced construction time is reduced cost!	Sep 14, 2012 10:40 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

1	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 10:33 PM
2	Cable stayed! The designs you've shown are beautiful! The thinner deck and no columns will make it much less intrusive at ground/water level. The bridge, instead of being something we put up with, will be a signature and beautiful architectural complement to our city. But: you need to make more CAD views to show the Capitol Hill residents that the thin towers and the thin cables won't impact their view. I believe a lot of the objections to the design were due to the renderings which overstated the thickness of the cables and hence created an incorrect impression of blocked-views. As for neighborhood integration, the work done to "mate" the CS bridge into the hillside was very well done.	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 PM
3	Both of these appear to merit further design exploration. I would like to see a clear analysis and presentation of the trade-offs of each - costs and benefits - including economic, aesthetic, environmental (views, bay impacts), durability, etc.	Oct 5, 2012 9:16 PM
4	No Comment	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
5	Skip the analysis, go with the cable stayed bridge	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 PM
6	Even more important, get the noise and air pollution levels DOWN!	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
7	Not as concerned about this - likely an engineering cost analysis would yield the appropriate answer	Oct 5, 2012 6:02 PM
8	I support this preference.	Oct 5, 2012 5:45 PM
9	I have no preference on this.	Oct 5, 2012 5:37 PM
10	box with bike trail underneath like 516 in Kent over green river.	Oct 5, 2012 4:07 PM
11	I think the box girder design should be dropped.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
12	Sure!	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
13	seems reasonable	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
14	Cable stayed bridge design should NOT be considered due to safety and view obstruction reasons. To much of an aesthetic obstruction.	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
15	Just pick one an go with it. Neither looks all that great, so I support going with an option that has the lowest amount of on-going cost and noise. You'll never please everyone.	Oct 5, 2012 3:03 PM
16	Box girder is definitely the better visual choice. Clean, unobtrusive. What about cost--construction, operation and maintenance?	Oct 5, 2012 3:01 PM
17	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM
18	Like the idea of the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

19	Definitely consider both types of bridges. High priority on integrating the structure with surrounding nbhds. I personally find cable bridges more aesthetically pleasing; they are more like works of art. I look at the Tacoma cable bridges and find them quite spectacular.	Oct 5, 2012 2:49 PM
20	Which requires less carbon? Cables because of less concrete? That's what I'd prefer, then.	Oct 5, 2012 2:43 PM
21	Should be expedited and include bike access.	Oct 5, 2012 2:28 PM
22	ok.	Oct 5, 2012 2:09 PM
23	I support integrating the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods.	Oct 5, 2012 2:01 PM
24	Integration with neighborhoods sounds like code for something -- but I'm not sure what. The Seattle Big Wheel is a great example of industrial design being able to be attractive while being industrial. Don't try to hide that it's a bridge. We live in a modern society. We have large public works projects. That's a good thing. Cost savings are essential. Move forward with cost effective, multi-use bridge plans.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
25	I support further study of this	Oct 5, 2012 1:53 PM
26	Yes, but I would drop the box girder. :) Pleae proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for the cable stay bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 1:21 PM
27	support	Oct 5, 2012 1:14 PM
28	Ok with emphasis on integration into the neighborhoods.	Oct 5, 2012 12:57 PM
29	OK - need to provide less of a "grade" in the road. It's a steep drop.	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 PM
30	see below	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
31	either concept is acceptable, they both have positive and negative aspects.	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM
32	No Comment	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 PM
33	pick whichever one is easier to maintain and more resistant to earthquakes.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
34	Want the bridge that provides the most lanes and efficient traffic flow as possible. If these are simply visual alternatives then go with cheaper of the two alternatives.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
35	Choosing a bridge type that has a smaller impact on existing neighborhoods is important.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
36	yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
37	Build the cheaper, easier to maintain option.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
38	I support further technical analysis that determines the best option	Oct 5, 2012 12:12 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

39	Cable stayed bridge is too intrusive on neighbourhoods and environment	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
40	I trust the engineers but the cables look cooler	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
41	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:36 AM
42	Cable stayed!	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
43	The cable stayed bridge construction is not a desirable environmental or visual approach. I suggest the design be focused on the box girder approach and use the money saved for mitigation and enhancement of the entire west side mitigation process and development.	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
44	This is the wrong place for an iconic cable stayed bridge. The imporant space here is Portage Bay and experience of that lake space is not improved by another high bridge. A box girder bridge is appropriate in this location.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
45	Not important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
46	I like the cable stay design. However, steps should be taken to minimize how much the bridge will stand out from the environment.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
47	no comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:59 AM
48	I have no opinion of this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:41 AM
49	Not sure why further analysis is necessary.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
50	VERY STRONGLY SUPPORT. This bridge should not become an eyesore. It should be something Seattle is proud of and the neighborhoods effected most should support.	Oct 5, 2012 10:29 AM
51	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
52	All new infrastructure must be integrated for maximum utility and minimum penalty please.	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
53	I think further design should be focused on the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
54	Other alternatives should be studied. The cable stay should have been done between bellevue and landfall. in Seattle. It is completely obstructive and out of scale with the portage bay area where it is currently being considered. It blocks views is too high and not in sync with the neighborhood architecture. The box girder is more preferable, but several design options should be put forth for consideration.	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 AM
55	Neutral.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
56	The MPCC has no conmments regardking this Preference.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
57	support further analysis	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

58	no opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
59	I'm not as concerned by the aesthetics of the bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
60	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
61	The main criteria should be to narrow the width and reduce noise as much as possible. Suggest building structure for ultimate lane width but only provide deck for four lanes until improvements are made to I-5 that make a 6 lane configuration justifiable.	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
62	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
63	Agree.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
64	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
65	The main desirability is a narrower, 4 lane, rather than a wider, 6-lane bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:11 AM
66	Sure I guess, bridge has probably been around longer than most of the residents so no integration is probably needed.	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM
67	no opinion	Oct 5, 2012 8:57 AM
68	All other things considered, which ever design that would not create an environment that would encourage transients to camp.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
69	good.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
70	Keep the design as light and airy as possible, to reduce shading and to preserve views.	Oct 5, 2012 8:48 AM
71	Use a cable stayed bridge. That is the only option that should be constructed as it provides achitetural interest and ties in with the Seattle Gateway intent.	Oct 5, 2012 8:36 AM
72	I support the bridge being as unobtrusive as possible which makes me lean toward the box and girder style. Unless, the funds are there to make it an architectural marvel of great beauty (think Calatrava) then it simply is more roadway obscuring the view of a green hillside with cables.	Oct 5, 2012 8:23 AM
73	NO COMMENT	Oct 5, 2012 7:51 AM
74	okay	Oct 5, 2012 7:30 AM
75	Integrating the structure with surrounding neighborhoods is critical.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
76	Keep it simple. It's for CARS, remember.	Oct 5, 2012 7:09 AM
77	Aesthetically, I don't have a strong preference either way, and would ask about long term care and maintainence costs.	Oct 5, 2012 6:47 AM
78	Pursue cable stayed bridge only	Oct 5, 2012 5:20 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods		
79	No, just do it	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 AM
80	It is important to do this right and we need all of the information that we can get before decisions are made.	Oct 5, 2012 3:57 AM
81	As a rower on the lakes for many years, a bicyclist and nearby resident, I enjoy the area and the bridge scenery. I guess the idea is to do it right, the first time, and account for future potential building requirements based off our increasing understanding and discoveries about geology, faults, and potential cataclysmic events in the region. Save money in the long run if possible.	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 AM
82	Either looks pretty good to me. Give me the one with a bike lane!	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
83	I wonder which one has a longer life span? I'm not sure i'm in love with the cable stayed...	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
84	don't waste money	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 PM
85	If the low profile effects noise impacts (according to your own report), why lower the Portage Bay Bridge at all and instead run the Portage Bay Bridge at elevation above the current Montlake Blvd. grade and connect it to the elevated West Approach. Contain the section between Marsh Island and Portage Bay in an elevated lid and let us have our direct neighborhood connections back.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
86	Please integrate with the surrounding neighborhoods, it would be ridiculous not to.	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM
87	Please explore ways to integrate these two bridge types with the surrounding neighborhoods,	Oct 4, 2012 9:49 PM
88	Please do.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
89	Prefer box girder bridge. Please integrate with surrounding historic nature of surrounding neighborhoods.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
90	from the drawings below the box girder bridge appears to be less intrusive which is preferable	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
91	Hmm hard to say, cable stayed is more visually interested, but box girder may hide better	Oct 4, 2012 9:22 PM
92	Thank you for offering to integrate the bridge more with the surrounding landscape.	Oct 4, 2012 9:11 PM
93	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:01 PM
94	If the cable is even 1.5 times as expensive, it's worth it because it's here for the next 50+ years, Locals will have more pride and visitors will be impressed with our vision if an attractive bridge is built.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
95	I think both look fine. The box girder looks less intrusive.	Oct 4, 2012 8:51 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

96	Ok	Oct 4, 2012 8:47 PM
97	Yes.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
98	Continue with the two bridge types to determine which design would have the most narrow width. Use that design.	Oct 4, 2012 8:35 PM
99	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 8:25 PM
100	I care more about safety, durabilty, cost and build time than aesthetics.	Oct 4, 2012 8:24 PM
101	cheapest should win.	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
102	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
103	I support such exploration and continue to hope for a four-lane bridge that will require less destruction of existing wetland, foraging habitat, beaver lodges, and shoreline. Sensitive and complete restoration of Portage Bay waters and shoreline affected by construction is hugely important to me and the fish, mammal, and bird life of the bay.	Oct 4, 2012 7:18 PM
104	Spend less money. Make more room for cars.	Oct 4, 2012 6:33 PM
105	Do this.	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
106	do not spend taxpayers money for estras that are not needed - no fluff -this seem to be another waste of taxpayers money on this bridge project	Oct 4, 2012 5:56 PM
107	Add a bike lane.	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM
108	Agree/ support	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
109	Yes Yes leave the bridge as integrated as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 4:55 PM
110	Yeah I think is important for the neighbors to be happy, but as of right now the 520 bridge is uglier than any of this options so I don't kow what you or they are worried about.	Oct 4, 2012 4:50 PM
111	Whichever will have the least impact on the neighborhood. Keep it low key. We don't need a monument.	Oct 4, 2012 4:23 PM
112	Fine?	Oct 4, 2012 4:02 PM
113	neighborhood integration is key	Oct 4, 2012 3:46 PM
114	prefer the option with cheapest cost	Oct 4, 2012 3:35 PM
115	Proceed with the two types of bridges through the concept phase.	Oct 4, 2012 3:24 PM
116	Don't care.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods		
117	I like either, though the cable is more interesting and iconic.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
118	I'm fine with whichever works; keeping it as cheap as possible would be nice, too.	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
119	Sounds good.	Oct 4, 2012 2:12 PM
120	my preference is for the cable stayed bridge, a look not found elsewhere in Seattle, and matches the grandness of Mt Rainer.	Oct 4, 2012 1:58 PM
121	Go with a nicer bridge, as long as it supports safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
122	See below.	Oct 4, 2012 1:30 PM
123	I have no desire for 'integration'	Oct 4, 2012 1:06 PM
124	Preference 7: No Comment	Oct 4, 2012 12:45 PM
125	My preference is for the cable-stayed bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
126	I support this	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM
127	Girder appears less obtrusive . We support the least obtrusive and lowest structure.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
128	I prefer a cable stayed bridge for the aesthetic enhancement of the crossing.	Oct 4, 2012 12:07 PM
129	Go with whichever is more beautiful design-wise. A bridge is a big architectural thing, it's not going to "blend in", but it CAN be beautiful or at least not another soulless lump of concrete with some token salmon molded into the concrete.	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
130	I prefer cable-stayed, as it creates a thinner road deck and has less imapct on the bay.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
131	A cable stayed bridge is out of context in this location. Just stick with the box girder and provide aesthetic treatments to make it look nice.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
132	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
133	Proceeding with further technical analysis of both bridge types is acceptable provided that they both can accommodate an adequate pedestrian/bicycle path.	Oct 4, 2012 11:56 AM
134	Yes, better integration with the neighborhood is key. We can't avoid this huge road slicing through the area, but at least the new version could do less harm then the old.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
135	Don't care.	Oct 4, 2012 11:44 AM
136	sounds good; but I'd like to hear specifics around integrating the structure with surrounding neighborhoods	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

137	not a priority	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
138	don't care	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
139	I am in support of whichever design would be the most cost-effective, taking into account durability and future repair costs, construction time/cost, and stability in an earthquake. As far as aesthetics, they both look like highways cutting through a neighborhood.	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
140	add art/design elements to connect bridge more to Montlake neighborhood and make it less of an eye sore	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 AM
141	nuetral	Oct 4, 2012 10:40 AM
142	minimize bridge footprint: box girder is narrower, especially without median and bike/ped lanes, and sightlines for neighbors are less impacted. It looks like there are no noise walls. The noise to neighbors, especially on hillsides, will be terrible - will the bike/ped lane be inside or outside the noise walls? Where is the EIS analysis on this???	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 AM
143	no comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 AM
144	No problem	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 AM
145	I have no preference on this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:18 AM
146	No Comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:09 AM
147	Do whatever is cheapest. This project is too expensive!	Oct 4, 2012 7:03 AM
148	the cable bridge is pretty (I grew up in the Bay Area and this is the image that means "bridge" to me) but I love the simplicity and unobstructed view of the box girder - especially of the view of Lake Washington	Oct 4, 2012 3:05 AM
149	Proceed with both at least as far as necessary to get an accurate idea of the relative costs of the two alternatives.	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 AM
150	If cable stayed more than 15% more expensive, proceed only with box girder.	Oct 3, 2012 9:26 PM
151	The best bridge is the one with the fewest legs. the fewer columns holding it up the better for the least impact on the ground and the neighborhood.	Oct 3, 2012 8:42 PM
152	OK.	Oct 3, 2012 8:29 PM
153	Integrate? Not nearly as nice as Roanoke solution by play field. Noisy play field and community center?	Oct 3, 2012 8:27 PM
154	the current 4 lane bridge makes so much noise it is obnoxious in an otherwise wonderful Montlake playfield. Will a 6+ lane bridge mean 50%+ inceased noise. I didn't read any analysis on which design might reduce noise.	Oct 3, 2012 6:06 PM
155	Any concept must include sound barriers and should be as narrow as possible	Oct 3, 2012 2:40 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods		
156	Don't overanalyze it, the construction duration savings proposed in #6 will be eaten up with additional consulting and time lost. The two options are not so materially different that we shouldn't just go ahead with the faster, cheaper option. Save the studying for areas where we'll make more of an impact between better delineated alternatives.	Oct 3, 2012 2:39 PM
157	I prefer the cable stayed bridge, however study of both would be prudent if the box girder design may end up being less costly.	Oct 3, 2012 2:30 PM
158	Lessening noise to the surrounding neighborhoods is more important than the visual appearance.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
159	um, sure	Oct 3, 2012 1:13 PM
160	no comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:06 PM
161	Cost should be the main driver here.	Oct 3, 2012 12:55 PM
162	I would like to see what a cable-stayed bridge with only one tower would look like as well as how it would appear from various points in the surrounding neighborhoods.	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 PM
163	further explore cable stay bridge	Oct 3, 2012 11:53 AM
164	I like the box girder bridge better. Yes, I think it's important to explore ways of integrating it into the neighborhoods too.	Oct 3, 2012 10:36 AM
165	As a Montlake resident who encounters the 520 bridge every day at Montlake Playfield, I'd rather that it is less conspicuous than more conspicuous. It seems that the Box Girder is less conspicuous than the cable stay. However, there are more important considerations such as noise and capacity: if the Cable stay is quieter, that would be a HUGE improvement, even if its more visible than the Box girder. Also, if the cable stay is able to make it possible to have better bike/pedestrian transportation than the box girder, that would be a more important consideration.	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 AM
166	No preference	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
167	Agree.	Oct 3, 2012 9:46 AM
168	Stick with box girder and safe $$ for bike/ped/people crossing. More people cross these areas than have to look at the bridge. Box girder may not be an improvement to their viewline but it's no worse than what's already there.	Oct 3, 2012 9:44 AM
169	Ok.	Oct 3, 2012 9:34 AM
170	Must be an iconic structure and our preference is is a	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
171	Box girder preferred by me. A box girder bridge is less visually intrusive than a cablestayed bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 AM
172	I strongly support the cable stay bridge concept. It will add to the Montlake	Oct 3, 2012 8:05 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

	community by giving us something that is pleasing to look at.	
173	no commet	Oct 3, 2012 7:57 AM
174	Make it to be the longest lasting, least costly type bridge. By integating with neigborhoods means adding more ramps then that could be a good thing depending on usage and safety.	Oct 3, 2012 6:57 AM
175	Sounds like a good plan. No comments. A box girder would be less invasive to the surrounding scenery.	Oct 2, 2012 8:52 PM
176	Where is the bicycle lane?	Oct 2, 2012 8:41 PM
177	Integration is important.	Oct 2, 2012 5:40 PM
178	No opinion.	Oct 2, 2012 3:14 PM
179	I do not mind what the bridge looks like. I am most interested in a bridge that allows bicycles to cross. I am appalled that there is a chance the proposed bike lanes may be removed in the interest of a "pretty" narrower bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 12:25 PM
180	With that being said, these are both interesting and beautiful ideas.	Oct 2, 2012 11:58 AM
181	this should be done anyways so we keep the view and looks of seattle	Oct 2, 2012 11:04 AM
182	No preference although it seems to me the box girder option would be better from a visual standpoint	Oct 2, 2012 9:51 AM
183	Keep structure low.	Oct 2, 2012 9:39 AM
184	I support.	Oct 2, 2012 9:38 AM
185	The active transportation coalition defers to the preferences of the impacted residents on this design issue.	Oct 2, 2012 8:37 AM
186	I don't know if these are exclusive or inclusive options...	Oct 1, 2012 7:15 PM
187	The type should support proper bike paths similar to the bridges to and from Mercer Island, otherwise why invest so much in the new 520 bridge with a bike lane?	Oct 1, 2012 4:07 PM
188	Prefer box girder style	Oct 1, 2012 2:19 PM
189	I support the lightest an airiest design in order to minimize the impact of the bridge for the Portage Bay folks as long as a multi-use lane is included in the plans.	Oct 1, 2012 2:07 PM
190	and include bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths!	Oct 1, 2012 1:21 PM
191	Employ the design that allows for better mass transit options including light rail or monorail.	Oct 1, 2012 1:17 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

192	Bridge should be lowest impact possible. Cable stayed bridge seems the opposite of this.	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
193	I'm for whatever structure is most cost-effective, longest life, and lowest mainatenance costs provided the support for bicycle and pedestrian traffic is included.	Oct 1, 2012 10:20 AM
194	Cable stayed seems much more majestic and in the spirit of our boating culture.	Sep 30, 2012 9:18 PM
195	Yes, with the goal of the bridge not changing it's present elevation.	Sep 30, 2012 3:02 PM
196	Box girder is significantly more visually appropriate than the ugly stayed version.	Sep 29, 2012 11:34 PM
197	Trust your engineering team to recommend the most efficient structural type. Then be demanding to ensure an elegant solution. Both can be beautiful. Both can be ugly.	Sep 29, 2012 9:12 PM
198	Yes, proceed with further technical analysis and refinements. I am strongly in favor of 3 lines for traffic going each way. Make it large enough to accommodate future traffic needs since it will be there for 50-60 years.	Sep 29, 2012 7:32 PM
199	I don't have a strong preference between Box Girder and Cable Stayed. Cable Stayed seems more aesthetically pleasing.	Sep 29, 2012 4:26 PM
200	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 9:28 AM
201	I don't think the cable stay should really be considered. It is out of context in this area. It would provide visual clutter and be a high cost. It would also limit future potential for that bridge. Creating a thin (as thin as possible) bridge with as Lon of spans as possible, would be the right solution here. Arches like on i90 would provide a little design flair. Even arches would add visual clutter. It would be good to make this bridge blend as best as possible and cables in the air won't succeed.	Sep 29, 2012 6:44 AM
202	Integrate with hillside.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 PM
203	Make everything bike/ped accessible. It's more useful and cheaper that roads for cars.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
204	Only if the costs are comparable. If not, only continue analysis for the most cost effective option.	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM
205	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:47 PM
206	Either design would be fine with me, however the cable stay design keeps more clear water space underneath. As a kayaker, I like that.	Sep 28, 2012 3:53 PM
207	Prefer cable bridge with less footings.	Sep 28, 2012 2:52 PM
208	More analysis is good.	Sep 28, 2012 2:36 PM
209	really don't care - just pick one and run!	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

210	Box girder.	Sep 28, 2012 2:00 PM
211	box girder is better. it has a lower visual impact	Sep 28, 2012 1:47 PM
212	I prefer the cable-stayed bridge but I defer to those who live near the bridge and need to see it every day.	Sep 28, 2012 1:17 PM
213	Prefer visually low impact ie box girder not cable stayed.	Sep 28, 2012 12:49 PM
214	The cable bridge is more attractive to me but it does take up more space in the view arena.	Sep 28, 2012 11:39 AM
215	A pretty bridge is nice once construction is over.	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
216	Only if there is no clear winner based on lower cost and aesthetics.	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
217	Yes but simple structure is acceptable if it does job and is more cost effective.	Sep 28, 2012 7:15 AM
218	Great. Let us know what you learn.	Sep 28, 2012 6:21 AM
219	Prefer the box girder to minimize visual impact on surrounding neighborhoods. I-5 and Aurora don't incorporate a cable stay and it would look strange in the area.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 PM
220	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 PM
221	sure	Sep 27, 2012 8:29 PM
222	Yes further study to determine best concept for bridge style.	Sep 27, 2012 7:51 PM
223	sounds good	Sep 27, 2012 7:36 PM
224	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:03 PM
225	Box girder!	Sep 27, 2012 6:14 PM
226	I can't tell the difference	Sep 27, 2012 5:45 PM
227	While I prefer the ascetics of a box girder bridge, I value function over form. Hence, whichever bridge design is believed to provide the longest service life with less ongoing maintenance is the one I'd prefer.	Sep 27, 2012 5:32 PM
228	Sure	Sep 27, 2012 4:44 PM
229	Definitely changes should be integrated with the surrounding infrastructure.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
230	cable stayed is more aesthetically pleasing to me, local integration is nice. Function first though.	Sep 27, 2012 4:37 PM
231	No, reduce cost by moving forward on the perferred design. I perfer the box girder as it reduces visual clutter. A cable stayed bridge is no more beautiful than high tension power lines.	Sep 27, 2012 4:02 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

232	The box girder intuitively seems like it would be cheaper and also less obtrusive. There is enough natural beauty and sites to see, the bridge does not add to it in this location.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
233	Agree - proceed with technical analysis.	Sep 27, 2012 3:57 PM
234	Personal preference is of aesthetic consideration only, and is in favor of a cable stayed design.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
235	Unless cable stayed is cheaper, which I doubt, don't pollute sightlines and views with it. Go box girder.	Sep 27, 2012 3:52 PM
236	I prefer the box girder	Sep 27, 2012 3:46 PM
237	Look for opportunities to integrate pedestrian and bicycle access	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
238	The locals would probably prefer the box girder bridge which wouldn't interfere with existing sight lines. The cable stayed bridge is more elegant, though.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
239	cost and durability should be a major consideration	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
240	So long as the bridge accommodates a separated facility for peds adn bikes	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
241	I prefer the box girder, it will have the least impact on all the residents and their views. If a cable stayed bridge can reduce the number of supports inthe ground, then I'm for that, but the cable stayed has to be beautfiul in the end!	Sep 27, 2012 1:55 PM
242	Yes! A cable stayed bridge would due the are so much aesthetic good!	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
243	see below	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
244	cable stayed is more visually appealing, but adds clutter. In either case, adding a intriguing lighting scheme would add to the evening appeal.	Sep 27, 2012 12:56 PM
245	integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhood is key for this project.	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
246	Fine, but where is the bike path?	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
247	looking at several possibliities is great, I would look to minimize the impact of the bridge on the water below.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
248	yes, further technical analysis should be determine the best engineered design for this segment of the project.	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
249	The structure should be integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods and provide easy access to pedestrians and bicyclists--reduce complicated access points requiring multiple street crossings, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM
250	I don't have any preference on these options, so I would support the option that is more cost effective to construct and to maintain in the long-term, particularly if this frees up money for a high quality bike/ped link for the entire length of the 520 corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 11:50 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

251	Should me a design for the ages, community pride.	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
252	no	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
253	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
254	Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM
255	Integrate in a low impact way.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
256	Good plan	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
257	box girder seems fine(?). the cable bridge seems aesthetically less preferable.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
258	Box girder bridge design is much preferred.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
259	even if this takes longer, I am all for integration	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
260	2.Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
261	The type of bridge is not an important factor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
262	Keeping costs down is a priority. I would rather trade off for a lower cost option here to have the capital for the other bike-friendly improvements.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
263	box girder blends in better, less obstruction	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
264	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 10:40 AM
265	I believe this is prudent.	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
266	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
267	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
268	Bridge as long as safe	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
269	technical and cost analysis. dont forego bike / ped improvements if cost of on over the other precludes non motor vehicle improvements.	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
270	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
271	Supported	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
272	good	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
273	The box girder appears more ascetically pleasing, but which design last longer.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

274	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
275	I think redoing the bridge would be nice for everyone	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
276	Either is fine. Cable stayed has more aesthetic value. MOST IMPORTANTLY: Include a shared use path along this section of bridge!!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
277	Continue to consider the two options until you decide on the cable stayed ;)	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
278	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
279	either solution can be designed to be appealing. go with the least expensive, most useful one.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
280	that would be nice.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
281	Ok	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
282	include bicycle path	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
283	yes - great idea.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
284	Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the “T” intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
285	Duh. This is a no brainer. Yes more analysis is required.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
286	Great	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
287	I prefer option 8.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
288	Either is fine but the cable design looks cooler	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
289	sure, fine. whatever.	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
290	Why not have the best of both worlds and build an extradosed bridge? I think it would look very handsome in this location. A regular cable-stayed bridge would be too tall!	Sep 27, 2012 9:10 AM
291	Which casts a bigger shadow? Which is noisier? Which is cheaper? Either can be elegant and have mossy growth watered by grey water recycling.	Sep 26, 2012 11:59 PM
292	what ever looks nicer...give it personality	Sep 26, 2012 11:16 AM
293	Do we need to do this? Hasn't this already been determined. I'm not worried about integrating the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods; clearly, we're running a freeway through here. Why try to cover it up? We haven't done that elsewhere in the city.	Sep 26, 2012 11:12 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

294	believe in integration with neighborhoods, need to preserve natural beauty	Sep 25, 2012 8:15 PM
295	I think the dollar wins in this case. This location is not iconic for Seattle. The neighbors might think so, because they live there. The views are not that great and I don't think they warrant a fantastic structure like a cable stayed bridge. We should focus on form, function, budget, schedule.	Sep 25, 2012 9:34 AM
296	I am in favor of effective structure integration into surrounding neighborhoods.	Sep 25, 2012 9:16 AM
297	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:48 AM
298	Delete cable stayed bridge option as it impedes views for many houses.	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 AM
299	Which one is cheaper ? I thing this is a poor spot for a cable stayed bridge because it spoils the view both from the bridge and looking north or south from the neighborhoods. I'd say if one is 20% cheaper go that route.	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
300	I like the look of the box girder, bu tI woudl support whichever best preserves the environment beneath. Cost and speed to build are important to me as well.	Sep 24, 2012 9:14 PM
301	The last thing you want is to end up with something which looks like a 'new' bridge. We have plenty of incredibly ugly cement bridges and overpasses already.	Sep 24, 2012 6:13 PM
302	Seems like low profile would look the best...	Sep 24, 2012 5:41 PM
303	I support researching the safest and most long-term focused solutions.	Sep 24, 2012 12:30 PM
304	Cable Stayed concept design is far above all other types of designs for pleasing artistic concept. Most photograph bridges built in the world have used this design concept. Even a foot bridge over the Sacramento River in Reading California used this design concept. City of Burien managed to build a replacement bridge on Sylvester Road using a classic pleasing design.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
305	Either way a bike path would help	Sep 24, 2012 11:58 AM
306	yes, please study. I have no preference. Whichever is the best long-term construction solution is my preference.	Sep 23, 2012 2:33 PM
307	I do not feel strongly about the bridge type as long as there is room for a bike/pedestrian path on the bridge.	Sep 22, 2012 4:31 PM
308	It is critical to avoid noise or interruption to neighborhood views. Cable seems to have high rising obstructions to views with fewer pillars between bridge and ground. Which is quieter, safer and more stable?	Sep 22, 2012 1:47 PM
309	Cable stayed bridge with one taller tower is preferred. The to tower design creates an in-your-face situation for the west tower. In fairness to the Roanoke community, this is not a good design. The single tower can create a more iconic design.	Sep 22, 2012 11:03 AM
310	no. do box girder - faster, cheaper - less visual distraction/disruption	Sep 22, 2012 10:01 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

311	Analysis should include budgetary concerns along with aesthetic and construction schedule concerns.	Sep 21, 2012 3:31 PM
312	That is an appropriate methodology.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
313	Doesn't really matter as long as people can walk and bicycle on it. Think about the Brooklyn bridge, the Golden Gate, even the I-5 bridge (current), there is bike access on all of those.	Sep 20, 2012 3:09 PM
314	Yes	Sep 20, 2012 10:33 AM
315	Cable swayed because its elegant.	Sep 19, 2012 3:22 PM
316	I would prefer the box girder style bridge.	Sep 18, 2012 3:16 PM
317	Very important. Need to integrate and understand and meet community concerns and needs.	Sep 18, 2012 11:48 AM
318	We live three blocks north of the bridge on Boyer Ave and are very much in favor of the "cable stayed bridge"	Sep 18, 2012 6:38 AM
319	I absolutely prefer and recomend the Box Girder bridge	Sep 17, 2012 9:28 PM
320	Go w/ cable stay bridge	Sep 17, 2012 5:13 PM
321	Yes!	Sep 17, 2012 11:16 AM
322	Stick with the most economical solution. Box girder seems to be the most economical.	Sep 17, 2012 10:41 AM
323	Yes! do this!!!!	Sep 17, 2012 9:29 AM
324	Support studies	Sep 17, 2012 6:11 AM
325	Favor a new unique cable stay bridge as a new Seattle Bridge signature design and welcoming to users to Seattle, with a long span over water less deck and bridge supports in the water, wo improve the water users and adjacent home ownwers and boaters views of the surrounding environment and P. Bay.	Sep 16, 2012 4:01 PM
326	Yes, please continue to refine. Prefer lighter look of bridge, definitely want the structure to have as little impact on the surrounding neighborhood as possible. Minimal visible structure so that the greenery and landscape is not visually impaired. Keep the wetlands and nature intact!	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
327	W about sound mitigation/sound walls on the bridge. Why can't the bridge be pushed north, away from Montlake playfield? Pant more trees at edge of Montalke playfield along shore to help with sound.	Sep 16, 2012 9:46 AM
328	Reduce the visual impact as much as possible. the whole bridge is so sad in this area.	Sep 16, 2012 9:02 AM
329	BBOTH OPTIONS MUST ACCOMODATE 14' REGIONAL PATH.	Sep 16, 2012 2:19 AM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

330	box girder only	Sep 15, 2012 9:24 PM
331	Prefer box girder design because it has less of an impact on vies from surrounding homes.	Sep 15, 2012 7:48 PM
332	Cable stayed sounds like it'd be more visually intrusive. I'd go with a box girder if at all possible	Sep 15, 2012 6:10 PM
333	Make an EXTRA Lane for the WEST bound/UPHILL traffic.	Sep 15, 2012 1:38 PM
334	It's a major highway on legs way above a navigable waterway. If you live near it - it will be ugly. Deal with it. It has been there for longer than anyone can remember, and it isn't going away. As stewards of our public transportation infrastructure, do what is required to get a good design built for a reasonable amount of money, but WHATEVER YOU DO, make sure it is wide enough to accommodate 2 full lanes of traffic, AND in addition, a HOV/Transit late, AND on and off ramps. IF you add light rail, DO NOT take any of these lanes, design the thing so that it can accommodate the addition of light rail without reducing ANY pedestrian, bike, or motor vehicle, or transit/HOV lanes. This may require more width than some people want - but WHY would you build something that would no accommodate the volume of traffic that is already there?	Sep 15, 2012 12:31 PM
335	Box girder. Do not want some high structure. For years citizens have said keep it low - and what do we get? A big viaduct all across the lake. Ugh.	Sep 15, 2012 11:21 AM
336	Integration would mean the pedestrian connection to both the lid and Boyer Ave.	Sep 15, 2012 10:54 AM
337	Not if it adds time.	Sep 14, 2012 5:52 PM
338	Please choose the safest and most stable long-term design. Earthquakes happen regularly! The landscape view is not as important as safety.	Sep 14, 2012 5:51 PM
339	Stop exploring and get a first rate designer with background in Classicism. Someone who understands timeless design.	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
340	I prefer the box girder design	Sep 14, 2012 4:42 PM
341	Integration is critically important!	Sep 14, 2012 4:29 PM
342	Some means to elegantly get up to the bridge from parks or other pedestrian or bike only entrance points would be interesting. Stairs, elevators, etc--some kind of grand approach like Harbor Steps, etc.	Sep 14, 2012 4:20 PM
343	The cable stayed bridge looks better. It is more environmentally sound inasmuch as it has fewer support columns to interfere with marine life.	Sep 14, 2012 2:41 PM
344	the cable bridge is far more elegant and impressive	Sep 14, 2012 2:01 PM
345	Would there be pedestrian access to the Montlake Playfield area from the bridge? I've never been there, and I don't know what the demand is like.	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
346	The cable stay option is a much more gracefull bridge and is much perferred to a	Sep 14, 2012 1:48 PM

Page 4, Q2. Preference 7: Bridge type: Proceed with further technical analysis and refinements for two bridge types, the box girder and the cable stayed bridge; explore ways to integrate the structure with the surrounding neighborhoods

	mass of concrete.	
347	OK - but don't go overboard with "integration" unless surrounding neighborhoods want to pay for it.	Sep 14, 2012 1:14 PM
348	Please do. Why is there even a comment field here??	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
349	if cable stay is not warranted by the span length, no need to compete with Tacoma. Keep it functional and less costly for long term maintenance.	Sep 14, 2012 12:55 PM
350	Forget the ugly, utilitarian box girder alternative. We would be foolish to pass on the cable stay option, which would be a huge enhancement for the neighborhood, esthetically.	Sep 14, 2012 12:54 PM
351	Two bridges offers additional redundancy.	Sep 14, 2012 12:52 PM
352	Cable Stayed bridges can be beautiful additions to the scenery	Sep 14, 2012 12:41 PM
353	Select the most cost efficient and move on, please.	Sep 14, 2012 12:33 PM
354	yes, please proceed, I would like to see something that plays with the natural and built environment around portage bay	Sep 14, 2012 12:24 PM
355	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:04 PM
356	Cable stayed bridge looks visually appealing but does not build confidence in stability of roadway.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
357	Both seem fine.	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
358	Prefer box girder	Sep 14, 2012 11:50 AM
359	If both options are similar cost, then I would be in favor of a democratic decission of letting the home owners that view the bridge vote on their preferred option - one vote per property that has a view of the bridge. If one option is much pricier then choose the less expensive option to reduce waste of tax dollars.	Sep 14, 2012 10:40 AM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
1	Functional but non partisipatory in the landscape. Industrial, Brutalist.	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 PM
2	Less visual impact	Oct 5, 2012 10:33 PM
3	Thick and ugly, something we would just put up with as a necessary intrusion on our view. We can do better by going w/ CS!	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 PM
4	Low profile is better	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 PM
5	I like the image just fine, what are the benefits and drawbacks of this design?	Oct 5, 2012 9:16 PM
6	I prefer this visually to the cable stayed bridge	Oct 5, 2012 8:30 PM
7	Boring	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 PM
8	It appears cleaner and less disruptive to view then the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:17 PM
9	Either can work - have seen example of both but the cable stayed bridge architecture is more dramatic in my opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 6:02 PM
10	I think it's ugly.	Oct 5, 2012 5:37 PM
11	Less intrusive to surrounding areas than cable stayed bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
12	Looks like less visual impact.	Oct 5, 2012 4:41 PM
13	More subtle and preferred as long as it is structurally sound	Oct 5, 2012 4:37 PM
14	seems like good basic design.	Oct 5, 2012 4:07 PM
15	I think it's ugly, has too many support structures in the water, and does not integrate well with surrounding neighborhoods.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
16	This option looks prosaic, common. We can do better.	Oct 5, 2012 3:36 PM
17	Both designs are nice, whichever is safer. Will say i like the unobstructed view slightly better, but prefer the cables, if they are just at the end.	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
18	Maybe stockier looking and not as pretty, but maybe fewer view impacts?	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
19	Clean design, easier maintenance, quicker construction, safer for traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
20	This eats up less visual area, but isn't as pretty. If it's cheaper to maintain and is quiet, go with it.	Oct 5, 2012 3:03 PM
21	Box girder is definitely the better visual choice. Clean, unobtrusive	Oct 5, 2012 3:01 PM
22	Something architecturally nice would be great to have. I'm fine if it's box girder provided it's beautiful. If it's not beautiful, don't build it.	Oct 5, 2012 3:00 PM
23	The less attention-calling box girder alternative may be the preferable one	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
24	NOT my preferred choice. See comments on cable bridge below.	Oct 5, 2012 2:49 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
25	meh	Oct 5, 2012 2:43 PM
26	This looks like Seattle to me, maybe because it's similar to existing designs.	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
27	It's fine, a little industrial.	Oct 5, 2012 2:28 PM
28	Will this be good for bicycles and pedestrians? We'll finally be able to walk/bike/run across Lake Washington - will it dump us out on Montlake or will we be able to continue along the portage bay bridge?	Oct 5, 2012 2:11 PM
29	looks like a freeway.	Oct 5, 2012 2:09 PM
30	I prefer the box girder bridge design.	Oct 5, 2012 2:01 PM
31	I prefer the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 1:53 PM
32	From a visual perspective, I like the box girder design over the cable stayed design. It feels like it would be less intrusive on the surrounding area to me.	Oct 5, 2012 1:49 PM
33	I strongly oppose the box girder bridge. It is just plain 1960's style concrete. It is bad enough that a major artery has to go across this piece of water - let's at least make it fun to look at for everyone who lives around it.	Oct 5, 2012 1:21 PM
34	I dislike the shadows and blocked sight lines underneath due to the increased bulk of the structure.	Oct 5, 2012 1:14 PM
35	Like that it stays out of the sky. Looks too thin to be strong like an old stone bridge, but too thick to float or disappear in the air.	Oct 5, 2012 12:57 PM
36	prefer this concept over cable stayed	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
37	Neutral - Can we use the same support as the old bridge?	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 PM
38	Prefer.	Oct 5, 2012 12:46 PM
39	boring	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
40	This is rather dull looking but would be OK if the cable stayed bridge is too expensive or unworkable.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
41	i like this so we can keep the view.	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 PM
42	pick whichever one is easier to maintain and more resistant to earthquakes.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
43	no preference in visual impact over cable stayed	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
44	from the design, it looks less visually obtrusive.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
45	It looks like but it seems like there are more supports that touch the ground. This seems to say there will be more disruption? Fewer contacts with the ground may open the door to more travel opportunities (less obstruction) and may have fewer places for people to hide.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
46	Relatively cheap and sturdy, but banal in appearance.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
47	ugly	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
48	Build the cheaper, easier to maintain option.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
49	Though minimalist, I do not enjoy this look of the current bridge of this style. I believe it has too much concrete in the park and serves as an odd juxtaposition.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
50	Prefer this as it is aesthetically more pleasing than the cable stayed bridge	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
51	looks good.	Oct 5, 2012 12:00 PM
52	Be careful!!	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
53	Streamlined and functional	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
54	As drawn it looks OK, if a bit clunky. I think this really needs to continue the curving underbelly on all segments to shore contact.	Oct 5, 2012 11:36 AM
55	Boring, but hidden.	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
56	Like this better, less intrusive and visually less painful to look at. A lower profile preserves the natural contour of the area and provides less obstructed views.	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
57	It is the most appropriate bridge type for this location.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
58	No preference.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
59	Less visual impact.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
60	no opinion	Oct 5, 2012 10:59 AM
61	Looks better than cable stayed bridge	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
62	I prefer this design because it minimizes the obscuring of the beautiful territorial views in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:31 AM
63	TERRIBLE. IT IS UGLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED.	Oct 5, 2012 10:29 AM
64	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
65	Looks more economical and easier to expand if necessary. No lights are shown in the sketch and I expect there will be many unsightly light poles and much light polution in the surrounding neighborhoods and marinas.	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
66	I think this is less obtrusive and I am for that. This concrete monstrosity is to big and too wide	Oct 5, 2012 10:13 AM
67	This design requires numerous supporting columns which sever the connection between the land and the beauty of portage bay. This design should not be implemented.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
68	Their is too little detail to make a decision, but this is the direction I believe to be less obtrusive and more in keeping with local historic architecture. More detailed	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 AM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
	options should be presented with some choices on this type of bridge.	
69	OK.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
70	A box girder design is the least diserable option	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
71	It's ugly.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
72	I absolutely prefer the box girder design over the cable design	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 AM
73	I find this less attractive than the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM
74	I like the other design more but this is ok.	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
75	looks fine	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
76	Prefer this because it creates the least visual impact to the surrounding households.	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
77	It appears to have less width than the cable stay which is a plus. Effective noise reduction is my main concern.	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
78	I think the box girder fits in better with the surroundings.	Oct 5, 2012 9:29 AM
79	It's not as visually appealing, but if it's more economical and structurally similar I would vote for it.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
80	Preserves current seattle-area design concepts. Most economical.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
81	Blah	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
82	Looks fine to me -- frankly as long as the pedestrian and bike access are taken care of, it doesn't really matter.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
83	Nicely unobtrusive. I'd be interested to know whether it has safety/price/durability advantages in any way, too.	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
84	Its basically whats there now. I'm fine with it, especially if it is most cost effective option.	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM
85	no opinion	Oct 5, 2012 8:57 AM
86	Low impact visually. Rainier might be a little optimistic, but leaves a nice view of the remaining trees on the hill.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
87	looks bland, institutional, without soul, and leftover from the technocratic modernism of the 60s.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
88	boring. a a distinctive bridge would be a benefit to the whole city and future generations.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
89	Prefered over the cable stayed bridge	Oct 5, 2012 8:50 AM
90	It is too heavy/ bulky. Out of scale with Portage Bay. Will create too much	Oct 5, 2012 8:48 AM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
	shading and will block views.	
91	Too generic. Doesn't make a statement, and in fact makesthe area ore commonplace.	Oct 5, 2012 8:36 AM
92	I like this one because it preserves the view from 520 at Portage Bay. It gives a sense of connection between 520 and Seattle.	Oct 5, 2012 8:34 AM
93	As long as we have a separated bike path, like on I-90, I'm good with it.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
94	No COmment	Oct 5, 2012 7:51 AM
95	This is fine.	Oct 5, 2012 7:40 AM
96	okay, but I prefer cable stayed	Oct 5, 2012 7:30 AM
97	Boring.	Oct 5, 2012 7:23 AM
98	The bridge looks as phenomenally ugly as the existing one.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
99	It's fine.	Oct 5, 2012 7:09 AM
100	less is more	Oct 5, 2012 7:02 AM
101	looks very out dated.	Oct 5, 2012 6:43 AM
102	Hate it!	Oct 5, 2012 6:17 AM
103	I believe this looks less intrusive and would choose that especially if the costs were lower.	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM
104	Like	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 AM
105	I prefer a bridge such as the box girder that minimizes its visual impact, especially to existing home's views.	Oct 5, 2012 4:53 AM
106	less visually intrusive than the cable stayed bridge, but has less potential to be an aesthetic object in its own right. concrete tends to not weather attractively.	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 PM
107	I like this option the best. It is sleek and understated. There is no reason this bridge needs to stand out. The surrounding trees, water, and mountains are more beautiful and scenic when the bridge serves to support transportation through the area instead of detracting from the natural environment by being a concrete and metal cable showpiece.	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 PM
108	Boring, too many pylons in the water	Oct 4, 2012 11:10 PM
109	meh	Oct 4, 2012 10:49 PM
110	Looks good.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
111	I like the lower profile of this option.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
112	Low profile is appreciated. Need sound walls and quiet pavement to improve	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
	neighborhoods from intrusive sounds.	
113	What is the noise levels. I think noise is as current to current property owners. Noise should not be transferred and reduce property values for those above. You need to do an acoustic map. What is the sound level of this design. I think this is a better equalizing bridge. People paid less for their houses and have the same noise. You can not place new sound levels to those above without knowing current sound and future sound	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
114	This is much less obtrusive. I really like this one!	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 PM
115	This is visually less obtrusive. My first choice would be the one that is most durable, long-lasting and most likely to withstand earthquakes.	Oct 4, 2012 10:03 PM
116	This is a good design for this area. It is not as high and fits in with the surrounding historic character of the neighborhoods.	Oct 4, 2012 9:49 PM
117	Seems like this would blend in with the landscape better and be nicer for residents close to the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
118	would like to see the open view from below the bridge as is here. would the underside area be accessible or at least planted, or is it just a concrete/gravel area? please maintain green space as much as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
119	The box girder design is of minimal impact to the skyline and is less invasive to the landscape of the area.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
120	I support this design as it is minimally intrusive	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
121	probably the safe route, but i prefer the cable stayed bridge	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
122	I prefer the box girder. The design distracts the least from the view of the lake and hills surrounding the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:11 PM
123	I prefer this more subtle design. It does not overpower the surrounding landscape.	Oct 4, 2012 9:01 PM
124	I doubt that it would be as attractive as shown, unless it's half the price, I'd rather have a nicer looking bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
125	Boring. Not a bridge for the future.	Oct 4, 2012 8:53 PM
126	I like it.	Oct 4, 2012 8:51 PM
127	Fits with existing design.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
128	Looks like an ugly freeway.	Oct 4, 2012 8:35 PM
129	Boring	Oct 4, 2012 8:24 PM
130	looks fine.	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
131	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
132	Boring	Oct 4, 2012 7:46 PM
133	Looks appropriate for the setting.	Oct 4, 2012 7:34 PM
134	It's functional and does not interfere with views. However, it's heavy looking and rather ugly in my opinion.	Oct 4, 2012 7:18 PM
135	This doesn't look any better than what we have.	Oct 4, 2012 6:54 PM
136	I think you might want to go back to The Highline CC program and study "transportation engineering" as opposed to "I'm a retard and I want to suck off the public teat" program.	Oct 4, 2012 6:33 PM
137	Looks effective but I'd want to make sure it can withstand earthquakes. Design looks like structures that have become unstable after seismic events.	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
138	if it is the lowest cost it will work	Oct 4, 2012 5:56 PM
139	Looks cleaner than the cable stayed bridge	Oct 4, 2012 5:32 PM
140	Add a bike lane.	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM
141	less obtrusive to rest of scenery	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM
142	Like it - less visual distraction - the bridge should blend.	Oct 4, 2012 4:55 PM
143	It's ok, simple for me!	Oct 4, 2012 4:50 PM
144	Either bridge type is acceptable. Aesthetics are not as important to me as functionality of the bridge. It must support pedestrian and cyclist usage.	Oct 4, 2012 4:38 PM
145	Prefer box girder design concept.	Oct 4, 2012 4:19 PM
146	Looks nice and very clean lines,	Oct 4, 2012 3:46 PM
147	simple, clean look is minimally intrusive	Oct 4, 2012 3:35 PM
148	The girder design is fine and will probably win because it will be cheaper. I would vote for a cable stayed bridge because they are beautiful. I'm thinking of Boston's most recent cable stayed bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:24 PM
149	looks nice, low profile	Oct 4, 2012 3:17 PM
150	Looks like a generic freeway overpass or flyover	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
151	Sure.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
152	Simple, elegant, less sexy.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
153	Fine by me.	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
154	It's ok, it looks bulky and out of the eisenhower era of freeways.	Oct 4, 2012 2:12 PM
155	not very exciting	Oct 4, 2012 1:58 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
156	I like this one, it doesn't obstruct views and make people upset	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 PM
157	Boring, old, cheap	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
158	Standard. Not particularly visually impressive.	Oct 4, 2012 1:30 PM
159	boring	Oct 4, 2012 1:28 PM
160	I like its minimal impact on the surrounding views. I would choose this option as long as bike/pedestrian options are included across the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:04 PM
161	no	Oct 4, 2012 12:45 PM
162	The monolithic legs of the box girder bridge are unattractive and already look dated.	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
163	I support this more for aesthetics	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM
164	Yes go with that design.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
165	not as attractive as the cable stayed	Oct 4, 2012 12:07 PM
166	Meh. Looks like every other boring hunk of concrete highway overpass.	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
167	Preserving views is nice, but the thicker road deck and all the pillers being drilled into the bay concern me.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
168	Low-profile design. Segmented post-tensioned girders would likely be more aesthetically pleasing than current precast (or steel?) I-shapes.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
169	The bridge design is acceptable provided that it can accommodate an adequate pedestrian/bicycle path.	Oct 4, 2012 11:56 AM
170	The box girder design concept seems a bit more scenic -- it blocks less of the view from either side -- but I don't have a strong preference.	Oct 4, 2012 11:56 AM
171	Functional, but boring.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
172	Don't care.	Oct 4, 2012 11:44 AM
173	The box girder design is lower profile and blends in more easily with the surrounding landscape.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
174	boring and unappealing.	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
175	not a priority	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
176	I prefer this to the cable stayed design.	Oct 4, 2012 11:22 AM
177	Seems very similar to what it is like presently.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 AM
178	preferred - but keep structure as light and airy as possible. I understand that this bridge design is narrow and lower - good. However, what ever is done should be passed by the Seattle Design Commission, and should be consistent with the	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 AM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
	historic character of Montlake and U Bridges, and the rich native heritage in Portage Bay (last potlatch was held there!)	
179	This is preferable based on less imposing looking structure.	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 AM
180	this looks nice and clean. I like it.	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 AM
181	Like lower profile	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 AM
182	I like this better than the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:18 AM
183	Spend the least money you can, for a change,	Oct 4, 2012 7:03 AM
184	like the simplicity, openness of the clean lines and view	Oct 4, 2012 3:05 AM
185	Very similar to existing.	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 AM
186	Okay, looks more cost effective.	Oct 3, 2012 9:26 PM
187	The current design needs more architectural consideration. Please build that into your design-build plan.	Oct 3, 2012 8:42 PM
188	Try to minimize the impact of the girders on views. One advantage of the box girder is that it keeps the visual impact of the bridge closer to the ground.	Oct 3, 2012 8:29 PM
189	Lower profile but more concrete feeling	Oct 3, 2012 8:27 PM
190	Decent look to it.	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 PM
191	Your drawings seem to indicate commercial buildings on the west side of Portage Bay. It's single family homes and that needs to be shown. I prefer this design - less impact on views.	Oct 3, 2012 6:59 PM
192	Nicer profile and lessens visual impact	Oct 3, 2012 4:00 PM
193	I prefer this design to preserve the open views of Portage Bay, UW, etc.	Oct 3, 2012 3:34 PM
194	Any concept must include sound barriers and should be as narrow as possible	Oct 3, 2012 2:40 PM
195	Great! The best option. Git 'er done.	Oct 3, 2012 2:39 PM
196	More attractive, as long as it's relatively cost-effective.	Oct 3, 2012 1:54 PM
197	Prefer this one due to its lower profile	Oct 3, 2012 1:49 PM
198	Looks good.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
199	looks lower profile so I lean toward favoring it	Oct 3, 2012 1:13 PM
200	Less pretty, but not terrible.	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
201	Would make for better views of natural landscape	Oct 3, 2012 12:55 PM
202	Box girder is good because it avoids tall cable towers that would be visible from	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
	many homes. It may also be more in character with the historic quality of surrounding neighborhoods.	
203	This is fine too, but the cable stayed bridge seems more classic.	Oct 3, 2012 11:53 AM
204	I like whichever accomodates most bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 3, 2012 11:29 AM
205	Borrring.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
206	I think this is simple and elegant, allowing the surrounding environment to hold the signature focus - Mt Raininer, the water, and trees are so splendid. I like the arched box girders quite a bit.	Oct 3, 2012 10:36 AM
207	The girder briddge seems less intrusive on the landscape of the area and would limit visual polution	Oct 3, 2012 10:17 AM
208	Less visually intrusive. I prefer it over the cable stayed version.	Oct 3, 2012 10:05 AM
209	See above answer. The less conspicuous, the better. I'd rather look at the distant mountains that bridge turrets.	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 AM
210	Good design, low profile, but not as aesthetically pleasing as the cable-stayed bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
211	Prefer.	Oct 3, 2012 9:46 AM
212	Doesn't interrupt skyline. I like.	Oct 3, 2012 9:44 AM
213	Inoffensive, not too dramatic.	Oct 3, 2012 9:34 AM
214	Seem like this design is less obtrusive on the landscape.	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM
215	keep the bridge minimal. the landscape is the art.	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
216	Too much like every freeway in the country. Must be an iconic design with archetectual elements above the bridge deck to make it a positive additon to our beautiful city	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
217	Best choice.	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 AM
218	It is ugly and detracts from the neighborhood.	Oct 3, 2012 8:05 AM
219	I prefer the box girder design concept because it appears less obtrusive than the cable-stayed concept.	Oct 3, 2012 8:05 AM
220	Clean design is GOOD	Oct 3, 2012 7:57 AM
221	I do not like this type of design. It is too mundane.	Oct 3, 2012 7:40 AM
222	Lower overall elevation but more support collums. Cost vs longevity s/b the main driver.	Oct 3, 2012 6:57 AM
223	This design seems bland, and has a lot of columns in Portage Bay (thought admittedly better than the current bridge).	Oct 2, 2012 11:42 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
224	Box girder design seems less visible, which is a plus for a freeway.	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 PM
225	Looks sleek and clean.	Oct 2, 2012 8:52 PM
226	I prefer the cable design. Where is the bicycle lane?	Oct 2, 2012 8:41 PM
227	The box-girder design is less intrusive on views and the surrounding landscape than the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 8:29 PM
228	My preference	Oct 2, 2012 7:51 PM
229	It fits much better with the Seattle style.	Oct 2, 2012 6:55 PM
230	This is what we already have.	Oct 2, 2012 5:40 PM
231	less intrusive than the cable bridge	Oct 2, 2012 4:21 PM
232	No opinion.	Oct 2, 2012 3:14 PM
233	Very Seattle looking. Reminds me of the a ferry view of DT Seattle with the Alaska Way viaduct.	Oct 2, 2012 11:58 AM
234	the box grinder will blend in better.	Oct 2, 2012 11:04 AM
235	Visually less interesting.	Oct 2, 2012 10:07 AM
236	Good. The current low-profile bridge design works very well -- you have your eyes on the signs and the traffic...and only the usual distractions of Seattle's attractive topography and waters.	Oct 2, 2012 9:39 AM
237	Not very exciting. Too many pillars. Heavy looking.	Oct 2, 2012 9:38 AM
238	no comment.	Oct 2, 2012 8:37 AM
239	yawn. More pilings in the water.	Oct 1, 2012 9:22 PM
240	cleaner bridge in our landscape	Oct 1, 2012 8:00 PM
241	low profile is good	Oct 1, 2012 7:15 PM
242	This is my preference as it leaves more of a view.	Oct 1, 2012 6:44 PM
243	less intrusive/ more stylish than cable stayed bridge	Oct 1, 2012 2:19 PM
244	No comment.	Oct 1, 2012 2:07 PM
245	Which one requires less sustainability and less cost? What is the cost for one versus the other? Can the savings be folded in to provide high walls along the bridges to minimize traffic noise? What about introducing noise-cancellation speakers along the route to minimize the traffic noise? Is a bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path included? Why not?	Oct 1, 2012 1:21 PM
246	Less interested in this design, but if it supports light rail or mono rail than go this route.	Oct 1, 2012 1:17 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
247	Much preferred to cable stayed bridge.	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
248	Uninspiring	Sep 30, 2012 9:18 PM
249	They reduce distractions from the other surroundings.	Sep 30, 2012 7:46 PM
250	In Favor	Sep 30, 2012 4:55 PM
251	Seems less obtrusive.	Sep 30, 2012 3:02 PM
252	Minimal obstruction of views	Sep 30, 2012 7:22 AM
253	This bridge fits in with the environment best!	Sep 30, 2012 7:10 AM
254	Looks smallr and somehow better integrated into the landscape ...	Sep 30, 2012 3:37 AM
255	Better.	Sep 29, 2012 11:34 PM
256	This is not my preference	Sep 29, 2012 10:06 PM
257	Go for the most efficient solution and make it elegant.	Sep 29, 2012 9:12 PM
258	The girder box design is fine. I am strongly in favor of 3 lines for traffic going each way. Make it large enough to accommodate future traffic needs.	Sep 29, 2012 7:32 PM
259	preferable	Sep 29, 2012 6:17 PM
260	Prefer box girder to maintain views of the area for neighborhood residents and commuters alike.	Sep 29, 2012 4:44 PM
261	It's fine.	Sep 29, 2012 4:26 PM
262	It doesn't look as nice, but I would focus on what is cheaper.	Sep 29, 2012 1:20 PM
263	Looks fine	Sep 29, 2012 1:13 PM
264	The bridge should be able to support rail transit	Sep 29, 2012 10:07 AM
265	I like it, it's lower profile, less intrusive visually, but it's less interested also	Sep 29, 2012 9:28 AM
266	I like the Box girder Bridge. Make sure the shoulders are wide enough to add another lane in the future.	Sep 29, 2012 7:50 AM
267	Yes. Again blend with environment as much as possible. I know it sounds silly, but an off tone color in the concrete might help it blend with the area. That might be a slightly different shade of greasy for Seattle.	Sep 29, 2012 6:44 AM
268	Less visually obstructive. Functional.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 PM
269	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it safely and easily.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
270	prefer the box girder as it has less effect on the skyline	Sep 28, 2012 9:46 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
271	The look is ok. To me it looks like something that was built in the 70's but in a "Futuristic" design.	Sep 28, 2012 9:07 PM
272	Lower profile is more consistent with existing design.	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM
273	Two words...Duck shade	Sep 28, 2012 5:47 PM
274	Box girder appears to be a better match, visually, to the rest of the 520 bridge and suits the neighborhood.	Sep 28, 2012 4:22 PM
275	Also acceptable, not as pleasing to the eye. Perhaps cost will drive this option.	Sep 28, 2012 3:53 PM
276	Great, looks similar to what is already there.	Sep 28, 2012 2:36 PM
277	don't care	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM
278	Box girder first choice cable stay second choice.	Sep 28, 2012 2:00 PM
279	This utilitarian design, though functional, is an eyesore.	Sep 28, 2012 1:55 PM
280	Preferred as long as it includes bicycle / ped lanes;	Sep 28, 2012 12:49 PM
281	its ok, nothing special	Sep 28, 2012 12:09 PM
282	Likely the best solution for an unitrusive design.	Sep 28, 2012 11:32 AM
283	Looks good to me!	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
284	I like it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:49 AM
285	It is fine, do which ever is best combination of lower cost and most aesthetic.	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
286	Ugly	Sep 28, 2012 8:31 AM
287	Key considerations would be: 1. Cost, 2. Environmental Impact, 3. "Performance" of the structure	Sep 27, 2012 11:41 PM
288	It looks nice, but would it be more subject to earthquake issues, and maybe be louder? NOT well integrated with landscape, I think.	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 PM
289	booring.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 PM
290	Prefered design to minimize visual impact from all viewpoints.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 PM
291	Bland.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 PM
292	go with the cheapest alternative	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 PM
293	Rather uninspired.	Sep 27, 2012 9:20 PM
294	Prefer it to the cable stayed concept as it looks less obtrusive.	Sep 27, 2012 9:02 PM
295	its ok	Sep 27, 2012 8:29 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
296	I like the box girder design slightly better, but do whatever is cheaper/maintainable.	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
297	Typical of what we see in Seattle...never looks a clean as the drawing..	Sep 27, 2012 7:51 PM
298	The box girder design appears more open and less visual blockage of the surrounding landscape, but whichever design provides more safety and longevity should probably be picked, unless there is no significant difference.	Sep 27, 2012 6:31 PM
299	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 6:14 PM
300	Same as before	Sep 27, 2012 5:45 PM
301	Looks nice	Sep 27, 2012 5:32 PM
302	I like the box girder design from the standpoint that it is less intrusive visually	Sep 27, 2012 5:20 PM
303	Looks like what we have today, nothing too impressive.	Sep 27, 2012 5:07 PM
304	Less visual impact than cable stayed bridge	Sep 27, 2012 4:46 PM
305	prefer cable - see below	Sep 27, 2012 4:44 PM
306	Defiitely the prefered solution	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
307	S'ok.	Sep 27, 2012 4:37 PM
308	Athough there are more footings, there is less visual clutter in the sky and I favor this approach.	Sep 27, 2012 4:02 PM
309	Rather ugly.	Sep 27, 2012 3:59 PM
310	Box girder is boring and unsightly -- better to make a bridge beautiful.	Sep 27, 2012 3:57 PM
311	My concern with the box girder design is purely aesthetic. I believe a (relatively) high number of bridge columns creates an aesthetic liability, and is somewhat reminiscent of bland older bridges in older cities.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
312	Fits in to the local architecture better	Sep 27, 2012 3:46 PM
313	subtle and boring	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
314	Please don't do this. It is just more ugly "concrete jungle" with lots of posts stuck in the water. We have the opportunity to make something distninctive and interesting and fun to look at with the Cable stay bridge instead.	Sep 27, 2012 3:17 PM
315	This would be visually less impact, so would be nice, but if cable is cheaper, I'd rather save money and spend on bike lanes.	Sep 27, 2012 3:00 PM
316	It gets the job done.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
317	functional - not very aesthetically appealing	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
318	looks fine, but not as nice as the cable-stayed option	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
319	no strong preference	Sep 27, 2012 1:43 PM
320	Never a big fan due to our region having an abundance of these	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
321	It's not very pretty, but doesn't take up as much visual space as the cable stayed bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
322	it's fine	Sep 27, 2012 1:22 PM
323	i like this look better	Sep 27, 2012 1:04 PM
324	I perfer this design over the cable design option.	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
325	I think local homeowners get less visual pollution from this approach	Sep 27, 2012 12:43 PM
326	Would look better with a bike path.	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
327	this is an inellegant solution	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
328	looks OK to me.	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
329	looks very much like what we currently have. does not change the look of the area much, so this will likely make more people happy. is it a good engineered design? if so, and if it is a reasonable way to build, it has less of an impact on the look of this area.	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
330	To preserve views I would lean towards this design.	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM
331	I support the cheaper option	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
332	I am sure that the nearby residents will prefer the box girder option, as it will impact their views less.	Sep 27, 2012 11:50 AM
333	Much more attractive than cables. Lower maintenance cost?	Sep 27, 2012 11:41 AM
334	Depending on cost it is obviously less intrusive visually.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
335	ugly	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
336	Balance between money, beauty, design, function etc prefer cable stayed bridge if all things equal.	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
337	Ugly. No	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
338	Which ever is cheaper overall (Construction / Maintenance / Replacement).	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
339	I prefer this design as it blends with the environment.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
340	What I was expecting, but less visually appealing than cable-stayed bridge. Would be fine if budget demands it.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
341	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
342	It looks like a 50's style structure.	Sep 27, 2012 11:16 AM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
343	Simple and elegant.	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
344	This is a much less cluttered design and fits in with the scenery better than the cable stayed option.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
345	My opinion depends on which concept lasts longer and is more economical over its lifetime	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
346	3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
347	I like cable stayed concept better than box girder	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
348	Adequate design. Least disruptive of views but less asthetically appealing. Better for handling more mixed use traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
349	It's a serviceable solution that lacks style.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
350	Seems "plain vanilla" and that's perfectly fine.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
351	This is OK.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
352	I like it	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
353	Prefer is because the landscape is less disrupted visually	Sep 27, 2012 10:38 AM
354	I prefer this design aesthetic.	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
355	More in keeping with current area bridge design.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
356	not preferred	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
357	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
358	See comments in cable stayed.. Simple might be less costly and allow for more bike / ped improvements.	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
359	Ugly	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
360	Cleaner look! Like it!	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
361	nice	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
362	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
363	Too much struts on the ground, more trees cut down to facilitate the design.	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
364	Ok.	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
365	I'm fine with either style	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
366	utilitarian, industrial, cheap	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
367	Will look heavy.	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
368	prefer this one	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
369	?	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
370	is there a cost difference between the two. I like cables for aesthetic reasons, but the box girder has a clean look.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
371	Fits better with local style and surrounding neighborhood.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
372	my thought is you should have bridge architects design the bridge - give them elements to include such as bicycle path - but they should pick box or cable based on costs, maintenance, safety, wind loads and other factors that I'm not trained in	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
373	Boring and ugly to look at.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
374	excellent	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
375	I prefer option 8.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
376	Appears to be a much lower profile and less visual impact than the cable stayed bridge	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
377	Nice looking with no cables in the view	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
378	less obtrusive. plain.	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
379	Fewer piers = better. Big ugly concrete must be greened with succulent plants of some sort (e.g. sedums)	Sep 26, 2012 11:59 PM
380	Prefer this design.	Sep 26, 2012 5:56 PM
381	Boring, depressing, just like what is there now	Sep 26, 2012 11:16 AM
382	Meh.	Sep 26, 2012 11:12 AM
383	This is the way to go if the cost is less than the cable stay. I think you need to keep the bridge low, thin, and as few columns as possible. How can it blend with the surroundings? Tough with any bridge. Color would be an option. Somehow capture the greens, browns, greys that appear through the seasons and mix that neutral color in the concrete. Sounds goofy, but it might work.	Sep 25, 2012 9:34 AM
384	The box girder design is a bit cleaner and is less visually distracting to the surrounding area. Has a more modern feel. As concrete ages it tends to look dirty.	Sep 25, 2012 9:16 AM
385	better visually, but only if not prohibitally more expensive	Sep 25, 2012 8:48 AM
386	Good. Low profile	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 AM
387	I think having a bridge there is kind of ugly, and the box girder is the least distracting. The box girder makes it possible to look around and enjoy the view	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
	from the bridge ... (ducks, water lilies, the really impressive year around pond on top of some one of the apartment buildings ...)	
388	I like the lower profile	Sep 24, 2012 9:14 PM
389	Preferable by far: minimal surface impact, clean aesthetics, and elegant without calling attention to itself.	Sep 24, 2012 6:13 PM
390	Looks like the existing one: its not pretty, but its "standard".	Sep 24, 2012 5:41 PM
391	Looks pretty much like the current bridge.	Sep 24, 2012 2:18 PM
392	It's what we have today. Boxy (by definition) and boring.	Sep 24, 2012 12:39 PM
393	Looks a lot like the current bridge - it's a chunk of concrete infrastructure cutting across the lake. Not terrible, certainly, but uninspired.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
394	It's simpler and less obtrusive.	Sep 24, 2012 12:08 PM
395	This doesn't realize aesthetic gains over the existing bridge.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
396	The box girder design is ok for a few boats from Queen City or Seattle Yacht Club on the north or the apartment on the south of the bridge. However for the majority of the homes in Roanoke looking down on I-520 or the passengers in autos the cable stayed is a much better artist architect design concept.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
397	Either way a bike path would help	Sep 24, 2012 11:58 AM
398	box design is less interesting visually, but obstructs less of the view	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
399	The box girder design concept looks more appealing than the cable stayed bridge. Box girder leaves the background viable; blends more into the environment.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
400	I think I like this one better, simply because it's less obtrusive in an area with a lot of natural beauty.	Sep 23, 2012 6:43 PM
401	It's clean and blends in better. I prefer it over the cable stayed.	Sep 23, 2012 8:19 AM
402	Boxy. Cheap solution that will look cheap. The box section will reduce the line of sight making it feel even bigger, creating more deep shadows.	Sep 22, 2012 11:03 AM
403	i like. minimal visual impact	Sep 22, 2012 10:01 AM
404	Compliments the landscape and retains the gorgeous view we enjoy today. Also, it is possible to create art work on the pillars underneath the bridge!	Sep 22, 2012 2:35 AM
405	I like this better from these renderings, as it seems to fade into the surroundings better.	Sep 21, 2012 3:31 PM
406	Too much in water work and impacts to the surroundings when other options are available. The increased weight is also not good when already dealing with poor soils. With more structure underneath the bridge, there are more complicated maintenance considerations. Aethestically, its boring and uninspiring.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
407	This appears to be less obtrusive, and therefore a better design for an area that already has a lot of "city" in the "nature"	Sep 20, 2012 9:47 PM
408	Both look nice, which will last longer? Whis will cost less to build? Which will require less maintenance?	Sep 20, 2012 9:16 PM
409	Less obtrusive, maintains the esthetic flow of the rest of the 520 bridge plan.	Sep 20, 2012 3:09 PM
410	Low profile, similar visual impact as current structure	Sep 20, 2012 10:33 AM
411	Its probable cheaper.	Sep 19, 2012 3:22 PM
412	Like it.	Sep 19, 2012 1:29 PM
413	I appreciate this design as it is simple and doesn't block the views of the bay.	Sep 18, 2012 3:16 PM
414	Much less obtrusive than the alternates	Sep 18, 2012 12:05 PM
415	This is the way to go. Does not block views.	Sep 18, 2012 11:48 AM
416	I want the box girder design bridge	Sep 17, 2012 9:28 PM
417	Pedantic, ugly, tried and ugly	Sep 17, 2012 5:13 PM
418	Not attractive	Sep 17, 2012 4:36 PM
419	boring	Sep 17, 2012 3:16 PM
420	I don't think this is beautiful. It doesn't seem to add anything to the vista. I think it is too much concrete.	Sep 17, 2012 11:16 AM
421	Lower profile would seem to result in less people complaining about their views being impacted.	Sep 17, 2012 10:41 AM
422	Looks reasonable. Low visual profile	Sep 17, 2012 6:11 AM
423	Although this bridge is simpler, I think that it blends into the landscape better than the cable stayed bridge.	Sep 16, 2012 7:33 PM
424	May be cheaper but not a new or contextually appropriate for this unique, city setting, with surrounding boating activity and 2 yacht clubs	Sep 16, 2012 4:01 PM
425	Like the way it is visually not interfering with the landscape.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
426	The absence of towers seems less intrusive, visually. But I also see more pylons in the water compared to the cable stayed bridge below. More pylons is not desirable.	Sep 16, 2012 10:00 AM
427	I like the low profile - Significantly better.	Sep 16, 2012 9:02 AM
428	looks boring.needs to be a graceful piece of engineering	Sep 16, 2012 7:21 AM
429	Design refinement should reduce the depth of the roadway.	Sep 16, 2012 2:19 AM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
430	one design makes sense, if we are stuck with a monstrosity we might as well have it look alike	Sep 15, 2012 9:24 PM
431	Like it. Less of a intrusion on views from homes in the area.	Sep 15, 2012 7:48 PM
432	I'd go with this, it looks about like what we have now	Sep 15, 2012 6:10 PM
433	I prefer this to the cable-stayed alternative because it is less obtrusive to the view.	Sep 15, 2012 5:13 PM
434	I like that it's cheaper, but it'll probably be uglier.	Sep 15, 2012 1:32 PM
435	Not bad, True and tested. If built correctly could provide cover for decent moorage underneath, eliminating the need for additional "roofing" over moorage spots below.	Sep 15, 2012 12:52 PM
436	It's a major highway on legs way above a navigable waterway. If you live near it - it will be ugly. Deal with it. It has been there for longer than anyone can remember, and it isn't going away. As stewards of our public transportation infrastructure, do what is required to get a good design built for a reasonable amount of money, but WHATEVER YOU DO, make sure it is wide enough to accommodate 2 full lanes of traffic, AND in addition, a HOV/Transit late, AND on and off ramps. IF you add light rail, DO NOT take any of these lanes, design the thing so that it can accommodate the addition of light rail without reducing ANY pedestrian, bike, or motor vehicle, or transit/HOV lanes. This may require more width than some people want - but WHY would you build something that would no accommodate the volume of traffic that is already there?	Sep 15, 2012 12:31 PM
437	Better than something with super structure	Sep 15, 2012 11:21 AM
438	Conforms to existing profile and unobtrusive to views, a good proposal.	Sep 15, 2012 10:54 AM
439	Looks are secondary within reason.	Sep 14, 2012 5:52 PM
440	See above comment. Safety first!	Sep 14, 2012 5:51 PM
441	Less is more but sometimes boring...the box will turn black with lichen and mold and moss over time.	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
442	The box girder is kinda ugly. Looks too Soviet to me.	Sep 14, 2012 5:15 PM
443	boring and kind of ugly.	Sep 14, 2012 4:29 PM
444	Blah and boring. Something your typical grumpy old man who doesn't want to pay for anything would design.	Sep 14, 2012 4:20 PM
445	very ordinary and utilitarian. not interesting	Sep 14, 2012 2:01 PM
446	I prefer the box girder, it interferes less with the environment visually.	Sep 14, 2012 1:52 PM
447	This design is less visually intrusive, but lack imagination. If we're wanting this to be a dramatic gateway to Seattle, this design does not accomplish this. However, the landscape in this area is beautiful, so the simplicity of the design helps the nature stand out.	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM

Page 4, Q3. What are your thoughts on the box girder design concept?		
448	Just another highway bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 1:48 PM
449	this seems to line up with the overall bridge with minimal visual impact	Sep 14, 2012 1:36 PM
450	It's OK	Sep 14, 2012 1:14 PM
451	I prefer the minimal aspect of this design. It will fit better into the neighborhood.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
452	Ugly! Looks like something the Army would build as a temporary crossing of the Euphrates during the Iraq War.	Sep 14, 2012 12:54 PM
453	Slightly better appearance for skyline, but supports could slow boat traffic.	Sep 14, 2012 12:52 PM
454	not as nice as a cable stayed bridge	Sep 14, 2012 12:41 PM
455	Utilitarian but okay.	Sep 14, 2012 12:36 PM
456	Select the most cost efficient and move on, please.	Sep 14, 2012 12:33 PM
457	This is a clean and minimal design that would be great to avoid more impacts both visually and physically to the site	Sep 14, 2012 12:24 PM
458	This is my favorite.	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
459	Better than cables	Sep 14, 2012 12:04 PM
460	It looks like it has low a low visual imprint from above however a large visual imprint from below.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
461	ho-hum	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
462	It's okay.	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
463	prefer the box girder design, less obstructive visually	Sep 14, 2012 11:50 AM
464	Less obtrusive in the views of the area - looks nice.	Sep 14, 2012 10:40 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
1	I prefer the cable stayed design versus the box girder design because it opens up the area beneath the bridge.	Oct 6, 2012 12:20 AM
2	Much more attractive. The road can serve more than just its transportation function.	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 PM
3	More visual impact, but is attractive and I like fewer piers.	Oct 5, 2012 10:33 PM
4	Architectural complement to the city and in particular to the views in Portage Bay. See comment in box #7 about needing to show neighbors what it will look like to avoid unnecessary fight. In every other city here and in Spain where I've seen these, they are elegant to behold.	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 PM
5	Low profile is better	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 PM
6	I like this image, it looks a little more unique and graceful than the box girder design, but I wonder about whether it would create greater view obstruction, or have other drawbacks such as increased noise or maintenance needs.	Oct 5, 2012 9:16 PM
7	Higher visual impact than box girder	Oct 5, 2012 8:30 PM
8	Looks beautiful!	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 PM
9	I like the visual aspect of the cable stayed concept	Oct 5, 2012 6:15 PM
10	Which one is more quiet for those who live near it?	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
11	Either can work - have seen example of both but the cable stayed bridge architecture is more dramatic in my opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 6:02 PM
12	Visually this concept is more appealing.	Oct 5, 2012 5:45 PM
13	I like this one better. It's more dramatic.	Oct 5, 2012 5:37 PM
14	why? seems like expense without significant benefit.	Oct 5, 2012 4:07 PM
15	I think it's a beautiful solution and I greatly appreciate that it reduces the environmental impact of the bridge through this sensitive area.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
16	This option is more elegant and poetic. This is the better design solution.	Oct 5, 2012 3:36 PM
17	if the cable is just at the end - not the entire span, that is great.	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
18	Maybe sleeker and prettier-looking, but maybe more view impacts?	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
19	Too disruptive to views and sight lines, should not be considered. Potential hazard from falling ice and snow in winter.	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
20	This eats up more visual area, but it's better looking. If it's cheaper to maintain and is quiet, go with it.	Oct 5, 2012 3:03 PM
21	Intrusive. Completely unnecessary and unattractive visual clutter. Cost? Or, if you go with this concept, add a huge ferris wheel!	Oct 5, 2012 3:01 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
22	Something architecturally nice would be great to have. I'm fine if it's cable stayed provided it's beautiful. If it's not beautiful, don't build it.	Oct 5, 2012 3:00 PM
23	Not sure if the design compliments the area. Might reflect boating focus.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
24	Cable stayed bridge looks MUCH more aesthetically pleasing to my eye. No comparison--cable bridge wins hands down.	Oct 5, 2012 2:49 PM
25	meh	Oct 5, 2012 2:43 PM
26	This doesn't look like Seattle style to me, somehow. Seems like it would obscure views.	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
27	Nice.	Oct 5, 2012 2:28 PM
28	I like this design better.	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
29	love the cable stayed. europe does this all the time.	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
30	is this safer during earthquake than the box girder system?	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
31	Will it have a bike/pedestrian lane?	Oct 5, 2012 2:11 PM
32	more visual impact, but looks more elegant and seems like it would have fewer supports in the neighborhood below.	Oct 5, 2012 2:09 PM
33	I don't like the cable stayed design.	Oct 5, 2012 2:01 PM
34	My thoughts are that if both are safe and equally durable, go with the less expensive option.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
35	I prefer the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 1:53 PM
36	I strongly prefer the cable stay bridge. It would add a much more visually appealing structure to the area, as opposed to just flat concrete for the box girder. It also results in less structures driving into the water, making boating around and beneath the bridge easier and more natural.	Oct 5, 2012 1:21 PM
37	I like the thinner, more modern appearance. I think the cable stays are visually appealing.	Oct 5, 2012 1:14 PM
38	like the slender bridge deck and floating appearance. Don't like the height relative to buildings in the neighborhood.	Oct 5, 2012 12:57 PM
39	Love the cable look, but would support the decision of the neighborhood. Those cables could block views, etc. I could go either way.	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 PM
40	Ugly.	Oct 5, 2012 12:46 PM
41	always better; should do this instead of the downtown tunnel	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
42	This is the most attractive design both for the homeowners nearby and the users but if it is too expensive or unworkable, the other option is OK too.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
43	It looks like but it will take away the view from gorgeous Seattle!	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 PM
44	pick whichever one is easier to maintain and more resistant to earthquakes.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
45	no preference in visual impact over box girder	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
46	I appreciate the cable stayed bridge both aesthetically and structurally.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
47	Better-looking bridge design.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
48	preferred option by far	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM
49	Build the cheaper, easier to maintain option.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
50	I like this design more as it will change the style of bridge we have in the area, we don't have many cable stayed bridges in the UW/lake region.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
51	Do not like this option - the bridge dwarfs the surrounding areas	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
52	do not like it as much	Oct 5, 2012 12:00 PM
53	Yes, very cool! Probably works very well too.	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
54	Pretty and striking	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
55	I prefer the look of this option. It will be a bridge that will be beautiful to look at for generations and has a limited footprint in the water, improving access and sight lines in the area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
56	My Preferred Style. A beautiful addition to the neighborhood.	Oct 5, 2012 11:36 AM
57	Much more impressive, beautiful architecture.	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
58	This design might be "neat" to the designers but is a busy eyesore in the area. This is the least desirable design feature I have seen proposed = Hate it!	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
59	This design appears more attractive from both a design as well as an environmental standpoint. Fewer pylons means less disruption of water which would allow better mixing.	Oct 5, 2012 11:32 AM
60	I strongly support this design.	Oct 5, 2012 11:29 AM
61	It is an attempt to produce an icon and it would be a far better icon than the design for the floating bridge. But this is the wrong place for a tall, iconic bridge. The slope of the roadway results in an awkward cable stayed structure and the height of the bridge viloates the lake space of Portage Bay.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
62	No preference.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
63	I like this.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
64	I like the cable stayed	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 AM
65	This is a beautiful design concept that adds to the overall beauty of the area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
66	uglier	Oct 5, 2012 10:59 AM
67	I like this design and the way it integrates into the landscpe	Oct 5, 2012 10:51 AM
68	Much more visually appealling and in keeping with the goal of creating something Seattle will be proud of.	Oct 5, 2012 10:29 AM
69	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
70	Looks expensive, lighting could be integrated more attractively. difficult to expand in the future.	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
71	This design is much more elegant and allows for better flow around Portage bay. This design is highly preferred	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
72	I believe the cable stay bridge is best viewed from great distances and this idea is too much for the close proximity to the homes. Residents have no idea how it would really look and impact the neighborhood because there are no 3D renderings available showing how it appears next to the residential area. I do not think this makes sense for Portage Bay/Roanoke Park. I do like cable-stay bridges, but they tend to be very large in scale, need lots of space around them to appreciate the design. This rendering is deceiving because the view is from the north from a distance, however if you live right by it you will only notice the massiveness of it not the lightness.	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 AM
73	This is very attractive.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
74	Superior to the box girder. Is steel not a viable option?	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
75	Highly preferable depending on relative cost analysis.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
76	too prominent, prefer box girder	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 AM
77	The cable stayed bridge is the most attractive option.	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM
78	I like it.	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
79	looks fine.	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
80	Beautiful, but belongs in a more urban environment, such as industrial area or downtown.	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
81	I prefer this design to the box girder design.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
82	It looks cool, but what do I know?	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
83	This is nice looking but if it is wider than the box girder I am not in favor of this design. Effective noise mitigation is my main concern.	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
84	Seems like it blocks the view more.	Oct 5, 2012 9:29 AM
85	I prefer the asthetic look of it. However, I think we should use the version that is structurally superior and more economical to implement.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
86	Excellent design, but impractical for neighborhood and Seattle area relative to current bridge designs.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
87	More interesting looking.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
88	Again, looks fine.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
89	Could be made very pretty! We all have to look at it anyway. Is it any cheaper/safer/better?	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
90	I like it. Does it cost more though. Ultimately I'd be in favor of a design that meets the needs of traffic or improves movement and is as cost effective as possible.	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM
91	no opinion	Oct 5, 2012 8:57 AM
92	Impressive impressive visually but might get lost in all the sail boat rigging and makes the hill side look busy with existing houses and roads cutting through the trees	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
93	More shapeful. Says to the eye that this bridge is something important (is it?). Consider having a third cable stay to continue the design to Montlake.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
94	much more worthy of the grand site it occupies than a box girder.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
95	Unsightly - prefer the Box Girder design.	Oct 5, 2012 8:50 AM
96	Probably the best concept so far, it is a lighter airier design that will not shade Portage Bay as much as the other option and will help preserve neighborhood views.	Oct 5, 2012 8:48 AM
97	This is the only option that should be considered if we are to make a statement about a Seattle Gateway.	Oct 5, 2012 8:36 AM
98	I like this one better, but worry about cost.	Oct 5, 2012 8:33 AM
99	I do not think that cables are an esthetic improvement over looking at a green hillside.	Oct 5, 2012 8:23 AM
100	The cable stayed is more aesthetically pleasing.	Oct 5, 2012 8:13 AM
101	Seems more intrusive, but that may just be the artist's rendering.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
102	NO COMMENT	Oct 5, 2012 7:51 AM
103	It's cool looking. I don't know enough about the merits of a cable-stayed bridge versus a box girder bridge to be more specific than that.	Oct 5, 2012 7:40 AM
104	This is more attractive than the box girder concept, but I wonder if it is also more expensive. I would favor the cheaper option if the savings are used to build a pedestrian and bicycle facility on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
105	better	Oct 5, 2012 7:30 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
106	Cool.	Oct 5, 2012 7:23 AM
107	I like this provided that the cables & support structures do not greatly increase the impact on the neighborhood.	Oct 5, 2012 7:13 AM
108	I doubt this colorful and upbeat illustrations represents the reality of concrete, steel, and traffic in portage Bay, though it certainly does look more appealing than the box girder design.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
109	Looks great.	Oct 5, 2012 7:09 AM
110	perhaps long term maintenance, painting, etc might add to the long term cost over alternate plan	Oct 5, 2012 7:02 AM
111	like this one better	Oct 5, 2012 6:43 AM
112	Better option	Oct 5, 2012 6:17 AM
113	I believe it looks too large for the area. We have natural beauty so we don't need a beautiful bridge. I would be fine with this if it was the less expensive option.	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM
114	Best option	Oct 5, 2012 5:20 AM
115	Like	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 AM
116	Not in favor due line of sight impact.	Oct 5, 2012 4:53 AM
117	I like it better!	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 AM
118	more visually intrusive, but bridges can be beautiful!	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 PM
119	Too elaborate, and as stated above, detracts from the natural beauty of the area. The vista is currently so nice when heading eastbound on 520 from I-5 to Montlake. Why add extra barriers to try to see through?	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 PM
120	the artist rendered just what you wanted us to see - the repeated shapes of Mt Rainer	Oct 4, 2012 11:10 PM
121	beautiful.	Oct 4, 2012 10:49 PM
122	Looks good. Maybe moving left cables further to the left would look more balanced.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
123	I like the seemingly smaller footprint.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
124	cool looking but too expensive	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 PM
125	Too visible, spend the money on sound walls and quiet pavement instead.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
126	Again looks good. I live on [redacted] and noise is worse below with current bridge. will this bridge transfer sound to those above. Not interested in high bridge with high noise to properties whose current value is less noise.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
127	It is a prettier design, and more modern looking. But it will also be more visually	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
	obtrusive.	
128	I don't like it. Not at all!	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 PM
129	This bridge is too high and over powers the area. Portage Bay is not San Francisco Bay,	Oct 4, 2012 9:49 PM
130	Detracts from landscape.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
131	Takes up a lot of view space. Since it's not the height of say, San Francisco Bay Bridge, it seems unnecessary.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
132	Undesirable. The cable stayed bridge distracts from the natural beauty of the landscape and is unnecessary.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
133	seems intrusive and detracts from the natural appearance of the neighborhood	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
134	i like this, i think it would turn out beautifully, but i'm sure there will be push back.	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
135	You close the bridge so often it will never be paid for	Oct 4, 2012 9:11 PM
136	Draws more attention to the bridge. Don't want any lighting that affect local neighbors and affect their sleep.	Oct 4, 2012 9:11 PM
137	Size and scale seems to big for the surrounding area. I would prefer a bridge design that fades away into the landscape versus overpowering it.	Oct 4, 2012 9:01 PM
138	I like the look.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
139	Cable stayed bridge would be more elegant and a design that would create an iconic bridge rather than the boring concrete monstrosity we have now	Oct 4, 2012 8:53 PM
140	I like it	Oct 4, 2012 8:51 PM
141	Pretty.	Oct 4, 2012 8:47 PM
142	A new look for the area. Seems to create more visual obstruction.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
143	It could be elegant, but would be probably obscure more views that it would create. Our trees look better than those cables.	Oct 4, 2012 8:35 PM
144	Lovely, evokes the masts of a sailboat	Oct 4, 2012 8:24 PM
145	looks fine.	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
146	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
147	Much nicer!	Oct 4, 2012 7:46 PM
148	The portage bay bridge isn't important enough to justify a cable-stayed bridge. It looks out of place.	Oct 4, 2012 7:34 PM
149	I'm interested in the cable stayed design because of its light and graceful	Oct 4, 2012 7:18 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
	appearance, which mirrors the shape of Mt, Rainier and surrounding hills. I'd like to see drawings of a cable-stayed bridge with only one tower if it's a safe, viable design for the location.	
150	The cable stayed bridge looks more elegant than the box girder.	Oct 4, 2012 6:54 PM
151	My thoughts? Less cost, more room for cars.	Oct 4, 2012 6:33 PM
152	The cable design is more elegant.	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
153	Looks good. Also, perhaps this would lead to fewer pillars to the ground.	Oct 4, 2012 6:00 PM
154	if this is higher cost than get rid of the idea	Oct 4, 2012 5:56 PM
155	Add a bike lane.	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM
156	more potential for view obstruction	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM
157	i think the cables look nicer, more classy than the box-girder version.	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
158	too much attention visually to the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 4:55 PM
159	More elegant than the other option. Easier on the eyes and if it's done right it could be a Seattle sightseeing place for when people visit. Heck, you might even get more people to pay the toll fee just to go over the cable stayed design bridge!!!	Oct 4, 2012 4:50 PM
160	better	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
161	Either bridge type is acceptable. Aesthetics are not as important to me as functionality of the bridge. It must support pedestrian and cyclist usage.	Oct 4, 2012 4:38 PM
162	Too visible. Again, we don't want a big display.	Oct 4, 2012 4:23 PM
163	I like it better. I like cable bridges, as they are bold and beautiful.	Oct 4, 2012 4:02 PM
164	I think in other locations this could really be aesthetically pleasing. But located so closely to the hillside, I think it was just block more views and look "messy". I think the other design provides a better view of the trees. Note: I could be swayed if one design would result in less noise (but not sure if that's the case)	Oct 4, 2012 3:46 PM
165	That looks very pretty. :)	Oct 4, 2012 3:37 PM
166	iconic looks gives neighbourhood a classic, retro look	Oct 4, 2012 3:35 PM
167	I prefer this bridge even though it costs more. It is ascetically pleasing. I think the residents with a view of this bridge would enjoy it more too.	Oct 4, 2012 3:24 PM
168	much prettier, but how do the lifespan/ maintenance costs between the alternatives compare?	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
169	Doesn't matter much either way.	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
170	Love it!	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
171	Beautiful, iconic, my preference. Echos the mountains and speaks to our high tech roots.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
172	It's certainly pretty; will it be more expensive to maintain?	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
173	Either option looks good.	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
174	This looks way better.	Oct 4, 2012 2:12 PM
175	looks interesting and adds a symmetry with Mt Rainier.	Oct 4, 2012 1:58 PM
176	Obstructs views	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 PM
177	I prefer this aesthetic as it mimics the mountain landscape, adding to the visual value of the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:38 PM
178	Iconic, beautiful, pleasant, but not at the cost of safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
179	Stylish.	Oct 4, 2012 1:30 PM
180	looks nicer, but is more visually present.	Oct 4, 2012 1:28 PM
181	I am not a structural engineer or architecture critic. I'm not sure we wouldn't be better off without a freeway bridge through here, but if we're building a bridge, the type of bridge should be chosen based on durability and cost effectiveness, not the aesthetic preferences of the Greater Laurelhurst NIMBY Club.	Oct 4, 2012 1:19 PM
182	I think that this design could add a certain amount of character to the bridge that would otherwise be missing. However, I am against it if it comes at a cost of the view that the residents in the area would have.	Oct 4, 2012 1:04 PM
183	I prefer the cable stayed design aesthetically.	Oct 4, 2012 12:59 PM
184	yes	Oct 4, 2012 12:45 PM
185	overkill	Oct 4, 2012 12:39 PM
186	Cable stayed bridges are elegant, and presuming that they can support the load equally well as the box girder design, I would strongly prefer this design.	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
187	I prefer the aesthetics of this design, but believe cost should be the primary driver.	Oct 4, 2012 12:21 PM
188	The cables are too high in the air.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
189	much better... but get Santiago Calatrava to design it!	Oct 4, 2012 12:07 PM
190	Yes. Looks good, almost monumental. Do it!	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
191	It looks kind of neat	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM
192	Looks better, thinner road deck, but the disturbance of views is a con.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
193	Works as part of a "signature gateway" concept. Visibility from UW and Burke-Gilman trail would be neat.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
194	The bridge design is acceptable provided that it can accommodate an adequate pedestrian/bicycle path.	Oct 4, 2012 11:56 AM
195	Cable stayed bridges have a very cool look and I think would give the neighborhood some added character.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
196	This looks better to me.	Oct 4, 2012 11:51 AM
197	Way more fun.	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
198	Don't care.	Oct 4, 2012 11:44 AM
199	If done well, a cable stayed bridge could be beautiful and blend in with the landscape and, for pedestrians riding or walking by, could show the immense beauty of human engineering.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
200	if the number of tower structures is truely limited to 2, I support this. It will greatly improve the feel of the structure from on the ground, nearby.	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
201	not a priority	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
202	more aesthetically pleasing than the box girder but i want whichever one best supports bike/ped paths.	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
203	Obstructs views	Oct 4, 2012 11:22 AM
204	More attractive than the first alternative. References the mountains? Could become an attraction instead of a negative.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 AM
205	too big, too high, and I think wider.	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 AM
206	This is too imposing on the landscape. Doesn't integrate well.	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 AM
207	this just looks excessive.	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 AM
208	Looks good	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 AM
209	The cable stayed version is certainly more aesthetic.	Oct 4, 2012 9:36 AM
210	Concerned about higher profile and making bridge more of a focal point	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 AM
211	I like the box girder more.	Oct 4, 2012 9:18 AM
212	a fan, but worried about the obstruction of view and how does it affect the animals who use the bridge supports?	Oct 4, 2012 3:05 AM
213	Far more attractive, I'm strongly if favor as long as the costs are reasonably comparable. (It's not clear from the design document, but it seems like this may be true since longer spans possibly offset more expensive superstructure?)	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 AM
214	I prefer whatever option leaves the most money left over for mitigation of the	Oct 3, 2012 9:41 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
	impact of the bridge on the surrounding neighborhood and the building of the narrowest bridge possible with the most non motorized and transit options for those of us who do not drive but rely on Metro or our bikes or our feet.	
215	Attractive but if significantly more expensive, do not imiplement.	Oct 3, 2012 9:26 PM
216	The current design needs more architectural consideration. Please build that into your design-build plan.	Oct 3, 2012 8:42 PM
217	I like cable-stayed bridges in general for their aesthetics. I don't like the idea at this site because of the tall towers obstructing and taking over the views. An advantage is there would be fewer pillars and girders blocking local views, but the towers and cables would be seen from all over the area.	Oct 3, 2012 8:29 PM
218	More dramatic and less like a concrete freeway overpass. This is my preference.	Oct 3, 2012 8:27 PM
219	Love this. Make it stand out and be a beautiful work of art.	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 PM
220	Too big a profile for residential neighborhood.	Oct 3, 2012 6:59 PM
221	the current bridge is a blight; slender design may work better; impact on noise from bridge?	Oct 3, 2012 6:06 PM
222	Too bridgy for this location.	Oct 3, 2012 4:00 PM
223	Any concept must include sound barriers and should be as narrow as possible. This looks pretty cool.	Oct 3, 2012 2:40 PM
224	I'd rather look at the trees on our Northwest tree-lined hillside than another cable-stayed bridge that could be in any of dozens of cities.	Oct 3, 2012 2:39 PM
225	Looks AWESOME!	Oct 3, 2012 2:30 PM
226	Unless much less costly, it's less preferable. It makes us look like Vancouver, BC.	Oct 3, 2012 1:54 PM
227	Looks much too visually intrusive and out-of-scale for the area (because of the height of the towers and "fans" of cables). Unless it is much cheaper than the box-girder bridge, I would not support it.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
228	could be pretty neat, though it looks really massive	Oct 3, 2012 1:13 PM
229	Prettier from a distance, but would probably piss off the neighbors more.	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
230	like this one better	Oct 3, 2012 1:06 PM
231	Looks cool and progressive	Oct 3, 2012 12:55 PM
232	I am concerned about impact of tall cable towers on views. Perhaps a cable stayed bridge with only one tower would at least partly solve this problem. Can we see what that would look like: where the single tower would be placed and how tall it would be?	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
233	I like this idea	Oct 3, 2012 11:53 AM
234	unique element and style for west side	Oct 3, 2012 11:53 AM
235	The cable stayed bridge looks better than the box girder design.	Oct 3, 2012 11:36 AM
236	I like the look of the cable stayed bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
237	I think it doesn't fit the context - it competes with Mt Raininer and blocks views. I don't like it.	Oct 3, 2012 10:36 AM
238	I prefer this design	Oct 3, 2012 10:29 AM
239	A cable stayed bridge if done properly and artfully, could be an important visual identifier of Seattle and could be a good option.	Oct 3, 2012 10:17 AM
240	See above answer. The less conspicuous, the better. I'd rather look at the distant mountains that bridge turrets.	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 AM
241	Prefered. It is more aesthetically pleasing, but cables may obstruct views.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
242	"Long span bridge type is not economical for the varying width of the Portage Bay Bridge". Better to have pedestrian infrastructure than add cost that we don't already have budgeted. Priority should be bike/ped/transit.	Oct 3, 2012 9:44 AM
243	A chance to make a very cool design impact that is still in keeping with the surrounding views and neighborhood. Portland doesn't have to be the only city with lots of cool bridges.	Oct 3, 2012 9:34 AM
244	looks like a nicer looking bridge but sticks out more in the natural landscape.	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM
245	Although it's more visually busy, it's more attractive. I'd rather have something that is interesting to look at over the next 50 years, than a design as boring and disruptive as the I-5 bridge over Lake Union/ship canal.	Oct 3, 2012 9:11 AM
246	keep the bridge minimal. the landscape is the art.	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
247	I love the look but is it true it must be considerable wider than the other concept?	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
248	Not a good choice. Too visually intrusive.	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 AM
249	I love it.	Oct 3, 2012 8:05 AM
250	Cables are not visually appealing!	Oct 3, 2012 7:57 AM
251	I really like this design.	Oct 3, 2012 7:40 AM
252	More sturcture on top but less ground supports. Same as B/G as far as cost vs longevity. Which ever has the best value s/b the choice to take.	Oct 3, 2012 6:57 AM
253	I like this concept much more. The space under the bridge seems much more usable, and it is more visually striking.	Oct 2, 2012 11:42 PM
254	It is too visible. It overwhelms the scenery around there.	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
255	Could be an eyesore. The towers could really obstruct the views.	Oct 2, 2012 8:52 PM
256	I like the cable. Where is the bicycle lane?	Oct 2, 2012 8:41 PM
257	Please no. It interrupts the nature and hills that dominate Seattle.	Oct 2, 2012 6:55 PM
258	This is way classier.	Oct 2, 2012 5:40 PM
259	more intrusive	Oct 2, 2012 4:21 PM
260	No opinion. Whatever is more cost effective.	Oct 2, 2012 3:14 PM
261	Gorgeous design, but it looks like it would be more at home in Portland than Seattle. The cable stayed design is more uncommon here (not counting Tacoma Narrows Bridge).	Oct 2, 2012 11:58 AM
262	could be nice if it blends in well	Oct 2, 2012 11:04 AM
263	Prefer this.	Oct 2, 2012 10:07 AM
264	Seems out of place and would introduce unnecessary visual clutter.	Oct 2, 2012 9:51 AM
265	The cable-stayed bridge design is far too visually messy for such a visually complex area. Drivers don't need any more distraction than they already have in an area of boats, trees, a busy entry from the university district and split entries to I-5. Don't add cables and such to shimmer in the wind and sunlight.	Oct 2, 2012 9:39 AM
266	It makes a better statement than the Box Girder design, it is more airy. It's better suited to marking the entrance in our city.	Oct 2, 2012 9:38 AM
267	no comment.	Oct 2, 2012 8:37 AM
268	Cool! More space underneath for boating, and looks better.	Oct 1, 2012 9:22 PM
269	lots of costly maintenance, no? blocks views; kinda ugly relative to box girder	Oct 1, 2012 7:15 PM
270	Blocks the trees. I don't like this one.	Oct 1, 2012 6:44 PM
271	It looks very fancy but would probably look great.	Oct 1, 2012 4:07 PM
272	I like this one better as it seems less invasive to the environment	Oct 1, 2012 2:54 PM
273	I do not like it; too intrusive	Oct 1, 2012 2:19 PM
274	Looks good. Appears light and airy...	Oct 1, 2012 2:07 PM
275	Is a bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path included? Why not?	Oct 1, 2012 1:21 PM
276	aesthetically, this much better looking than the box girder version. Seems like it makes more of a design statement - in a good way. BUT, go with the one that can support and sustain mass transit rail options like light rail or monorail.	Oct 1, 2012 1:17 PM
277	I like the signature design of this style, plus the fact that it will have less footprint in the water.	Oct 1, 2012 12:38 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
278	Unless there is some huge advantage that I am not seeing, avoid at all cost.	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
279	I've a preference for the cable stayed design	Oct 1, 2012 11:41 AM
280	Exciting.	Sep 30, 2012 9:18 PM
281	They are preferred in regards to look. They strengthen the view and make the skyline more prominent.	Sep 30, 2012 7:46 PM
282	Not in favor	Sep 30, 2012 4:55 PM
283	It is more visually obtrusive. The goal should be to minimize visual and sound impact.	Sep 30, 2012 3:02 PM
284	Less ground/water contact is better.	Sep 30, 2012 9:53 AM
285	More asthetically pleasing from a distance but disrupts landowner views.	Sep 30, 2012 7:22 AM
286	Much more intrusive to the eye	Sep 30, 2012 7:10 AM
287	... but a cable design better, despitie sticking out more ... Hard to say. Maybe the purely technical reasons can tip the balance.	Sep 30, 2012 3:37 AM
288	Ugly! Makes this area look like Tacoma. Accckkk!!!!!! Ugly!!!!	Sep 29, 2012 11:34 PM
289	Vote for cable stayed bridge	Sep 29, 2012 10:06 PM
290	Unless the span/foundation system justifies this don't pay more for this. If you select this option be sure to get a good designer or you risk a clunky attempt at structural drama.	Sep 29, 2012 9:12 PM
291	More picturesque, I think most people like cable stayed bridges. If it works as well as box girder then do it.	Sep 29, 2012 7:41 PM
292	This rendition is most attractive. I am strongly in favor of 3 lines for traffic going each way. Make it large enough to accommodate future traffic needs.	Sep 29, 2012 7:32 PM
293	looks pricey, obtrusive visually and not germane to this locale.	Sep 29, 2012 6:17 PM
294	It's prettier than the box girder design.	Sep 29, 2012 4:26 PM
295	I love cable stayed bridge design.	Sep 29, 2012 2:35 PM
296	It looks pretty, and is more iconic for the neighborhood. I also like that it is less disruptive to marine life.	Sep 29, 2012 1:23 PM
297	It is more beautiful, but I would focus on what is cheaper.	Sep 29, 2012 1:20 PM
298	If it's equally safe and cheap, I prefer this. If it's less safe or more expensive, stick with box girder.	Sep 29, 2012 1:13 PM
299	Visually intrusive	Sep 29, 2012 10:07 AM
300	More iconic looking, but more visual noise. I think I prefer the girder concept	Sep 29, 2012 9:28 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
	more	
301	This looks like an eye sore. Girder looks better.	Sep 29, 2012 7:50 AM
302	No. Costly, limited future potential, does not blend, costly long term maintenance.	Sep 29, 2012 6:44 AM
303	A fun touch but glamorizes the roadway.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 PM
304	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it safely and easily.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
305	Definitely preferred visually.	Sep 28, 2012 9:16 PM
306	I like the look of this, I know the look isn't anything new but to me it is a classic look that stands the test of time. This design also has the potential for seasonal decor.	Sep 28, 2012 9:07 PM
307	Cable stayed design looks like it could reduce the number of footers.	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
308	I prefer its appearance but the selection should be based on cost, durability, ease of maintenance and similar engineering considerations.	Sep 28, 2012 7:21 PM
309	Interesting design, but much more visually imposing.	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM
310	Great idea if built as a gateway into Seattle. e.g. totem pole pylons, Seasonal or event colored LED illumiinated cables	Sep 28, 2012 5:47 PM
311	A lot of visual noise. Would cable stays impact bird flyways?	Sep 28, 2012 4:22 PM
312	Nice classic design.	Sep 28, 2012 3:53 PM
313	I think it will open up the area for a better connection to the water. Some neighbors have complained about the mass of cables above the bridge. But homes south of the bridge are much higher on the hill, I don't think their view will be negatively impacted. The cable bridge design also means less footings in the water, less soil disruption.	Sep 28, 2012 2:52 PM
314	I like the look of cable stayed bridges. Very class!	Sep 28, 2012 2:36 PM
315	I love it. We can't avoid a wide bridge crossing Portage bay, and this is a confident and beautiful way to do it. There is something exciting about crossing a suspension bridge that you judt don't get with a box girder design.	Sep 28, 2012 2:20 PM
316	don't care	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM
317	Beautifil but more expensive right?	Sep 28, 2012 2:00 PM
318	The cable design is more architectural and therefore more visually interesting. It adds to the view rather than detracting from it.	Sep 28, 2012 1:55 PM
319	looks pretty on paper...but it is visually intrusive.	Sep 28, 2012 1:47 PM
320	I think cable stayed bridges are cool.	Sep 28, 2012 1:38 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
321	No - reduce the visual impact dont increase.	Sep 28, 2012 12:49 PM
322	Like it, distincive - prefer this	Sep 28, 2012 12:09 PM
323	I think these are attractive.	Sep 28, 2012 11:53 AM
324	Adds a new visual (but prehaps unwelcome) element. If embraced, can be a signature piece.	Sep 28, 2012 11:32 AM
325	Cute, but unnecessary. Blocks the views of the ridge.	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
326	I actually prefer cable stayed from an aesthetic standpoint.	Sep 28, 2012 11:08 AM
327	I like it too.	Sep 28, 2012 10:49 AM
328	This option seems more architecturally desirable than the box girder concept.	Sep 28, 2012 10:01 AM
329	It is fine, do which ever is best combination of lower cost and most aesthetic.	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
330	Love it	Sep 28, 2012 8:31 AM
331	The Cable Stayed Bridge has a large visual impact on the area. It also matches much of the bridge work in the Northwest. IF it will reduce the foot print of the bridge and speed up construction then it may be a very good design. Finding designs to limit the visual impact the the local homes would make it much more exciting.	Sep 28, 2012 6:21 AM
332	Key considerations would be: 1. Cost, 2. Environmental Impact, 3. "Performance" of the structure	Sep 27, 2012 11:41 PM
333	These are overused and overrated and would clutter the landscape, which actually has buildings (not just forest). However, if they reduce environmental impacts, it might be worthwhile. I	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 PM
334	Fab... let's make a statement that is iconic.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 PM
335	Seems like this would ruin views for many people. We have existing water, mountain and Husky Stadium views which should be emphasized. You can ruin a good thing by trying to improve on it.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 PM
336	Well, they are prettier than boxes. But that's nowhere near as important as good non-motorized trail connections.	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 PM
337	Beautiful.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 PM
338	prefer but not if more expensive	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 PM
339	Build it	Sep 27, 2012 9:20 PM
340	i like the look of it	Sep 27, 2012 8:29 PM
341	Vancouver has many bridges like this and Europe as well. These can be very attractive, strong and cost effective. If clean lines I'm all for it, it will look good in this area...	Sep 27, 2012 7:51 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
342	No	Sep 27, 2012 6:14 PM
343	Elegant	Sep 27, 2012 5:45 PM
344	Does it last longer?	Sep 27, 2012 5:32 PM
345	Preferred option, Simpler and takes up less space.	Sep 27, 2012 5:29 PM
346	Cable stayed bridges are beautiful pieces of art, however, I like them best where they stand up above the landscape and can be seen from all sides. In this location it will be hidden down under Capital hill.	Sep 27, 2012 5:20 PM
347	Looks nice, could add some character to the area and variety. Also might help attract tourists etc.	Sep 27, 2012 5:07 PM
348	The towers and cables seem to overwhelm the scale and nature of the abutting neighborhood.	Sep 27, 2012 4:46 PM
349	I can only speak from an beauty point of view and find this much nicer. I am really impressed with the new cable stayed bridges in the Vancouver area and one I saw in Boston recently. I have both driven and biked across them and find them safe as well as beautiful.	Sep 27, 2012 4:44 PM
350	I don't like it.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
351	cable stayed is more aesthetically pleasing to me	Sep 27, 2012 4:37 PM
352	This design adds too much visual clutter in the sky and is not worth the reduced number of support footings.	Sep 27, 2012 4:02 PM
353	seems like it would be more expensive, if so I would skip it. The area has enough beauty that adding to it is not nesessary	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
354	I like it... very beautiful. Mimics the mountains.	Sep 27, 2012 3:59 PM
355	I like cable-stayed bridge design -- I don't see the point of trying to hid the reality of the bridge; better to make it beautiful.	Sep 27, 2012 3:57 PM
356	In terms of pure aesthetics, I feel the cable stayed design is more visually striking and vivid. The angles somewhat mirror that found in our two regional mountain ranges. I believe this would visually stand out, in a very positive way. The reduction in bridge columns is also critical, and very aesthetically positive.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
357	If designed properly this could become a local landmark. However, if we cut corners and make it cheap or garish then it will become a local joke and eyesore	Sep 27, 2012 3:46 PM
358	might be too big for the space, visually	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
359	I like the look more of the cable-stayed design.	Sep 27, 2012 3:20 PM
360	I like the cable stay - please build this bridge. I like that it is iconic and adds beauty to Portage Bay. I also like that it reduces the number of pillars that end up in the water on Portage Bay.	Sep 27, 2012 3:17 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
361	Seems fine.	Sep 27, 2012 3:00 PM
362	this is a much better looking bridge over the box girder design.	Sep 27, 2012 2:56 PM
363	Much more elegant.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
364	I like the cable stayed design	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
365	This option is much more attractive, aesthetically speaking	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
366	make sure the cables are thin and dont obstruct the nearby neighbors. reduce the number of supports in the ground. It could become the icon for the neighborhood, but should not detract from the natural setting this neighborhood has already established.	Sep 27, 2012 1:55 PM
367	no strong preference	Sep 27, 2012 1:43 PM
368	We don't have enough cable stayed bridges in the Seattle area. In fact, I don't recall any. I feel that this would add the most aesthetically as we'll as functionally.	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
369	Took ugly...takes up too much visual space (even if it looks pretty it's still out of place).	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
370	It looks like it would effect peoples' views.	Sep 27, 2012 1:22 PM
371	this design appears to be more attractive and give more water clearance	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
372	i am not in favor of this design.	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
373	It detracts from the nature goal in the mission and accentuates the bridge which is not ideal	Sep 27, 2012 12:43 PM
374	Would look better with a bike path.	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
375	Cable-stayed bridges are certainly pretty to look at!	Sep 27, 2012 12:29 PM
376	the cable stays are much prefered as they appear much more delicate in the landscape and minimize the contact with the bridge on the ground.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
377	Excessive visual impact. Do not like it.	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
378	big change to what we currently have, so visually jarring, but if this is a better way to build and maintain our roads, then we should be considering this option seriously.	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
379	Less desirable if it has a negative impact on skyline and views.	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM
380	This design is preferable if it can reduce the visual mass of the structure.	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM
381	Much more aesthetic than the box girder.	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
382	I support the cheaper option	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
383	I like the cable bridge design compared to the box girder.	Sep 27, 2012 12:01 PM
384	if designed well, this could become a signature view in Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
385	I like it, it gives an identity to the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 11:51 AM
386	This may be more aesthetically pleasing from a distance.	Sep 27, 2012 11:50 AM
387	Could be artistic-looking, but "busy."	Sep 27, 2012 11:41 AM
388	Dependent upon cost analysis cmpared to above not as attractive...	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
389	more aesthetically pleasing for the city	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
390	Like	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
391	Attractive. Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
392	Which ever is cheaper overall (Construction / Maintenance / Replacement).	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
393	This design is too disruptive to the natural lines of the hill.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
394	Much more elegant and visually appealing - would enhance the project, but need to make sure it doesn't kill important features such as bicycle access improvements due to extra cost.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
395	no--what's the point? earthquake readiness would make this a yes for me, anything else seems unnecessary. This area is not a focal point in the city. I like the low key option.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
396	Nicer looking than box girders.	Sep 27, 2012 11:16 AM
397	If done right, these can be quite beautiful.	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
398	This is a great way to clutter the landscape with unnecessary overhead support. In other words, it's a dreadful idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
399	cables look cooler!	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
400	My opinion depends on which concept lasts longer and is more economical over its lifetime	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
401	Cable stayed is more distinctive	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM
402	I like the design concept of the cable stayed.	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
403	4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
404	I like this design better than box girder	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
405	This seems better to create an iconic architecture to the region.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
406	Adequate design. Mosre asthetically pleasing, concerns that it may handle less traffic and less able to be expanded.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
407	Properly executed the cable stayed design is more attractive.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
408	Visually it's very appealing, but doesn't seem to fit in with the local surroundings.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
409	I like the cable stayed design much better.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
410	to big and showy for that spot. only consider it if there are cost savings.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
411	Esthetically more pleasing. This is preferable unless the other design is more durable or significantly less costly.	Sep 27, 2012 10:40 AM
412	Visually overwhelming for the area.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
413	preferred	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
414	Love it! Really looks pretty. The box girder type seems so boring.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
415	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
416	its beautiful	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
417	Could be beautiful like bridge in tacoma. Cable stayed design could enhance the scenic view where the box beam is more subdued. Cost is also a concern.. If cable stayed is more expensive and leads to losing ped / cycle improvements then lower cost option to get ped / cylcle accomodation.	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
418	This design looks better (pretty subjective ... as to what appeals to people) than the other ... but cost definitely needs to be a consideration.	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
419	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
420	A good looking option..	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
421	Much nicer looking	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
422	not needed	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
423	More visibly attractive	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 AM
424	Looks great and can be an asset to the area with the benefit of less supports on the ground than the box girder approach.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 AM
425	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
426	Less ground struts would be better for the lot owners in the area, and for boats in the area, a great idea	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
427	Better.	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
428	I'm fine with either style	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
429	I prefer the more open feeling space under the bridge, and I just like the way cable stayed bridges look.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
430	A beautifully designed cable stay will better evoke our maritime heritage, will bring more beauty to the project and will be something you look back on and say "I'm glad we built that."	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
431	Most desirable aesthetically	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
432	Cable Stayed provides more visual interest.	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
433	Cable stayed is far more visually appealing and can add beauty to an otherwise ugly gash through surrounding green areas.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
434	The cable-stayed bridge is prettier	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
435	?	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
436	see comment above.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
437	More interesting... Perhaps an opportunity to get a famous architect to design and bring more notoriety to seattle!	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
438	If you look at the history of Seattle during the World's Fair it was supposed to be the futuristic city. Either design which is chosen should have a futuristic feel. One example of a futuristic cable bridge is the futuristic bridge they are building in Dubai. I am sure we are not willing to spend as much money, but we could do some of the concepts to make it look as futuristic. LINK: http://dailyapps.net/2008/02/dubai-building-worlds-most-futuristic-arch-bridge/	Sep 27, 2012 9:47 AM
439	cable stayed design is aesthetically beautiful - but I would like to know more about the impacts on birds/bats...etc (if there is one).	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
440	Sweet choice. Of course, there never should have been a highway in this neighborhood in the first place.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
441	I prefer option 8.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
442	I like this design best	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
443	too much of a visual impact	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
444	Looks like a classic bridge. Nice design	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
445	fancy but how much more will this cost?	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
446	I fear architects who like to make their mark. Colorful and modern designs often look trite, and in 10 years, dated. Some designs, however, look like careful engineering, practical, simple, and necessary.	Sep 26, 2012 11:59 PM
447	Do not like this concept. It will ruin views from Bagley View Point.	Sep 26, 2012 5:56 PM
448	Not as aethetically appealing as the box girder design.	Sep 26, 2012 2:59 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
449	Rocks....makes a statement that says it is proud to be here	Sep 26, 2012 11:16 AM
450	The cable design is more scenic and provides more visual interest over the box girder design. It's something to look at, rather than try to hide.	Sep 26, 2012 11:12 AM
451	like this design, think it brings something other than just concrete	Sep 25, 2012 8:15 PM
452	Way too much visual clutter for this area. Likely very pricey too. The cable stay locks in the design too.	Sep 25, 2012 9:34 AM
453	I have a slight preference for a cable stayed bridge. It has a classic feel and will appear "cleaner" since it can likely be painted for a fresh look and colors could be selected to blend in with the surrounding area.	Sep 25, 2012 9:16 AM
454	less desirable visually	Sep 25, 2012 8:48 AM
455	impedes views of Portage Bay for those on the hill (we are not there)	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 AM
456	This does not seem like a good spot for a Cable stayed design. I am a big fan of engineering as beauty ... and this design could look really nice some places ... not here ... here it looks big and ugly. Also part of the beauty of the current bridge is the view , and Cable Stayed bridges tend to make it hard / impossible to enjoy the view as you are passing over them. If this design is significantly cheaper, go for it ... but aesthetically it does not appeal to me.	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
457	It's OK but from the pictures, I prefer the look of the box girder.	Sep 24, 2012 9:14 PM
458	More lines in the sky, blech! Nice clear access under the bridge, but the design is clearly out of context with its setting and adds nothing but clutter to the view. If this were an airport overpass it would look great, but absolutely not in a heavily treed residential neighborhood.	Sep 24, 2012 6:13 PM
459	Obviously, bigger visual impact. It doesn't seem any better to me, and I don't especially like the modernist feel of this picture.	Sep 24, 2012 5:41 PM
460	It could be too disracting from the natural landscape.	Sep 24, 2012 2:18 PM
461	I prefer the cable stayed design, more aesthetically pleasing.	Sep 24, 2012 12:56 PM
462	Cable-stayed bridges are more aesthetically pleasing to the eye from distance. However, I would not like to pay more for the privilege. If the cable stayed design is cheaper (all safety and practical considerations being held equal), that is what we should build.	Sep 24, 2012 12:39 PM
463	Much more dynamic - the cable-stayed bridge echoes the form of the mountains beyond, and also provides construction and environmental benefits.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
464	I am in support if it is the safest and longest-term solution.	Sep 24, 2012 12:30 PM
465	That said, this is quite elegant and I think it meets the vision of "City meets Nature."	Sep 24, 2012 12:08 PM
466	I like this concept. It looks more aesthetic.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
467	CABLE STAYED design is a POSITIVE. I own the house at [redacted] (northeast corner of 11th & Edgar) and have to look down on the concrete flat scar of 4 lane I-520. The thought of having to look down on a 6 lane concrete mass is revolting. A cable stayed design is a positive front door approach to a beautiful city.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
468	I like the cable stayed bridge idea - it looks beautiful.	Sep 24, 2012 12:00 PM
469	Either way a bike path would help	Sep 24, 2012 11:58 AM
470	More visually interesting, but detracts more from the view.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
471	The box girder design concept looks more appealing than the cable stayed bridge. The cable stayed bridge draws attention to the bridge.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
472	Does not fit in the landscape	Sep 24, 2012 10:00 AM
473	Although I think this bridge design is the more attractive one in itself, I think I would choose the lower-profile option to detract less from the beauty of the setting.	Sep 23, 2012 6:43 PM
474	See previous comments above.	Sep 23, 2012 8:19 AM
475	Cable stay is more monumental and in line with the community's desire to create a gateway. UNclear tome if it offers any structural advantages or disadvantages	Sep 22, 2012 12:35 PM
476	First off, small detail: you cannot see Mt. Rainier from this perspective. The cable stay is the best solution. Two towers are not acceptable. The design should include a single tower. I am not sure if it should a bit more massive to match what the Olmsted's would have design. Or should it be modern, matching the sail approach.	Sep 22, 2012 11:03 AM
477	Looks fine. If it is easier and less expensive to build and maintain, I say go for it.	Sep 22, 2012 10:33 AM
478	too much visual disruption	Sep 22, 2012 10:01 AM
479	I still like this option more than the box	Sep 22, 2012 2:39 AM
480	Blocks views and is unsightly.	Sep 22, 2012 2:35 AM
481	As an engineer, I generally like cable stayed bridges, and this one is no exception; however, from the renderings, it looks as if the box girder will fade into the surroudings better - I think most residents will prefer that to the cable-stayed design, which definitely stands out.	Sep 21, 2012 3:31 PM
482	With a large industry push to use less materials, reduce environmental impacts, and make things lighter, this would be a perfect opportunity for WSDOT to keep on the cutting edge. It may be more expensive, but far less impacts to the marine environment during and after construction, as well as less materials makes this my choice the new bridge. Less disruptions to the surrounding industries also helps. Aethestically, it is extremely pleasing, and gives me the urge and desire to live in the Montlake area.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
483	While these are beautiful bridge designs in general, I think it's too much	Sep 20, 2012 9:47 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
	manmade material in the confined space/	
484	Only useful if the mid-rise on the east side of Montlake is designed the same way. Otherwise it's like jamming a Corvette front onto a 57 Bel-Air rear end. Then esthetically, friends.	Sep 20, 2012 3:09 PM
485	High profile, better looking, fewer contact points with water will allow better access to Community Center shoreline/wetlands.	Sep 20, 2012 10:33 AM
486	Looks like Tacoma!	Sep 19, 2012 3:22 PM
487	Don't like it.	Sep 19, 2012 1:29 PM
488	I think that this design is too imposing. We want to see the views provided from either side of the bridge, not the bridge itself.	Sep 18, 2012 3:16 PM
489	Adds too much visual distraction, a cluttered view of the area. P	Sep 18, 2012 12:05 PM
490	OMG! So ugly. So view blocking. I cannot believe you are considering this.	Sep 18, 2012 11:48 AM
491	There's no question this is the best and best looking option and would be an iconic structure for Seattle...	Sep 18, 2012 6:38 AM
492	Absoulutely not !!	Sep 17, 2012 9:28 PM
493	That's definitely the preferred choice for aesthetics and minimal impact below.	Sep 17, 2012 5:13 PM
494	This is my preferred design-much more attractive	Sep 17, 2012 4:36 PM
495	PRETTY!	Sep 17, 2012 3:16 PM
496	Is one or the other easier to provide pedestrian and bike facilities, either when built or as an add-on?	Sep 17, 2012 3:04 PM
497	This is a beautiful bridge. It looks light and its touch points in the water are minimized.	Sep 17, 2012 11:16 AM
498	Looks nice. Mostly concerned about the cost impacts and maintenance long term.	Sep 17, 2012 10:41 AM
499	CABLE is WAY nicer. probably more expensive, but it will look sooo much nicer. do it. we need it.	Sep 17, 2012 9:29 AM
500	Design of towers will be critical for aesthetic success	Sep 17, 2012 6:11 AM
501	Although I think that this type of bridge can be very attractive, I'm not sure that it blends into the neighborhood. It might detract too much from the neighborhood.	Sep 16, 2012 7:33 PM
502	Support this design and urge that it be selected. Fewer water supports and graceful saliboat contour is a new arppropriate design for the area. I've heard that the hillside Residents have do not like the blinking Aerial lred ights on the top of each support span--but I would hope that they would adjust seeing the improved bridge design as a replacemtn of the existing ugly structure.,	Sep 16, 2012 4:01 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
503	Like the lighter structure, but not the heaviness of the towers and larger visual impact.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
504	The towers are more visually intrusive, but the reduced number of pylons in the water is an improvement.	Sep 16, 2012 10:00 AM
505	too imposing in an inampropriate area. This is a residential area. That that must always be taken into all the design decisions. Designers will want to trend to the cool and grandous, but that is not what we need here.	Sep 16, 2012 9:02 AM
506	Likely prefer this to the box girder..Needs to be graceful, feel light! has to be interesting to look at.	Sep 16, 2012 7:21 AM
507	Not appropriate in Portage Bay "amphitheater" (these bridges are better in wide open areas with long vistas).	Sep 16, 2012 2:19 AM
508	waste of time and money	Sep 15, 2012 9:24 PM
509	In general I find the cable version more interesting visually but no strong opinion here.	Sep 15, 2012 8:36 PM
510	Beautiful bridge, but would rather have box girder to preserve views from homes in the area.	Sep 15, 2012 7:48 PM
511	Like I said before, I think it'd be more visually intrusive	Sep 15, 2012 6:10 PM
512	I prefer the box girder alternative because it is less obtrusive to the view.	Sep 15, 2012 5:13 PM
513	Destroys more views than the other concept	Sep 15, 2012 2:51 PM
514	Looks better thnn the above.	Sep 15, 2012 1:38 PM
515	It looks nicer, but I'm curious how it would really look, especially if the cables are to "disappear" during the day.	Sep 15, 2012 1:32 PM
516	Beautiful, but at what cost?	Sep 15, 2012 12:52 PM
517	Cables and the requisite towers seem to me to be uglier, out of scale and MORE intrusive, but it's a major highway on legs way above a navigable waterway. If you live near it - it will be ugly. Deal with it. It has been there for longer than anyone can remember, and it isn't going away. As stewards of our public transportation infrastructure, do what is required to get a good design built for a reasonable amount of money, but WHATEVER YOU DO, make sure it is wide enough to accommodate 2 full lanes of traffic, AND in addition, a HOV/Transit late, AND on and off ramps. IF you add light rail, DO NOT take any of these lanes, design the thing so that it can accommodate the addition of light rail without reducing ANY pedestrian, bike, or motor vehicle, or transit/HOV lanes. This may require more width than some people want - but WHY would you build something that would no accommodate the volume of traffic that is already there?	Sep 15, 2012 12:31 PM
518	No	Sep 15, 2012 11:21 AM
519	Might disrupt views from the Roanoke Lid.	Sep 15, 2012 10:54 AM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
520	Doesnt matter which aesthetically. Choose based on functional issues.	Sep 15, 2012 1:14 AM
521	Like it better than other option	Sep 14, 2012 7:33 PM
522	as above, prefer faster lower cost solution.	Sep 14, 2012 5:52 PM
523	See above comment. Safety first!	Sep 14, 2012 5:51 PM
524	I like the cable stayed bridge...which design has the best value over a 50 year period?	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
525	I think this is pretty. I grew up in a city full of this style bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 5:15 PM
526	Nicer looking, but impairs the view too much	Sep 14, 2012 4:42 PM
527	Much more aesthetically pleasing. if designed right.	Sep 14, 2012 4:29 PM
528	Distinctive look and visual interest is great. Much more Brooklyn Bridge or Golden Gate than standard highway interchange.	Sep 14, 2012 4:20 PM
529	The box girder looks more clunky, and when built, the view from underneath on the Roanoke side will look like an overpass. such as seen in the SODO area. The cable stayed avoids that effect. It also has few pillars on the Roanoke side for graffeti taggers to splash.	Sep 14, 2012 2:41 PM
530	prefer it	Sep 14, 2012 2:01 PM
531	This is a more graceful, exciting design. I feel like the cables add an airyness to the landscape.	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
532	Gracefull. I beleive it gives a positive visual impact that you do not get from a standard highway bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 1:48 PM
533	It's OK too.	Sep 14, 2012 1:14 PM
534	Looks excessive.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
535	Looks cool, but this is not the locaiton for such a limited view by others for this type of architecturally beautifil bridge. There are better locations where the functionality of this type would fit.	Sep 14, 2012 12:55 PM
536	Gorgeous! Rarely has a suspension bridge or cable stay bridge been built where it hasn't been embraced by the community as an iconic structure.	Sep 14, 2012 12:54 PM
537	Less impediment to boat traffic, and looks great as pictured here.	Sep 14, 2012 12:52 PM
538	designed correctly it can be a beautiful addition to the landscape	Sep 14, 2012 12:41 PM
539	Cable bridges always look cool.	Sep 14, 2012 12:36 PM
540	Select the most cost efficient and move on, please.	Sep 14, 2012 12:33 PM
541	the only issue I can see is that the cable stay really annoys residents, not sure why, it is signature and allows for an interplay with the 2 marinas, I like it and it	Sep 14, 2012 12:24 PM

Page 4, Q4. What are your thoughts on the cable stayed design concept?		
	avoids even more physical impact to the area, i like it the most of all options	
542	Too expensive.	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
543	No	Sep 14, 2012 12:04 PM
544	It looks like it has low a large visual imprint from above however a low footprint from below, allowing more marine traffic and less impact to underwater wildlife.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
545	Pretty, but WA doesn't have a stellar reputation with suspension bridges.	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
546	better visually, but if costs are a lot higher I could like the box girder design	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
547	I like the cable concept better -I think it's prettier, lower impact to things (roads and houses) underneath it. Cables are also more easy to replace.	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
548	It is a bridge. Any bridge is good!	Sep 14, 2012 11:55 AM
549	do not like the cable stayed design, too top heavy and stops the eye visually	Sep 14, 2012 11:50 AM
550	Impressive but could be too obtrusive to the views of the area. Is this too expensive and unnecessary? Cable stay bridges are usually necessary to create space for large boats to pass under and/or because there is no reasonable place for columns due to deep waters. Neither of these apply here, so why is a cable stay bridge proposed here ("just for fun" with my limited tax dollars?)	Sep 14, 2012 10:40 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
1	I urge WSDOT to not just study, but to implement a shared-use bicycle and pedestrian path on the Portage Bay Bridge. This connection between Capitol Hill and Montlake and the Eastside is absolutely essential to completing connections for all modes of transportation. To complete the regional trail all the way to the Delmar lid from the eastside to connect with Capitol Hill, the most densely populated neighborhood in the entire state of Washington, is obvious. The Portage Bay Bridge path would be highly utilized.	Oct 6, 2012 12:20 AM
2	I support integrating a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends - give folks a inexpensive healthy alternative!	Oct 5, 2012 11:09 PM
3	Yes, please consider bikes and pedestrians on the bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 PM
4	A bicycle and pedestrian trail on the bridge is critical. The 520 corridor should connect cyclists coming and going to north Capital hill and Eastlake/Downtown. They should not have to deviate around the south end of Portage Bay while auto traffic goes directly across. This will encourage growth in bicycle and walking use of this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 10:33 PM
5	Yes. This is our opportunity to build the right, long term bike connection from the eastide, along the bridge, to downtown/Cascade/Eastlake. Safer, and more likely to attact more commuters, who like me, feel streets and intersections are more dangerous especially in inclement weather than a dedicated bikeway. Of particular note: The objection to the bikeway is in large part that it leads to a wider bridge. That's true, but a wider box girder bridge is indeed much more intrusive, but the cable stayed design, with its thinner deck and no support columns, can be built wider and result in much less visual impact, and with much less effect on the light below the bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 PM
6	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 PM
7	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 9:57 PM
8	I would very definitely like to see the integration of a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends of the Portage Bay Bridge. It will be a shame to miss this opportunity to provide such a great, direct connection that will serve cyclists and pedestrians for generations to come. The alternatives using city streets around the bay are much less efficient, less safe, and will not do nearly as much to encourage more bicycle trips in lieu of driving. We only have this one chance to get it right and we need to provide equitable	Oct 5, 2012 9:16 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	access to this significant public investment for all modes of travel, and include a dedicated bicycle and pedestrian facility.	
9	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
10	Please study then ACT.	Oct 5, 2012 8:30 PM
11	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 7:39 PM
12	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 PM
13	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 7:17 PM
14	We need the bike and ped lane to connect from Delmar to the Bill Dawson trail. Not sure putting the 'facility' on the bridge would accomplish that except for those just traveling through rather than those who live in the neighborhood.	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
15	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. - this needs to be done and not studied for 30 years - please find a way to incorporate these into the actual construction activity up front.	Oct 5, 2012 6:02 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
16	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This would provide a better route between the neighborhoods east and west of Montlake without having to climb a steep hill.	Oct 5, 2012 6:02 PM
17	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 5:45 PM
18	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 5:37 PM
19	I strongly urge Wsdot to not just study but also build bicycle paths in portage bay to connect to commuter bicycle traffic patterns in the area.	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 PM
20	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
21	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 4:41 PM
22	Wonderful!	Oct 5, 2012 4:37 PM
23	consider hanging bike facility below bridge. At grade and close to traffic will not be fun. below means bike and peds are protected from traffic impacts. Also get out of the rain. this will better match with existing trail at montlake end. then build a switch back at capitol hill end to take from underneath 520 to above on lid.	Oct 5, 2012 4:07 PM
24	Yes, I am very strongly in favor of this idea. Adding a bike/pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge will complete a seriously missing transportation link for cyclists in this entire project. In addition, having a pedestrian facility on the bridge would provide a new way for users to enjoy this bridge and the surrounding area, especially if the more beautiful cable-stayed bridge is chosen. It'd be a shame to have such a beautiful bridge and be unable to walk across it and stand and awe in its wonder! To mitigate the added width of a pedestrian facility, is it possible to reduce or eliminate the shoulder widths through this area, in addition to removing the planted median? If there are federal standards, etc. mandating certain lane and shoulder widths, is it possible to get a waiver on such requirements?	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
25	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:03 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

26	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 3:36 PM
27	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 3:31 PM
28	Sounds great!	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
29	I'm strongly in favor of this. Again, a bicycle-pedestrian trail along the Portage Bay Bridge would be a great way to provide connections among many neighborhoods: UW, Montlake, Capitol Hill, and NE Seattle.	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
30	There should be no bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge itself.	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
31	Bike facilities are essential. You've blown a huge opportunity if you don't make good connections to downtown and captiol hill.	Oct 5, 2012 3:03 PM
32	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:01 PM
33	yes. the community wants these connections.	Oct 5, 2012 2:57 PM
34	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
35	This is the weakest part. There should be a path for bikes/peds on the bridge. This is especially important because there are no other good solutions for getting from UW/Montlake to downtown. I do this route often now by bike and it is awful. When the days are dark and wet it is just too dangerous. OK, I've studied it for you and the solution is obvious: put a bike/ped on the bridge. It shouldn't even be a question.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
36	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a	Oct 5, 2012 2:52 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	whole.	
37	Endorse	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
38	Definitely favor actual implementation of a ped/bike trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:49 PM
39	Don't just study bicycle connections: PLEASE IMPLEMENT THEM. I worked on the Eastside for many years and would consider it again if I had a safe bicycle route to Capitol Hill.	Oct 5, 2012 2:43 PM
40	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
41	This bicycle link is critical to bike commuters and badly needed.	Oct 5, 2012 2:28 PM
42	Imperative!	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
43	We really need good bike access with this project. It's a vital link to all areas south and west of the u district. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
44	don't study it; implement it!!! absolutely critical to include bike route planning and that route is v. important	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
45	These shoudl be IMPLMENTED	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM
46	I strongly support further planning for safe,direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 2:11 PM
47	YES, YES, YES. It would be absolutely crazy to go forward with this project without extending the bicycle/pedestrian path along the bridge up to Roanoke. Without this extension, bicyclists coming from the East Side would be stranded at Montlake -- the extension is necessary to make sure there is a good connection for these cyclists to continue to Capitol Hill, Downtown, South Lake Union, etc. But it would actually help much more than just the cyclists coming from the East Side -- it would help fill a huge gap in the city's current bicycle network. Currently, there is no good way to get from the U-district or Montlake up to Capital Hill. One has to either brave 23rd, or 19th + portions of Interlaken. This would immediately be one of the most important pieces of bike/ped infrastructure in the city.	Oct 5, 2012 2:09 PM
48	I strongly request IMPLEMENTING a bicycle and pedestrian trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. There is no way for bicycles and pedestrians to get from Montlake to Roanoke at this time. Please fix that.	Oct 5, 2012 2:01 PM
49	Yes. Bicycle-centric planning for the new bridge is *essential*. 520 is a major commute pathway, and there's no way for people to use bikes now on that commute. Allowing commuters to cross the lake further north is essential to getting msft + other employees using that mode of transport.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
50	I ride my bike for transportation and enjoyment from northeast Seattle to Capitol Hill and throughout Seattle. My wife works on First Hill and rides her bike to	Oct 5, 2012 1:53 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	work from northeast Seattle. I strongly support improved bicycle and pedestrian access to this area. I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
51	A bike lane is a must from montlake towards downtown! It will fill a need of more then just riders across the new 520, as it will allow those coming from NE Seattle to have a much better way to get downtown then currently. Getting from the Burke Gillman trail to the this Portage Bay crossing for peds and bikes and then the easy and quick access downtown is a must.	Oct 5, 2012 1:32 PM
52	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 1:21 PM
53	In the strongest possible way, I support a bicycle/pedestrian facility on the PBB. As a resident of the neighborhood I'm astounded there's even the possibility of not including one. It's a once in a lifetime opportunity to provide essential connections between UW, North Capitol Hill, Montlake, Eastlake, and downtown. Don't just study it, build it please!	Oct 5, 2012 1:14 PM
54	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 1:08 PM
55	Yes, I support implementation of bicycle trail on the Portage Bay bridge and connections between Montlake and downtown (especially), and Capitol Hill.	Oct 5, 2012 1:05 PM
56	Yes, very important.	Oct 5, 2012 12:57 PM
57	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
58	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

59	Love it - need to be at grade. Maybe a tunnel?	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 PM
60	no, there's other ways	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
61	Forget about wasting money on bicycle and pedestrian ideas. Too few people use them and they are a waste of money. The toll payers don't want money wasted on this type of project. If Seattle, Capitol Hill and the Montlake areas want bicycle and pedestrian connections, they can pay for them themselves. The money can be better used for more bridge safety and access by autos.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
62	I prefer that bicycle and pedestrian connections montlake to downtow be included on the new bridnge connection, transportaion should be more than just about moving cars.	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM
63	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:35 PM
64	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 PM
65	this is not necessary	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
66	Montlake crossing is already a major transit hub. Any design needs to consider transit impacts for bike/pedestrian use. However, if bikes and pedestrians have a quick and easy connection to downtown through the Montlake light rail station then adding additional facilities (over the existing) to the 520 bridge at Pt 8 seems superfluous.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
67	For the bridge, integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
68	I strongly and urgently support WSDOT actually implementing (not just studying) a pedestrian and bicycle shared use path on the portage bay bridge. This is key to area transportation infrastructure and a responsible approach to future travel options.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
69	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
70	I prefer the most direct connection.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
71	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:16 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
72	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
73	I like this option as currently there is only a bike path that requires riders to use a sidewalk that is uneven, narrow, and interrupted by multiple pedestrian interactions. A dedicated lane would make the area more efficient and as the area is more congested suitable for furture growth.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
74	I support the study but implementation is what is critical. There must be a bike and pedestrian trail to complete the link that is missing.	Oct 5, 2012 12:12 PM
75	Dedicated pedestrian/bicycle access to downtown is needed.	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
76	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 12:00 PM
77	Important	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
78	I strongly support not just studying this but actually implementing it. Efficient bike and pedestrian access across 520 will be a huge benefit. Currently I have to bike out of my way to get around this area and cars get to zip right through it. Bikes and pedestrians should have the most direct route.	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
79	Yes! Study, design and build it. I am a bike commuter who lived in N Cap Hill and strongly support this.	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
80	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:41 AM
81	WSDOT must not just study, but actually implement a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage will fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city , and regional level. It will be a small cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It will help people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Making this connection is a once in a lifetime chance to improve our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It has serious longterm positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 11:36 AM
82	Bicycle use on this bridge is criticle to design plans.	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

83	Incorporate the Pedestrian and Bicycle connections into the Bagley view point and Roanoke lid design. This would provide rides various alternatives to additional pedestrian and bicycle routes from North Capital Hill area as well as access to Eastlake providing access north and south to additional trails and the downtown area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
84	Yes- it will be great to have an easier route across to Bellevue.	Oct 5, 2012 11:32 AM
85	yes please! bikes bikes bikes bikes.	Oct 5, 2012 11:30 AM
86	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:29 AM
87	Absolutely essential connectivity	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
88	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
89	Yes please!	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
90	I strongly support this for connecting neighborhoods and schools with safe bicycle trails/lanes and facilities. This should not just be "studied" but should be implemented.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
91	This is of high importance to me.	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 AM
92	This is key. Safe bicycle and pedestrian paths for families should be a high priority.	Oct 5, 2012 11:07 AM
93	absolutely	Oct 5, 2012 10:59 AM
94	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:58 AM
95	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 10:55 AM
96	VERY important to design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities	Oct 5, 2012 10:51 AM
97	Yes! I support this wholeheartedly.	Oct 5, 2012 10:41 AM
98	Yes - implement this. It would be a shame not to have a bicycle path.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
99	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:34 AM
100	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 10:31 AM
101	strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 10:29 AM
102	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
103	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
104	I strongly support implementing a pedestrian and bike trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 AM
105	It should be illegal to build a bridge without safe pedestrian and cyclist access. The Montlake neighborhood has poor vulnerable user routes to both downtown and north Capital Hill so if they can be improved it has high value to neighborhood residents.	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
106	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle train on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:13 AM
107	I am only for this if you make the bike trail narrower and not make the whole bridge so wide. Really 8 feet is enough. We have to live with this thing in our back yard.	Oct 5, 2012 10:13 AM
108	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
109	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

110	I am against this because of the extra width it would require on the bridge. There are several very adequate bicycle and pedestrian routes from Montlake to downtown already.	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 AM
111	I think bicycle connections on the bridge are a waste of resources as they are not utilized that much from what I've seen on I-90, however it would be nice to have a a dedicated bike path that links the bike path on the current eastside segment, through the area and into downtown. This would be a more pleasant alternative for cyclist as it could go along the south side of the bridge in a greener area. It appears that bicycle traffic is increasing especially along the Eastlake corridor to downtown and the university. I believe that the added size to the Portage Bay Bridge is not warranted and should be deleted. The size of this bridge through the neighborhoods should be kept to a minimum without a bike path and ideally not more than 4 lanes since this is one of the more destructive aspects of the bridge corridor to the neighborhood. The bridge should also have very quiet pavement, no light pollution to the nearby by residents. Eliminating the bike lane from this segment of the bridge would be cost effective and allow funding of adjacent bicycle connections. The land currently owned by Seattle Prep could be used for a park and bike path through the neighborhood. If the bike path on the bridge still persists then it should be much narrower than the 14 foot proposed addition which is just a disquised future auto lane.	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 AM
112	This is critical. It is very challenging to ride from Montlake to downtown. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
113	Yes to bike connections. Neutral on bike facility.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 AM
114	The MPCC strongly supports having as effective and comprehensive plan for bicycle and pedestrian ability to navigate the entire City as is possible. The connection from Montlake to Downtown and North Capital Hill, particularly as it is now developing, is essential.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 AM
115	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly	Oct 5, 2012 9:56 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
116	I strongly support a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge. It would provide an important connection for bicycle users and pedestrians. The non motorized facility on the 520 bridge will be part of the regional network, and it is poor design to terminate it at Montlake when it could continue on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM
117	I strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
118	DO NOT JUST STUDY THEM! MAKE THEM HAPPEN! I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car. Pedestrian facilities should not be an afterthought, nor should pedestrians be expected to go up and over or down and around to avoid cars. Pedestrians are like water, and if they see a flat route, they will take it, even if it is unsafe. Therefore, the pedestrian routes should be both safe AND direct.	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
119	I am for this	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
120	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. Seattle needs more bicycle trails.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
121	agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:34 AM
122	It is ridiculous to consider building a new Portage Bay Bridge without a bicycle/pedestrian path, especially when a similar path is already being built on the main bridge across Lake Washington. Please include bicycle and pedestrian connections in this bridge plan.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
123	Safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay need to be a top priority!	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
124	A bikeway on the Portage Bay bridge could be a link to nowhere unless the connections to downtown, possibly in the I-5 corridor are improved.	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
125	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the	Oct 5, 2012 9:29 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
126	I think this is the optimal plan for our city's future. More safe, well designed bike infrastructure will improve various aspects of the Seattle area.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
127	Agree.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
128	I strongly support this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
129	There is NO NEED FOR A STUDY. Just DO IT. I can't stress this enough. We already know what to do: build a quality bike and pedestrian facility, including protected lanes. Endless study just wastes money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
130	This is a top priority of mine and key infrastructure for the city of Seattle as a whole. Study AND IMPLEMENTATION of pedestrian and bike connections is very important. I do not currently use this area as it is a challenge with two young children on a bike or walking. Failing to build easy to access and safe to use pedestrian and bike connections on the Portage Bay Bridge would reduce the accessibility from the SR 520 project and squander an opportunity to make key improvements in this area. I do not have a car and would love to take my children more to the Eastside, the arboreteum, Madison Valley, etc. I truly cannot imagine how a responsible planning commission could complete this huge project without doing all possible to connect large economic centers like UW and downtown Seattle. Adding improved pedestrian and bicycle connections will impact Seattle's economy and the quality of life of its residents for years to come. I look forward to biking across it with my daughters.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
131	Yes, I need these!	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
132	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
133	Certainly build a bicycle/pedestrian sidewalk on Portage Bay bridge. But when I heard that it was proposed to be 14 feet wide I was shocked. That is an unnecessary expanse and cost.	Oct 5, 2012 9:11 AM
134	Probably a waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM
135	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 8:57 AM
136	I spent a year *trying* to bike from Broadmoor to UW. Anything to separate bikes, pedestrians, and cars through the Montlake area would be greatly welcomed by each group. Especially with the addition of the Husky Stadium Light Rail Station, routes for all forms of traffic need to be improved in the Montlake area. I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
137	Most definitely study the Portage Bay Bridge connection. If there is community resistance to the width, consider replacing motor-vehicle lanes for the the bike/ped facility.	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
138	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
139	Essential to do these connections	Oct 5, 2012 8:50 AM
140	There are other options for getting cyclists from point a to point b. Let's keep the bridge width as minimal as possible. It takes me about fifteen minutes to walk my sixteen year old dog from one end of the bridge to the other -- walking around the southern edge of Portage Bay. A cyclist can make the same trip in just a matter of minutes. The convenience to a few cyclists (shaving a couple of minutes off their ride) is not a justification for the extra millions of dollars that would be spent (on a portion of the 520 project that is having difficulty getting funding), and the negative impacts to the environment and the community. For those cyclist who suggest they want to commute from the east side of Lake Washington, perhaps we can offer free bus service across the lake? This encourages people to ride bikes, as well as to use public transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 8:48 AM
141	It is absolutely essential that the SR-520 corridor provide a continuous connnection for bikes and pedestrians, from the trail east of I-405 to west of I-5.	Oct 5, 2012 8:36 AM
142	A bike trail on the Portage Bay Bridge would be nice, but should be considered in the context of Seattle's current and future bicycle trail network. Trails should connect to trails (ideally, relatively flat trails).	Oct 5, 2012 8:34 AM
143	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 8:33 AM
144	It is difficult to over-emphasize the importance of actually building (not simply studying) bicycle and pedestrian connections in this critical area.	Oct 5, 2012 8:23 AM
145	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 8:13 AM
146	Portage Bay bridge NEEDS bike access. This seems like such a no-brainer, I can't believe we're talking about *studying* it.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
147	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 8:05 AM
148	Preference 8: I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely	Oct 5, 2012 7:51 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
149	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:40 AM
150	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:40 AM
151	I strongly support this.	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
152	yes!	Oct 5, 2012 7:30 AM
153	Connections are important. I'm less convinced on a facility	Oct 5, 2012 7:23 AM
154	Yes. Any new structure like this bridge should include bicycle/pedestrian access. Bike commuting is growing fast in Seattle and this is a chance to include a safe and direct cross-town connection that would help to serve Capitol Hill, the UW, and Montlake.	Oct 5, 2012 7:13 AM
155	I think that it would be a terrible waste to build this bridge without a bicycle/pedestrian path, but it should not be more than 10 feet wide.	Oct 5, 2012 7:11 AM
156	This is a phenomenally useful study. In fact, a bicycle route over this bridge is not redundant. The most similar route is Boyer the street has no bicycle lanes, and carries a very heavy traffic volumes. Given the lack of controlled intersections in the proximity to multiple freeway on ramps, traffic proceeds at approximately 40 mph. Drivers are extremely aggressive, making bicycling very unsafe. A protected bike lane on the portage Bay Bridge would add much–needed flexibility in this region of Capitol Hill, whereby safe bike routes are highly constrained by topography, freeways, water, and high-traffic city streets.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
157	No. This is overkill.	Oct 5, 2012 7:09 AM
158	please do not place byciclist above vehicle function, thus affecting commerce. lets not forget this is a state highway.	Oct 5, 2012 7:02 AM
159	I strongly support WSDOT actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge, and not just conducting a study.	Oct 5, 2012 6:47 AM
160	good ideal	Oct 5, 2012 6:43 AM
161	Needs to be implemented into the project!	Oct 5, 2012 6:17 AM
162	I strongly support dedicated pedestrian and bicycle access along each and every portion of the 520 project. We absolutely need to include full accommodation for non-motorized transportation in this regional project. This is a once-in-a-	Oct 5, 2012 6:03 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	generation opportunity, and we need to get it right and maximize this public investment. We don't need any further study to make this decision. As a regional policy matter, it should be a clear imperative that any new road infrastructure of this scale will include bicycles and pedestrian use throughout its length. YES ABSOLUTELY to a shared-use ped/bike trail across Portage Bay!!	
163	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 5, 2012 5:35 AM
164	Mandatory!	Oct 5, 2012 5:34 AM
165	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 5:20 AM
166	Not really a practical route, do not study	Oct 5, 2012 5:20 AM
167	Don't just study it, build it. Why build a car-only facility? We need options for bicycles and pedestrians, too.	Oct 5, 2012 5:15 AM
168	Yes, this would be a very important improvements. The connection would improve pedestrian and bicycle access to the uw from capital hill.	Oct 5, 2012 5:07 AM
169	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 4:53 AM
170	I strongly support, and believe this is very important. This will greatly enhance pedestrian access to the Portage Bay Multiuse-Trail and Waterfront, the Montlake Community Center and playfield, as well as Interlaken Park and Roanoke Park. It helps create a greenbelt loop around Montlake, just as was intended in the original Olmsted plan for the neighborhood. Hopefully this connection will reactivate an entire area close to SR520 that currently sees some gang and drug activity.	Oct 5, 2012 12:49 AM
171	Do it. You get people over to Seattle quickly from Montlake, Lauralhurst, Ravenna, Bryant, Sand Point, etc and you potentially get more bicycling commuters. That large hill to Capitol Hill either straight up or through the forested path/street adjacent scares off lots of ordinary folks, and adds lots of time and sweat. Great potential to reduce congestion for students, work commuters. Great reason for a bike station, like London, on the Lid too.	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 AM
172	Bicycles on the bridge! YES YES YES	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

173	This would be an excellent extension of the pedestrian and bike path on the new SR-520 bridge. It would be a shame not to extend it to north Capitol Hill and downtown Seattle. I strongly support implementing bike and pedestrian paths here.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 AM
174	don't just study it, design and do it already! it is incredibly and painfully obvious that a multi-use trail on the portage bay bridge is CRITICAL to providing connectivity not just through the immediate area of work, but for the city as a whole. to miss this opportunity would be a pathetic shame.	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 PM
175	I don't know how these will work but I'm all for them!	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 PM
176	Yes. What's the point? The question is a leading one anyway. Should I want you to study unsafe, indirect and uncomfortable connections?	Oct 4, 2012 11:10 PM
177	I strongly support not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:59 PM
178	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. It's crazy how much I support this idea. And I suggest you visit Delmar Drive any sunny day and realize how many confused tourists wander through there looking for the arboretum! What a great and easy connection this bridge would be for tourists and grandmothers alike! People who say existing streets are appropriate for all citizens passing from roanoke park to montlake are crazy. IT's just too steep. How come the cars get all the benefit of gradual altitude changes, while people on foot navigate the treacherous Delmar sidewalk, or Edgar street drop? Trust me you won't let your grandma walk either route. Put a walkway on the bridge! It will get used!	Oct 4, 2012 10:49 PM
179	I WANT THAT PATH. Care more about this than all previous items.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
180	ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT BE LEFT OUT OF THIS PLAN! If this is forgotten, there is a huge gap in a safe and continuous bike and ped route from Seattle to the East Side. Make the shared use path part of the Portage Bay Bridge please!	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
181	The WSDOT shouldn't just study this, but actually implement a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:44 PM
182	Study and implement. If done right, this project will open up a safe and efficient bicycle corridor connecting downtown Bellevue and downtown Seattle as well as Eastlake, Capitol Hill, and the University District.	Oct 4, 2012 10:30 PM
183	provide bike path on land south of portage bay	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 PM
184	Any improvement on bicycle/pedestrian access to Capitol Hill and downtown is needed.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
185	Strongly support	Oct 4, 2012 10:19 PM
186	There is already bike paths to downtown. No need for new ones. No bike lane	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	is needed on north capitol hill.	
187	This is a must. The freeways make it very difficult to walk and bike around town. This is some very small recompense for the problems they cause. If the bike-ped path ends the freeway should end as well.	Oct 4, 2012 10:09 PM
188	Study? I support DESIGN & IMPLEMENTATION of direct and safe bicycle and pedestrian connections between Montlake, the UW/lightrail station, north capitol hill and the portage bay bridge. This is too busy an interchange for all users to just "study"; a trail on the bridge will allow direct access from the Eastside to Seattle by bicycle, a need for many who commute by bicycle.	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM
189	There MUST be a bike lane I think across all parts of the bridge!	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 PM
190	I don't see any design details indicating a bike path along the portage bay section. Am I missing something? Is it underneath the bridge? That would be great for staying dry and out of the road spray from the cars and away from all the noise. But don't route bikes the long way around. Every extra mile counts big when riding a bike.	Oct 4, 2012 10:03 PM
191	Please study! Then DO!	Oct 4, 2012 10:02 PM
192	Keep the bike trail on land between downtown and Montlake. Make use of the new greenway concept to give bikers a connected path. A facility on the bridge for bikes and pedestrians will increase its width too much.	Oct 4, 2012 9:49 PM
193	STRONGLY SUPPORT!!! Please do this. I have not commuted via bicycle for the last two years as I'm not comfortable on the roads. Knowing the routes were safer would make it easier to begin.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
194	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 9:32 PM
195	Currently, there are sufficient bike routes to downtown. However, I would strongly support a bike/pedestrian connect from Seattle to the Eastside, which I presume this would allow. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole. The I-90 trail currently sees a lot of use year round and this would	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	further increase that opportunity. It could concievably be utilized in future tourism (ie, marathons, etc)...	
196	The Portage Bay Bridge should allow for a 14 foot bicycle and pedestrial trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
197	I strongly support adding pedestrian and bicycle pathways that will increase alternative travel choices.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
198	Yes this would be a great bike connection	Oct 4, 2012 9:22 PM
199	as a cyclist, i don't really think the best route is to put a bike lane on the freeway bridge, but i do support researching it. I would suggest utilizing the Interlaken bike boulevard as a route into downtown and cap hill. I would put the money into upgrading the surface of that road and into improving the bicycle direct connection to the montlake draw bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:20 PM
200	I prefer a shore trail vs. another lane on the bridge. If there was tons of money I would like both. I would be nervous riding with my young children on an additional lane across the bridge and am concerned about a wider footprint for the bridge and it's effects on plants and animals in the lake. Please study, design, and build a Portage Bay Bridge multi-use trail. This trail would be an enormous asset to people who walk, bike, and simply enjoy recreating on trails. It would interconnect our neighborhoods, better connect the UW area to Capitol Hill, and serve as a critical regional link.	Oct 4, 2012 9:11 PM
201	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 9:01 PM
202	This study is getting very over due since we're getting close to pouring concrete! It seems obvious that these connections and a route on the bridge are needed. How else can bicycles to/from the 520 access the rest of Seattle if they're dumped into small, dark, twisty mazes and forced to wind around hills on narrow roads with heavy traffic?	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
203	strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity	Oct 4, 2012 8:53 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
204	Connection our regional bike and pedestrian trails is key to the quality of life in our city. Seattle may be a world-class city in many regards, but will never be a vibrant, livable community without transportation options in and between every neighborhood. This is really important!	Oct 4, 2012 8:47 PM
205	Why just study it, except to figure out how best to do it? This is an obvious need, and I strongly support a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap and address a traffic choke-point. It would improve safety, and could be built for a relatively small price tag relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
206	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:38 PM
207	Bicycle and pedestrian connections should be included in the final design.	Oct 4, 2012 8:35 PM
208	PLEASE integrate a bicycle and pedestrian connection from Montlake to Capitol Hill!	Oct 4, 2012 8:25 PM
209	Include biking and pedestrian options! There are few good connections between north capital hill and Mountlake that dont include a steep hill or car/pedestrian conflict. Please include this connection!	Oct 4, 2012 8:24 PM
210	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:16 PM
211	kindly include a bike path on the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
212	Must have bicycle and pedestrian facilities on bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:09 PM
213	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole. I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the	Oct 4, 2012 8:02 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole. I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
214	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
215	Build the Portage Bay Trail. It's all sorts of good.	Oct 4, 2012 7:52 PM
216	Most important	Oct 4, 2012 7:46 PM
217	NEEDS a bike trail ON the bridge. It is the most logical path to follow, and would provide a continuous trail from North Broadway all the way to Bellevue Way. The path would be much more used than the surface street alternatives, since it would be safer, more direct, less steep, and easier to explain/navigate.	Oct 4, 2012 7:34 PM
218	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 7:20 PM
219	I'm opposed to adding any bicycle lane on the Portage Bay Bridge unless the bridge can be reduced to four lanes. We are already having to adjust to a much larger presence in the south end of Portage Bay and cannot afford an addition 14 feet of concrete. I support a bicycle path on land immediately south of the Portage Bay Bridge. I also support design of pedestrian friendly, well lighted, open spaces under the bridge wherever it passes over the land. Design is crucial in discouraging crime and adoption by groups wishing to make them their exclusive "hangout" while encouraging use of such well-lighted spaces by the public for athletics, bicycling, and walking.	Oct 4, 2012 7:18 PM
220	I think it is essential to study and implement this connection on the Portage Bay bridge. As a pedestrian and cyclist who lives in Capital Hill but works on the East side, I believe it would be a missed opportunity to not provide access for all modal types across Portage Bay. Currently I have to weave through Capital Hill and Montlake (up and down) in order to access buses to the East side. It would be extremely beneficial to the greater Seattle population to provide access to 520. While it is amazing that there will be a ped and bike path over 520 (thank you!), that alone isn't enough to allow for easy commuting between the east side, montlake and downtown Seattle. Direct, safe connections across Portage Bay	Oct 4, 2012 7:15 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	are essential as well.	
221	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 6:54 PM
222	Honestly, I think you peiople are retards. You need to put your pointy dunces hats on and think, "What would the citizens of my city want, given they are paying my f***ing salary?" Think long and hard, bureaucrats.	Oct 4, 2012 6:33 PM
223	This is critical to have a path connecting the Montlake lid to North Capitol Hill and Eastlake. The route by road is to steep and curvy for many folks to feel comfortable on. It will be a beautiful ped-bike route that will connect the neighborhoods and be a great long term asset for the City.	Oct 4, 2012 6:18 PM
224	We need a path for pedestrians and bicyclists across the lake. Encouraging non-fuel using transportation is an important part of looking towards our future. Riding ten miles or more just isn't that hard but we need ways to do it.	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
225	Yes, this is critical.	Oct 4, 2012 6:00 PM
226	NO taxpayers money	Oct 4, 2012 5:56 PM
227	Please include a safe bike lane across the new bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
228	YES - the current bicycle connections through Montlake are a disaster	Oct 4, 2012 5:32 PM
229	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:31 PM
230	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:21 PM
231	Please do this!	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM
232	Support	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
233	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:13 PM
234	Bike and pedestrian facilities IF provided must be separate.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
235	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
236	Yes Yes - make it easy for me to cycle down the lake with options other than the eastlake bridge	Oct 4, 2012 4:55 PM
237	This sounds very interesting. I definitely would like to see this happen. As long as preference 6 or 7 doesnt, specially preference 6, does not interfere with it.	Oct 4, 2012 4:50 PM
238	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 4:43 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

239	do it	Oct 4, 2012 4:42 PM
240	It seems to me that you have already thoroughly studied it. Do not delay construction for further studies on behalf of obstructionist special interests.	Oct 4, 2012 4:38 PM
241	Yes. I support a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge, but 14-feet width seems excessive.	Oct 4, 2012 4:23 PM
242	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 4, 2012 4:19 PM
243	Of absolute importance. Leaving it out is a sick joke in 2012.	Oct 4, 2012 4:02 PM
244	Sounds great	Oct 4, 2012 3:46 PM
245	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:37 PM
246	don't study too hard, just ensure we have well-lit sidewalks everywhere.	Oct 4, 2012 3:35 PM
247	I support a bicycle/pedestrian lane from I-5 all the way to the end of 520 in Redmond.	Oct 4, 2012 3:24 PM
248	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:17 PM
249	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:17 PM
250	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:15 PM
251	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
252	Get beyond the studies, network connectivity is essential for a successful, well-used system. Just do it!	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
253	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge!	Oct 4, 2012 3:01 PM
254	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

255	Multi-mode transportation options are critical, particularly when designing transportation elements that will be with us for many years to come.	Oct 4, 2012 2:42 PM
256	Bicycle and pedestrian connections are a TOP priority for me on a new 520 bridge, followed by higher auto capacity.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
257	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 2:37 PM
258	Important! Surprised it is not listed already as part of design.	Oct 4, 2012 2:33 PM
259	I strongly support the development of a bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would form a key connection between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle.	Oct 4, 2012 2:32 PM
260	Study? Why not actually implement them? The currently available routes up to Delmar are unsafe - full of blind corners, parking which poses horrible door hazards to cyclists, and unregulated intersections. Additionally, cycling to Roanoke currently requires losing elevation through Montlake and being forced to make it all up in one long swing up to Roanoke. An evenly graded bike/pedestrian lane like those seen on the Montlake, Ballard, Fremont and University bridges (let alone I-90!) would go a long way towards fixing these problems.	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
261	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
262	This is a must, while bombing down 23rd ave in the morning is fun I can also see how it is dangerous. I was commuting across 520 from the central district and this was my path every morning. Cars often did not see me and would pull out in front of me. I do not think 23rd ave is a reasonable choice for newer cyclists. At the moment there is not a good, safe route to the 520 transit area. Also the intersections by the 520 are horrible for bikes and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 2:12 PM
263	We need to have a connections to connect the growing Capitol Hill neighborhood for bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 1:58 PM
264	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:54 PM
265	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 1:38 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

266	Yes, yes, yes, dear god yes!!! We must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections from across the bridge to Capitol Hill, Montlake, and Downtown. You are the Department of Transportation, not the Dept of Cars	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
267	Yes- I strongly support this idea.	Oct 4, 2012 1:30 PM
268	It is important to implement bicycle and pedestrian facilities during construction. There is no excuse to simply study adding facilities: This is the year 2012, and people do not dream of sitting in traffic in their cars on a bridge. When you build a new transportation facility, the only ethical thing to do is to include all modes of travel.	Oct 4, 2012 1:28 PM
269	YESYESYES my favorite preference!	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
270	Not just studying, but a bike and pedestrian facility should be required on this Bridge. That's what complete Streets mean. Second class facilities (take this long detour bikes, while cars get to go the direct route) are not appropriate.	Oct 4, 2012 1:22 PM
271	This is my preference.	Oct 4, 2012 1:21 PM
272	This is 2012, not 1960. To build any road anywhere without pedestrian and bike access is a crime.	Oct 4, 2012 1:19 PM
273	Building that direct connection is absolutely necessary	Oct 4, 2012 1:06 PM
274	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole. Why should we spend money on a study, instead of spending money to build it?	Oct 4, 2012 1:04 PM
275	I strongly support WSDOT BUILDING a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. I understand that the study is important, but it needs to be built, too.	Oct 4, 2012 1:04 PM
276	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
277	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:59 PM
278	Preference 8: I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to	Oct 4, 2012 12:45 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
279	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:39 PM
280	Support	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
281	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:31 PM
282	I whole-heartedly support studying safe bicycle-pedestrian connections, but studying is not enough. Build these connections with the information you gain by studying!	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
283	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:21 PM
284	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. These are routes I take regularly and don't offer much for safe biking.	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM
285	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
286	We support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. Building this trail to connect the eastside, UW, Northesast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake and downtown Seattle is a once in a lifetime opportunity. We hope it is affordable to include.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
287	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:07 PM
288	I strongly support building the bike and walker connections on the Portage Bay Bridge, which will enhance the connections between the key job and residential areas on the north and east sides.	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
289	Don't just study it BUILD IT! This area is/could be a huge pedestrian and bike hub through the city. The bridge needs, must have, a bike and pedestrian path.	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
290	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM
291	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
292	Don't just study it: do it. The entire mission of WSDOT and the portage bay	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	project should be to enable the movement of people - and people don't just use cars. Providing facilities for non-automobile useage on the Portage Bay Bridge shouldn't even be in question.	
293	Bikes should not be placed on the Portage Bay bridge. The lid at 10th disrupts the continuity of the bike lane and it's extremely expensive to add this element to the bridge. There are several alternative routes for this connection, including one partially through the arboretum that is already being funded by WSDOT. Keep this connection on land and consider additional street improvements for the existing land based bike connections. It will be a lot of money saved by keeping the bikes on the street.	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
294	Highly support. Alternate connection across Montlake Bridge, Burke-Gilman, and University Bridge is circuitous and involves two crossings with potential bridge raises.	Oct 4, 2012 11:57 AM
295	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This is a golden opportunity to really connect parts of our city for generations to come. Infrastructure projects that are this expensive and will have an impact on transportation for the next 100 years must accommodate as many transportation modes as possible. This bridge must accommodate all types of motor vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. Build a pedestrian/bicycle link on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:56 AM
296	Yes, yes, yes. A thousand times yes. We need to not just study but implement a trail in this area. This is an area of the city that is provides links somewhat poorly at present, and this is a tremendous opportunity to provide cyclist and pedestrian access between the east side, northern Seattle via the U District, Capitol Hill and Downtown.	Oct 4, 2012 11:56 AM
297	A bike and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge is the only logical option. We are already investing in a path across the lake, having that path abruptly end without giving users a way to get to the major employment centers of South Lake Union and Downtown totally wastes the investment we are going to make in the Lake Washington crossing.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
298	This is a no brainer. We don't need to even study this. I am very surprised that in this day and age bicycle and pedestrian connections were not included by default. Don't build the project if this bicycle and pedestrian connection is not included.	Oct 4, 2012 11:51 AM
299	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
300	I can really get behind this design. I would use it quite frequently.	Oct 4, 2012 11:44 AM
301	Yes! This is crucial for bike and pedestrian safety.	Oct 4, 2012 11:44 AM
302	I live in this area and would be making use of this trail frequently. I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
303	I think WSDOT should study and implement a bike and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 AM
304	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. I have been upset that this was not done already, and do not appreciate the "splitting" that's been going on between people worried about their view and the need for multimodal connections. It would be criminal to build this facility in 2012 with our city/regional transpo goals and NOT include bike/ped connections. Really.	Oct 4, 2012 11:35 AM
305	I support usable bike path connections. Will the bike/pedestrian "facility" be at a transportation hub (like the lockers at montake and 520)? If not, its usefulness is limited.	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
306	please IMPLEMENT such bicycle and pedestrian connections. just don't STUDY them. your ability to improve cycling and pedestrian infrastructure should be mandated, just not as an afterthought. this is a very busy ped and cycling corridor between these two communities.	Oct 4, 2012 11:30 AM
307	This is absolutely necessary. It would be pointless to construct a large bridge and to not include facilities for bicycles and pedestrians which logically mesh with the surrounding roadways and bike paths.	Oct 4, 2012 11:29 AM
308	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:29 AM
309	it's completely ridiculous to me that actually implementing, not just studying, safe/direct/comfortable bike and pedestrian connections across neighborhoods through dedicated facilities on the PBB is not a key component of this plan. Please implement. The usefulness of these facilities to the many citizens of Seattle far outweighs the honestly silly concerns about bridge width that a few rich people are whining about. It's common sense. You don't need to study it. Just do it. It won't even cause the bridge to be widened by more than a couple of feet.	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
310	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 AM
311	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 AM
312	This is absolutely necessary. There would be no point in further constructing car	Oct 4, 2012 11:25 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
	infrastructure without also offering access for bicycles and pedestrians.	
313	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:22 AM
314	How about study AND IMPLEMENT. This is such a no-brainer that it's distressing it's even a question. Some people really have to use cars to get around--the easier it is for other people to bike, walk, or take transit, rather than clog the roads with cars, the better it will be for everyone.	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
315	I strongly support this more than any other single preference asked in this survey. We *must* have a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:10 AM
316	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. It is completely unacceptable in 2012 to build a bridge in Seattle without proper considerations for all road users. As Portland builds a bridge that is ONLY for people on foot, bikes, buses, or lightrail, Seattle continues to take a backseat to forward-thinking transportation policy.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 AM
317	Yes! Bike path along the bridge, with a good amount of separation between the bridge and the bike path so biking is comfortable.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 AM
318	I own our home a half mile from this location and strongly support continuous bike / ped connections throughout the corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 10:40 AM
319	When will be see the EIS on this? Hard to comment without it. There are Seattle-funded portions of a level grade bike path from Bill Dawson trail, thru Montlake park area, to Boyer-Fuhrman, thence to a flat connection with Eastlake and SLU. While bike/ped connectivity is nice, I doubt this section will be used due to the steep climb from viaduct surface to exit on or near Delmar Lid. Also, no bike/ped lane keeps the bridge narrow. Explore an "under the bridge" bike/ped lane "hung" off the supports for the viaduct - an example is the pedestrian lane under the Montlake Bridge, north side, that is sunny, widely used during crew races/Boat Day, and most of all, does not widen bridge, at the same time it provides safety to peds/bikes, and a less steep climb to Delmar area exit.	Oct 4, 2012 10:27 AM
320	This is not only important to study, but important to implement. This detail is very important to include in the project.	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 AM
321	Please dont spent the money on a fancy looking bridge- spend it on a separated bike path along this highway. The Montlake crossing is one of the worst areas for bike travel and having this connection would help a lot.	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 AM
322	It makes no sense not to do this bicycles reduce congestion and emissions	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 AM
323	I strongly support bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on the Portage Bay Bridge. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to improve connectivity for these users.	Oct 4, 2012 9:36 AM
324	Strong preference for bike and pedestrian connections	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

325	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 9:18 AM
326	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 9:09 AM
327	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
328	I oppose spending money on bicycle and pedestrian faciliries that will be used by hardly anyone.	Oct 4, 2012 7:03 AM
329	One of the most important goals to keep community coonections or impove them.	Oct 4, 2012 6:43 AM
330	YES!! We need walking and biking access to reduce carbon emissions!	Oct 4, 2012 6:07 AM
331	always support this sort of access and I love the idea of just making the area easier to navigate	Oct 4, 2012 3:05 AM
332	Strongly in favor, I would OPPOSE any proposal that does NOT include such a connection. It seems absurd that this isn't part of the baseline for the construction of ANY new highway and bridge project.	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

333	The project should have a firm commitment to implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge, not just a commitment to studying this. In this day and age you can't build infrastructure like this just for SOV. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 9:41 PM
334	Excellent idea.	Oct 3, 2012 9:26 PM
335	Support: integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Oct 3, 2012 9:03 PM
336	The bicycle use of Boyer is currently dangerous. A bike path more apart from car traffic is a good idea especially given the marked increase in traffic on that street over the past few years and in light of even more traffic due to the 520 changes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:42 PM
337	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:29 PM
338	Great. Create, don't just study	Oct 3, 2012 8:27 PM
339	This must be a part of the design and implementation. If not, would be a huge regional missed opportunity.	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 PM
340	Absolutely crucial. Ithere are incredible numbers of bicycle commuters in this area.	Oct 3, 2012 6:59 PM
341	include bike lane on the bridge	Oct 3, 2012 6:06 PM
342	YES!	Oct 3, 2012 4:21 PM
343	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 4:00 PM
344	These should be included as a continuum from the eastside! Encourage bikers & pedestrians all we can for the exercise & views & it might as well be constructed now instead of an afterthought!	Oct 3, 2012 3:34 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

345	Optimize for bicycle and pedestrian connections! More bikes! Fewer cars!	Oct 3, 2012 2:40 PM
346	How will a 520 bike trail connect with Roanoke and I-5. Running a bike lane up to the new Roanoke lid is a great idea. Not sure where it ends otherwise since I-5 ain't exactly bike-friendly.	Oct 3, 2012 2:39 PM
347	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 2:30 PM
348	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 1:54 PM
349	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Oct 3, 2012 1:49 PM
350	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 1:49 PM
351	Yes, yes, yes, so important	Oct 3, 2012 1:22 PM
352	A mixed-use trail ON the Portage Bay Bridge is ESSENTIAL. It doesn't have to be fancy or very wide, but it must be there.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
353	yes, please!!!!!	Oct 3, 2012 1:13 PM
354	Don't just study it, BUILD IT. This is essential!	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
355	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown	Oct 3, 2012 1:06 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
	Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	
356	I'm not sure how many "pedestrians" would use the Portage Bay Bridge. Bicyclists should probably be the main focus. However, where 520 intersects with existing neighborhoods, there should be significantly more focus on the impact to pedestrians. Having a major highway running through streets that connect schools, stores, parks, hospitals and universities should really give pause to the design of pedestrian connectivity. Children in elementary school should be able to walk to school without having to negotiate with on and off ramps and the risks associated with crosswalks. Please focus on the safety aspect of these areas.	Oct 3, 2012 12:55 PM
357	Please do NOT add a bicycle and pedestrian facitlity to the Portage Bay Bridge. This bridge is already too wide. Any connection from the currently planned bike/ped facility on the north edge of 520 at Montlake to an added facility on the south edge of the Portage Bay Bridge would be extremely awkward. And bike and pedestrian connections west from Montlake are already available on dry land.	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 PM
358	Please incluce a bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 3, 2012 11:53 AM
359	which connects to Portage Bay Loop Trail	Oct 3, 2012 11:53 AM
360	We ABSOLUTELY MUST prioritize pedestrian and bicycle traffic above cars. In my opinion, the project must not go ahead without guaranteed safe (current seattle bike lanes are _not_ safe, btw) access to cyclists and pedestrians.	Oct 3, 2012 11:36 AM
361	Please please please incorporate bicycles and pedestrians!!!	Oct 3, 2012 11:29 AM
362	In general I am in favor of increasing the bike/walk-ability. Getting between Montlake and North Capitol hill would be much more straightforward with a bike trail on the bridge. I'm not sue why you *wouldn't* build it this way. OK I'm sure it costs a bit more. But this is the kind of thing you can point at and say "look, we support bikes and pedestrians". Money where your mouth is, and all that.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
363	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 10:44 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

364	Isn't the bridge kind of steep for a bike path? It looks like it to me. I think if the connections elsewhere are clear, safe, and separated from traffic where possible, then a path on the Portage Bay bridge wouldn't be necessary. I know you're getting a lot of pressure from advocacy groups to include the path on the PBB, but it doesn't sound like a good idea to me.	Oct 3, 2012 10:36 AM
365	please integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 3, 2012 10:29 AM
366	Sounds appropriate	Oct 3, 2012 10:17 AM
367	Very important to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian access that can accommodate large numbers of people safely.	Oct 3, 2012 10:05 AM
368	This really important--whatever preference is chosen, there must be safe, direct and comfortable transportion through the area--cars and their drivers aren't the only inhabitants of the area. We make dozens of trips per year on foot from Montlake to the UW, as do many thousands of others. It's would definitely be unfair if this area were treated as just a convenience for car travellers.	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 AM
369	Yes! We need better bike routes through this area.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
370	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 9:46 AM
371	Yes. Yes. Yes. More linkages, more safe places to walk and bike. I can also see this as a great link for all the runners in the neighborhood. A thoughtfully designed space for people on the bridge would be great, so that you don't just feel like you are eating fumes while using it.	Oct 3, 2012 9:34 AM
372	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 AM
373	A must.	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
374	Please include bike and ped facility and trail throughout.	Oct 3, 2012 8:38 AM
375	Imperative to the liveability of the city and allows for alternatives to auto use	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
376	Yes! YES! Yes!	Oct 3, 2012 8:16 AM
377	I support this alternative only if it does not favor construction of the box girder design.	Oct 3, 2012 8:05 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
378	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 8:05 AM
379	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail linkage would fill a key gap that has been identified at the neighborhood, city wide, and regional level. It can be built at a tiny marginal cost addition relative to the rest of the SR520 project. It would allow people to travel easily and safely between the eastside, the UW, Northeast Seattle, Capitol Hill, Montlake, and downtown Seattle. Building this trail connection is a once in a lifetime opportunity to better connect our neighborhoods, city, and region with safe and family-friendly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 3, 2012 7:57 AM
380	My primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 3, 2012 7:40 AM
381	Bicycle and pedestrian routes with a minimum of elevation gain and loss s/b very high on the list of design criterea. These should also be equiped with cover to minimize the rain snow and wind issues that abound in the Seattle area.	Oct 3, 2012 6:57 AM
382	Yes! Definitely include a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge! The would significantly improve mobility for these users who are traveling to or from the Eastside, Montlake, and the Roanoke/Eastlake areas.	Oct 2, 2012 11:42 PM
383	Choices are good. If car drivers get a direct way to Harvard and Roanoke, so should cyclists. It would be best if the city would create safe, exclussive rights of ways for cyclists, instead of fitting them on theside of car rights-of-way such a freeways. There shoud be better choices than to exercise next the car exhaust of thousands of vehicles. But, if you are not going to create direct, motor vehicle free rights of way for cyclists and pedestrians, then there should be room for bikes on any bridge that carries cars. I live in Phinney and work at the end of 520 in Redmond. My bike to work bike commute is over 26 miles long each way. My car commute is only about 16 miles long, which is how long my bike commute should be, if the state had not gone cheap on bike access to the 520 bridge. It would be less still if they had built a straight bike way between Kirkland and Redmond. And it would be faster if the bike path along 520 did not have to exit stop and re-enter wherever 520 has an on-ramp or off-ramp.	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 PM
384	yes	Oct 2, 2012 10:44 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
385	YES! A bike path is needed connecting north Seattle and the Kirkland/Bellevue area. The I-90 bike path is great, but not a substitute for a 520 path.	Oct 2, 2012 8:52 PM
386	YES. I want to be able to go by bicycle to all points of the city as quickly as possible. Please no round about route for bicycle.	Oct 2, 2012 8:41 PM
387	We need a shared use bicycle and pedestrian facility on this section of the bridge and it needs to be adequately wide to meet current and future demand. Biking and walking are seeing steadily increasing mode share in Seattle.	Oct 2, 2012 8:29 PM
388	yes	Oct 2, 2012 8:25 PM
389	Please ensure a bicycle trail exists	Oct 2, 2012 8:04 PM
390	This should be mandatory. If we don't have an easy way to get from the Burke Gilman to Montlake to across 520 it would be a huge shame. I'm a Microsoft employee who lives in Seattle and I dream of a day where I can consistently ride to work without being dependent on the bus or riding 25 miles around the long way.	Oct 2, 2012 6:55 PM
391	This is the way to go.	Oct 2, 2012 6:22 PM
392	This needs to be a higher priority! There is plenty of Eastside - to - Seattle traffic that would be done by bicycle if it were accessible ... having to ride around the top of the lake or through traffic to I-90 is just not reasonable for many folks.	Oct 2, 2012 6:21 PM
393	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 2, 2012 6:14 PM
394	This is incredibly important. Bicycle and pedestrian connections have long been missing from this bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 5:47 PM
395	Seriously necessary! More bikes!	Oct 2, 2012 5:40 PM
396	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 2, 2012 4:21 PM
397	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 2, 2012 4:16 PM
398	I strongly support the inclusion of a 14 foot wide multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge. The alternative connections simply are not effective options and to not create this connection would be the same as not building the tunnels that connects the I-90 bridge multi-use trail to Beacon Hill, Central Seattle, and Downtown. The value of that bridge and use of the investments made in building a trail on the bridge has been dramatically increased due to this connection. With 520, we will be making a huge mistake and significantly undermining the value of the investments we are making by effectively cutting off Capitol Hill and Downtown. The alternatives do not provide an easy, direct, or safe route to these destinations.	Oct 2, 2012 4:00 PM
399	Strongly agree. The project should include and encourage non-motorized	Oct 2, 2012 3:14 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	access between the east side and Seattle.	
400	Yes! It is so important the bike and ped facilities are part of this.	Oct 2, 2012 12:25 PM
401	Please include this infrastructure to promote safe car-free transportation.	Oct 2, 2012 12:22 PM
402	This is something that is very much needed here on the more northern side similar to what I-90 has; dedicated commuter bicycle and pedestrian paths following the expressway	Oct 2, 2012 11:58 AM
403	This is the one! There needs to be a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 2, 2012 11:37 AM
404	yes, if anything see about a tunnel like I90	Oct 2, 2012 11:04 AM
405	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 2, 2012 10:07 AM
406	ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL that a bike/ped path be provided alongside the north side of the new Portage Bay bridge. In 1991 I started the BIKE520 project to provide a bike/ped facility from Eastlake in Seattle to Redmond along the 520 corridor. This is the last crucial piece to provide that connectivity and access for non-motorized travelers. Ending the coming path on the new floating bridge section at Montlake would require users wishing to access Capital Hill or South Lake Union/Downtown with having to pick their way either through the UW and across the U bridge or find a route to climb the north end of Capital Hill. This is totally unacceptable when for a relatively tiny amount of money we can continue the bike/ped path on the new Portage Bay bridge and provide direct access to/from key destinations in Seattle. Not doing so would be the equivalent of not having provided the I-90 bike/ped tunnel through Mt Baker. Think how stupid that would have been - dropping bikes and peds onto Lk Washington Blvd near Leshi and asking them to fend for themselves if they wanted to head downtown. Let's not waste the opportunity to complete a vital piece in the bike/ped regional network.	Oct 2, 2012 9:51 AM
407	Need better/more specific designs before comments can be made.	Oct 2, 2012 9:39 AM
408	I strongly support: - there will not be another opportunity to add the critical connection from Montlake to downtown/capitol hill/first hill. - It represents a marginal addition to the cost of the project. - It completes the 520 multi-use lane. - It allows the east side of the lake to be tied to downtown, and the NE of Seattle to downtown also. - It completes the regional bicycle trail network, tying downtown Seattle, an area where bicycling is becoming every day more popular and practical to the entire region.	Oct 2, 2012 9:38 AM
409	Yes, integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 2, 2012 9:03 AM
410	Please carry out Portage Bay Bridge design preference. This corridor has been deemed very important at the regional, citywide and local levels. Supporting this preference would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and	Oct 2, 2012 8:37 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	environment of our communities and the city as a whole. Supporters of studying direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections along the 0.57 mile SR520 bridge segment between the Montlake and Roanoke lids: Seattle Design Commission, Seattle Neighborhood Greenways, Central Seattle Greenways, Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board, Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board, SDOT's Seattle 2007 Bicycle Master Plan, PSRC: Regional Bicycle Network Map, WSDOT's SR-520 Health Impact Assessment, Montlake Community Club, Montlake Greenways, University Greenways, Eastlake Greenways, Cascade Bicycle Club, Seattle Bike Blog, Montlaker community Blog350 community members who signed a letter of support summer 2012.	
411	I prefer this option as the most beneficial use of the money.	Oct 2, 2012 8:07 AM
412	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 1, 2012 9:22 PM
413	Best idea!	Oct 1, 2012 7:15 PM
414	Yes having the bridge contain bicycle portions is the only thing that makes sense, especially for bike commuters (thinking-the hundreds of Microsoft and Bellevue-area employees who bike to work much of the year)	Oct 1, 2012 4:07 PM
415	This is a requirement! We need to provide other means of commuting--one that does not burn fossil fuels and increases physical activity/reduces health car costs.	Oct 1, 2012 4:06 PM
416	Yes, we need more bike paths.	Oct 1, 2012 2:54 PM
417	I have no preference to any of the design considerations above, but absolutely feel that bicycle connection from the east side across 520 should connect easily to the eastlake neighborhood and on street bike lanes there. this creates a bicycle highway system that makes commuting from east side into seattle a reality. a termination at montlake for bikes would be a horrible decision and would keep me in my car. I support bike connection into montlake, across portage bay, and into roanoke/eastlake environs.	Oct 1, 2012 2:30 PM
418	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 1, 2012 2:19 PM
419	I strongly support this preference. This _mostly_ bike connection would allow for easy access from NE Seattle to Capitol Hill, First Hill, Downtown and the all the businesses, and in the other direction the UW, the UW Hospital, Children's Hospital, Montlake, and the East Side. It would play a vital economic role and allow a lot of commuting to happen on bicycle. It would also complete the regional trail system where it is missing the most critical segment. You simply cannot build the PortageBay Bridge without adding this extension to the already planned SR520 multi-use lane.	Oct 1, 2012 2:07 PM
420	Not 'Study' but make happen! This word seems to be a means not to include this option!!!	Oct 1, 2012 1:21 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

421	Make sure to integrate at least a 14' shared use path for both pedestrians and bikes to allow for future growth and need for these kinds of transportation. And make sure there are safe and convenient access at both ends.	Oct 1, 2012 1:17 PM
422	Yes, please include an well-connected bike/ped trail across the bridge.	Oct 1, 2012 12:38 PM
423	Many surface street options so not sure it is worth the cost. Would rather ensure excellent bike/ed access on main bridge and better Montlake interchange.	Oct 1, 2012 12:35 PM
424	I think this is absolutely necessary. the current alternative is multiple surface streets with constrained bike likes, and complicated intersections including the 5-way round about. It would seem super strange to me that the bridge from Medina to Monlake has a bicycle and pedestrian lane and this bridge doesn't.	Oct 1, 2012 11:41 AM
425	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Oct 1, 2012 10:20 AM
426	This is an exciting idea.	Sep 30, 2012 9:18 PM
427	This bike-ped connection is important. Rather than force people to go around, and fight the Seattle topology, let them ride on a bike-ped lane on the bridge.	Sep 30, 2012 7:48 PM
428	Yes please. A must for any future transportation development. To not think about reducing car cogestion is is irresponsible and a waste of the current opportunity.	Sep 30, 2012 7:46 PM
429	Very High Priority	Sep 30, 2012 4:55 PM
430	Use current surface streets and paths for bicycles and pedestrians, rather than having a larger Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 30, 2012 3:02 PM
431	It is necessary to use this opportunity: connect the new SR520 bridge bike/ped path to the Portage Bay Bridge, with connections to Roanoke and Eastlake. Bicycle commuters from the eastside need safe and direct access to downtown Seattle. This is essential. We cannot miss the possibility to connect to the new SR520 bridge with an integrated 14-foot wide shared-use path. This small portion of path would do wonders to show Seattle's vision for a well-planned future. Leaving out such a path will surely be seen by future generations as inexplicable.	Sep 30, 2012 9:53 AM
432	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Sep 30, 2012 7:22 AM
433	This is crucial.	Sep 30, 2012 7:10 AM
434	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 30, 2012 3:37 AM
435	Better to shunt Bicycle and Pedestrian traffic over Cap Hill to shorten the commute and limit complexity of 520 merge with I-5.	Sep 29, 2012 11:34 PM
436	My primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 29, 2012 10:06 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

437	Most important to me. Enable effective and safe bike commuting.	Sep 29, 2012 9:12 PM
438	ABSOLUTELY!	Sep 29, 2012 7:41 PM
439	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Sep 29, 2012 7:32 PM
440	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Sep 29, 2012 6:30 PM
441	yes	Sep 29, 2012 6:17 PM
442	YES, PLEASE! Please provide a safe direct path for cyclists on this route that does not require dismounting for stairs.	Sep 29, 2012 4:44 PM
443	I strongly strongly support the bike and pedestrian lane on the Portage Bay bridge!!!!	Sep 29, 2012 4:26 PM
444	It seems to me that a nice wide bicycle path is a no-brainer here. Please please make a bike path part of this design!	Sep 29, 2012 1:23 PM
445	There needs to be more bicycle facilities in this area with the creation of a new bridge.	Sep 29, 2012 1:20 PM
446	Please build a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 29, 2012 1:13 PM
447	Make it safe for pedestrians. Noise will be a major issue.	Sep 29, 2012 10:07 AM
448	Yes, definitely! Both my husband and I would bike over and bring out of town guests too if there was that option from Eastlake.	Sep 29, 2012 9:28 AM
449	Will it get used? How many cyclists use Harvard? Most north south riders use Eastlake Blvd to access uw. They wouldn't want to ride up the steep hill to then go down to Montlake. Riders from east side to Seattle are mostly going to uw area. The project is putting in great trail(s) under 520 for walkers. I think this one needs a study to determine usage and it needs to be built to full width so that high speed downhill riders and really slow weaving struggling up hill riders don't collide. I also think a layout of how it would really look and connect with the neighborhoods should be developed before anyone can decide. There is not enough information provided to garner full support from me yet.	Sep 29, 2012 6:44 AM
450	Having a wide bike path on this bridge would really connect the east side to downtown for cyclists.	Sep 29, 2012 6:37 AM
451	Need substantial bicycle and pedestrian connections throughout.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 PM
452	Duh! Make everything bike/ped accessible. It's more useful and cheaper that roads for cars.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
453	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 28, 2012 9:46 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

454	There MUST be bike/ped connections here.	Sep 28, 2012 9:16 PM
455	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 28, 2012 9:07 PM
456	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 28, 2012 8:14 PM
457	Again I am very interested in seeing more bicycle and pedestrian connections. This helps people exercise and hopefully get out of their cars.	Sep 28, 2012 8:12 PM
458	For me biking and pedestrian functionality and safety are exceptionally important.	Sep 28, 2012 7:21 PM
459	Only if the users are tolled.	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM
460	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:47 PM
461	YES! YES! YES!	Sep 28, 2012 5:09 PM
462	This is extreamly important to me. I commute daily between Seattle and Redmond. There is never enough room on the buses and it is costly to use them just to cross the 520 bridge, forcing me to ride an additional 25 miles around the north end of lake washington.	Sep 28, 2012 4:58 PM
463	This is imperative to allow an accessible bridge for walkers , joggers and bikers	Sep 28, 2012 4:28 PM
464	This would be an important consideration for the bicycle traffic coming across the SR-520 bridge. If you do not have this, many potential cycle commuters will get back in their cars because there is no direct way to come off the bridge and get in or out of the downtown Seattle area.	Sep 28, 2012 3:53 PM
465	I believe there should be a bicycle and pedestrian component to the portage bay bridge section. It will connect the north end of Roanoke Park to the new link light rail station at UW and bus connections to the 520 montlake bus stops which is an asset. I also think an aerial path across the bay will be a pleasant viewpoint. To my mind a bike/ped path does not need to climb to 10th Ave E.. To be more accessible it can connect to the hillside just west of Boyer Ave E. A series of switchbacks and paths can bring people up to Delmar and then 10th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 2:52 PM
466	Utmost importance. Need bicycle lanes.	Sep 28, 2012 2:36 PM
467	Clearly cyclists need to get from Montlake to downtown and north Capital Hill. If there is a reasonable route that avoids adding an extra lane to the bridge, that seems the most sensible option. That said, I would rather have the cable-stayed design with a bike lane than the dull box-girder without!	Sep 28, 2012 2:20 PM
468	strongly prefer	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM
469	Please do more than just study the idea. Add in a wide enough bicycle and pedestrian trail - 14 feet wide - with safe and convenient access at both ends of the bridge to other trails and paths.	Sep 28, 2012 2:10 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

470	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 2:00 PM
471	there should be easy access for bikes to commute across 520. grade should be considered	Sep 28, 2012 1:47 PM
472	A 14-foot bike/ped shared-use path on the Portage Bay Bridge is a no-brainer. It makes no sense to build a bridge without such a path, as we'd likely need to add one later. People crossing the 520 bridge should be able to continue, crossing the Portage Bay Bridge, without having to go the long way around. Include it!	Sep 28, 2012 1:17 PM
473	Yes, separate bicycle & ped lanes not necessary.	Sep 28, 2012 12:49 PM
474	YES! Strongly like! Need a 14 ft wide minimum bridge trail and connectors	Sep 28, 2012 12:09 PM
475	I think this is vital and fills a glaring missing link that exists with the current bridge.	Sep 28, 2012 11:53 AM
476	I would like to see a bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This would allow bicyclists traveling through the university district and capitol hill more direct access to attractions on the east side of Lk WA.	Sep 28, 2012 11:46 AM
477	Better bicycle and pedestrian connections will make the whole project work better in the long run.	Sep 28, 2012 11:39 AM
478	For the Portage Bay Bridge, I support this integration of a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 28, 2012 11:34 AM
479	Great idea! Must have	Sep 28, 2012 11:32 AM
480	A Number One! This is the must have!	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
481	This is my preference although the facility is less important than the safe connections.	Sep 28, 2012 11:08 AM
482	Very important!	Sep 28, 2012 10:49 AM
483	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 28, 2012 10:17 AM
484	We absolutely must ensure that the Portage Bay Bridge includes safe, direct bicycle access to downtown and the University district.	Sep 28, 2012 10:01 AM
485	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 28, 2012 9:54 AM
486	Yes, it is very important to have a bicycle and pedestrian path on this bridge as there is no easy direct route at this time.	Sep 28, 2012 8:49 AM
487	Yes...i cycle this route and it is far from safe or simple today	Sep 28, 2012 8:31 AM
488	YES - MUST HAVE BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS.	Sep 28, 2012 7:02 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

489	YES, this is a must!!!	Sep 28, 2012 6:21 AM
490	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 12:36 AM
491	Absolutely. Bike use will only continue to grow as a mode of commuting and getting around Seattle, for fun or errands. A thoughtful plan will make sure that the routes are safe and well connected and integrated with existing routes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 PM
492	It is so important to have a nice 12 to 14 foot wide mixed use path on this bridge - for pedestrians and bicycles. I work with so many people at Microsoft that don't commute on their bicycles from Seattle to Redmond due to not having an easy way to get acoss the bridge... Let's continue to make a statement in the PNW with alternative modes of transportation - it is so critical to the spirit of our area.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 PM
493	A bike/pedestrian lane on the Portage Bay Bridge is a huge waste of money. There is a nice path that moves from 23rd to Montlake with a direct & flat connection to Boyer and the University Bridge. The path also connects to Delmar which will swing into the new lid at 10th for great bike access to Capitol Hill and SLU. For walkers on the existing Montlake path, stairs up from Boyer to 10th provide direct, easy access up and over the hill from the end of the Montlake path. A little paint, a couple signs and a hillside stairway provide better connection options for FAR, FAR, FAR less money than building a wider, more obstructive bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 PM
494	Most certainly must provide bicycle facility on bridge, to complete link between Eastside and downtown Seattle along this corridor	Sep 27, 2012 10:53 PM
495	I am all for new and improved bicycle lanes/paths.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 PM
496	Yes! Let's "integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends." I've been bike commuting -- and advocating for others to do the same -- in the Seattle area for 12 years now. The number one thing that makes the difference between scary and pleasant is *trails*. When people can get where they're going without fear of being struck by a car, many more can enjoy their bikes. Trails have a network effect: more trails make the existing trails more valuable. Putting an adequate trail on the Portage Bay Bridge would be a huge win; let's use the right-of-way and construction opportunity while we have it!	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 PM
497	Please make sure there is a separated bike/ped trail/	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 PM
498	Yes Yes, we need a bridge for everyone!	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 PM
499	Needs to be a high priority. 14 foot wide multiuse path at the minimum.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 PM
500	definately! minimum 14 feet wide	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 PM
501	Safe bike route please!	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 PM
502	Please integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 9:34 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

503	There needs to be safe transitions for bicycles from the bridge to commuting corridors.	Sep 27, 2012 9:20 PM
504	Please integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 9:02 PM
505	Yes, yes yes!	Sep 27, 2012 8:35 PM
506	bicycle path would be great	Sep 27, 2012 8:29 PM
507	Bicycle lane on 520, and anything that connects, would be great! Many commuters would use it.	Sep 27, 2012 8:16 PM
508	Oh my God, yes...We need thought out bicycle access, this is our opportunity to plan it right. Use our local resources here in Seattle for design and input. Bicycle transport is growing faster then the city has been able to provide good support for. This is a great opportunity to do it right!	Sep 27, 2012 7:51 PM
509	This is a must. More and more people will be commuting by bike and on foot and this option will greatly increase the accessibility by bike and foot. There should be planning to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities	Sep 27, 2012 7:36 PM
510	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:03 PM
511	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 6:31 PM
512	This is what I would most prefer.	Sep 27, 2012 6:29 PM
513	Yes please, need relief from only having I-90 as a 'cross the lake option' for bikes.	Sep 27, 2012 6:14 PM
514	YES!	Sep 27, 2012 6:04 PM
515	I'd very much like to see this happen.	Sep 27, 2012 5:58 PM
516	yes, yes, yes. We need a separate path for bikes and pedestrians. It would be a crime to build the 520 bridge without this and adjacent amenities for bicyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 5:58 PM
517	I bike. Please let me bike.	Sep 27, 2012 5:45 PM
518	I am all for more convenient ways for cyclists and pedestrians to travel around the city.	Sep 27, 2012 5:32 PM
519	My primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 5:20 PM
520	Yes, continue a a trail through the Portage Bay bridge to allow better connections to downtown for cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 5:07 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

521	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 4:51 PM
522	Not only study, include in design and construction. This should be a full 14 foot wide bicycle/pedestrian corridor to enable current and future cycling/walking needs.	Sep 27, 2012 4:46 PM
523	Please be sure to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 4:44 PM
524	Bicycle and pedestrian accommodation should exist to alow use across the whole bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
525	Primary importance and concern. The enormous transportation and access payoff for the relatively trivial added expense makes this almost mandatory.	Sep 27, 2012 4:37 PM
526	providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge. THIS is the reason I'm filling out this survey.	Sep 27, 2012 4:06 PM
527	I favor Preference 8 because it's very important to have excellent bicycle and pedestrain connections in this area. With the University in the area and many sporting events, bike usage will increase from the Bellevue area and it's really important to have a direct connection.	Sep 27, 2012 4:02 PM
528	bike and ped connections would be great. The lake is obvious impediment to getting around via bike or walking. adding these connections would be helpful.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
529	Please build a separate bicycle path or bicycle/pedestrian path.	Sep 27, 2012 3:59 PM
530	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 3:57 PM
531	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
532	Absoluetly, efficient bike travel to downtown and S. Lake union is a must	Sep 27, 2012 3:52 PM
533	This is really needed as a top priority. There are many cyclists who want to use the Northern Bridge	Sep 27, 2012 3:46 PM
534	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
535	there should be a 14 foot shared use trail along the portage bay bridge and connecting Montlake to the east side for use by bicycles and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 3:35 PM
536	This is very important to me, particularly Montlake connections to downtown. Please integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail across Portage Bay Bridge with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 3:20 PM
537	Yes! Please, please add a bicycle/pedestrain lane to the Portage Bay Bridge. It makes total sense to connect the Eastside to Downtown with a direct protected	Sep 27, 2012 3:17 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	path. It is a bicycle path that I would use personally.	
538	YES!!! Don't just study connections, but make connections. We need a safe connection across the bridge! Not loading our bikes on a bus, but a bike/pedestrian lane across the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 3:00 PM
539	There must be a 14 foot wide bicycle and pedestrian connection on the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 2:56 PM
540	This is definitely a requirement for any new infrastructure expenditure like a bridge. Pedestrians and cyclists are commuters too.	Sep 27, 2012 2:53 PM
541	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
542	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
543	YES - this is really needed for safe alternate transport!!! we BIKE here in seattle	Sep 27, 2012 2:42 PM
544	Highly recommed doing this!!!	Sep 27, 2012 2:34 PM
545	This is SO IMPORTANT!!	Sep 27, 2012 2:21 PM
546	I support evaluation of a bike/pedestrian link along the Portage Bay corridor between the new floating bridge, Roanoke area and north Capitol Hill. I hope the outcome will support these critical links as part of this project, but I view this as an important and necessary step. A proper bike/pedestrian facility width would best and most safely accomodate the various types and speeds of uses, and accomodate long-term growth of these travel modes. 14 feet has been mentioned, and hope the evaluation will consider this option.	Sep 27, 2012 2:21 PM
547	Yes, please--all the way across to Bellevue. The I-90 bike/ped. path is afar too narrow for safety. This should be at least 12'.	Sep 27, 2012 2:13 PM
548	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Sep 27, 2012 2:11 PM
549	The bridge should include a ped and bicycle facility	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
550	Absoutely should be a requirement.	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
551	A bicycle and pedestrian connection on the Portage Bay Bridge from Montlake to downtown Seattle and North Capitol Hill is essential. If you want to get this project right and make it visionary, it should include this bicycle/pedestrian connection.	Sep 27, 2012 1:58 PM
552	YES, YES AND YES!! the safer the bicycle route thats provided the greater the number of users for all levels of cycling. I bike to work everyday and risk my neck everyday and so much NEEDS to be done to make commuting by bike safer. Its the 21st century why are we still debating this topic, look at europe they've been doing it for decades!!!! plus portland is ahead of us on all categories cycling, shouldn't we be ahead of them?	Sep 27, 2012 1:55 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

553	This is key add...	Sep 27, 2012 1:43 PM
554	Absolutely!	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
555	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. We need to have an end bike path everywhere on 520, not piecemeal approach!	Sep 27, 2012 1:34 PM
556	We definitely need a bike path.	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
557	Bicycle and Pedestrian safety has to be one of the highest priorities in design to facilitate use of alternative transport modes. I recommend at least a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
558	THIS IS ESSENTIAL. I'm and avid biker from Bellevue and want a bike optimized ride to and from Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 1:22 PM
559	THIS MUST HAPPEN	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
560	that a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail is integrated within the Portage Bay Bridge design. This connection is not currently in the Baseline Design and yet has the potential to serve thousands of people wanting to bicycle and walk to destinations across Seattle and the Eastside.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
561	This is a high priority item needed to support non-motorized use by pedestrians and cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 1:06 PM
562	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Sep 27, 2012 1:04 PM
563	This would be an absolute. This would help ensuring safe and efficient passage to downtown from local areas and the Eastside. This trail should include enough separation between bikes and peds.	Sep 27, 2012 12:56 PM
564	incorporating bicycle and pedestian walkways has to be part of the overall plan.	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
565	This is really a great nice to have. There are other ways to get there but have a direct route on the bridge would really encourage non auto commuting. If the bridge gets you across the lake but then dumps you on busy streets its much less viable	Sep 27, 2012 12:43 PM
566	The fact that you even present a bicycling option on the bridge as something optional is a mockery, insult and slap in the face of the bicycling community. The bridge must have a bike path, the only question is what side to put it on.	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
567	This would great if it can be integrated into existing bike ways	Sep 27, 2012 12:32 PM
568	As a resident of Capitol Hill who works in the University District, I would be more inclined to ride my bike to work if I felt there were safer options for commuting. I would also ride my bike to the East side, again if the route was safer.	Sep 27, 2012 12:32 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

569	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 12:29 PM
570	Definately integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 12:28 PM
571	No further widening of the bridge!!	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
572	build 14' wide pedestrian/bicycle path! I want to be safe and I don't want to have to go out of my way while being a good citizen.	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
573	YES! we should be including bike/pedestrian access on all of these projects! as you say, Safe, direct and comfortable. let's move people on all modes of transport!	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
574	Crucial!	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM
575	This is an extremely important and should be built with any new bridge design. It's a critical link between Capitol Hill, Eastlake, the UW and SR-520.	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM
576	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
577	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Sep 27, 2012 12:07 PM
578	I feel this is essential. It is an important transportation link to the Eastside as well as within Seattle. The bridge spans geographical barriers (water, hills) and a bike/pedestrian route is very important.	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
579	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Sep 27, 2012 12:01 PM
580	This is very important and needs to be included in the final design	Sep 27, 2012 11:59 AM
581	This is my preference.	Sep 27, 2012 11:55 AM
582	yes - this very important	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
583	Yes please! This would an extremely useful way of getting to downtown from the Eastside and from points north of the UW. The other option is to use local roads for that segment, but this is slower and involves more climbing. The trail under 520 is also not very safe as it is very narrow in parts and has poor sightlines.	Sep 27, 2012 11:51 AM
584	I strongly support the construction of a direct bike/ped bridge all the way through Portage Bay. i would like to see it designed such that it can easily be accessed at Montlake Blvd and taken all the way to the 10th/Delmar lid, so it can connect directly with Harvard Ave E. The current route under 520, through the play fields, up Delmar and 11th is less than ideal. It is also important for there to be a direct bike link from the Eastside to downtown Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 11:50 AM
585	This is worthwhile. Bikers reduce traffic and keep big businesses here in Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 11:49 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

586	Yes, and include a shared use path on the 520 bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
587	don't just study, install safe bike lanes. it's still too dangerous to bike across with kids	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
588	agree	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
589	MUST include a bicycle/pedestrian lane on Portage Bay Bridge. Failure to incorporate this feature would be a gross dereliction of responsibility. East/west bicycle traffic should not be forced through dangerous 5-way Boyer/Lynn/16th intersection and should not be forced up/down Delmar.	Sep 27, 2012 11:38 AM
590	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
591	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
592	Yes, Awesome, do it!!! I would also improve the connection from Montlake to Eastlake Ave along the southside of Portage Bay. And, improve the connection to the Burke Gilman trail.	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
593	Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM
594	My primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
595	Important! Bicycle connections should be paramount in planning if we want our citizens to become healthier and reduce traffic and emissions by getting more people on bikes and out of cars.	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
596	I would be strongly in favor of a path separated from autos by an impregnable wall, with separate pedestrian (i.e. jogger) and bicycle lanes. This would definitely benefit drivers and cyclists (and joggers)--right now, cyclists have a LOT of hills to climb in that area and tend to compete with and minorly delay traffic at rush hours.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
597	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 11:16 AM
598	I wouldn't personally use it often because I don't live in the Roanoke or Portage Bay area. Also, I'm pretty sure bike paths exist on the streets to take you around Portage Bay to Montlake through the neighborhoods. A bike path on the bridge would be a fast way to get to 520 on your bike if you then wanted to cross 520 and could with your bike to get to Bellevue.	Sep 27, 2012 11:16 AM
599	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 AM
600	yes, integrate a 14 foot bicycle and pedestrian trail	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

601	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:13 AM
602	Yes! I am a frequent bike commuter and also ride recreationally. I think that the lack of a bike path across 520 is pretty limiting. I live in Bothell and it would be VERY nice to have a lake crossing via bike that is closer than I-90! I feel strongly that adding bicycle and pedestrian lanes is a CRITICAL aspect of any new road work as it will provide better transportation and health opportunities for years to come.	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
603	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
604	Please integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. A bridge without accommodations for pedestrians and bicycles is not a bridge at all.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
605	This is extremely important to me. I live on the east side, but do a lot of my business in seattle. I am also an avid bicyclist, and would love to be able to bike into seattle without having to go all the way over the top of the lake, or down to I-90,	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
606	very high priority	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
607	By facility, do you mean a path? If so, then you should be mindful of the gradient. Have a look at the I-90 cycle path design, this is about as steep as the path should be for general pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
608	we need this!	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
609	ABOSOLUTELY YES!	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
610	Yes, this is important	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM
611	Strong support for an integrated 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This would help mitigate traffic on the bridge and promote alternative commuting options.	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM
612	Don't need a "facility." We do need a wide enough path to support bike traffic, feeding into safe bike arterials to UW, downtown, and Capitol Hill.	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
613	As a cycist and runner I prefer any and all safe, direct and comfortable bicycle	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	and pedestrian connections	
614	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
615	This would be very important for me. Enabling bicycle traffic on the 520 bridge would allow me to travel without my car	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
616	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
617	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:58 AM
618	Important	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
619	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
620	It's imperative to have proper bicycle and pedestrian access.	Sep 27, 2012 10:51 AM
621	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
622	Bike connections through this area are absolutely needed; the current paths are indirect and, in places, unsafe.	Sep 27, 2012 10:45 AM
623	I really want to see good bicycle and pedestrian connections. This is a must.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
624	Definitely need this - biking is so prevalent now, we need to make it safe	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
625	I prefer preference 8	Sep 27, 2012 10:40 AM
626	Absolutely. Need ability to bike safely from Lake Union to the east side.	Sep 27, 2012 10:40 AM
627	This is the most important feature... An at least 14 foot wide bike/ped lane.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
628	Of course add pedestrian and bike facilities. We need to move people in as many ways as possible. Bridges aren't just about moving cars, buses and trucks	Sep 27, 2012 10:38 AM
629	My primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
630	This would be wonderful	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
631	Ensure that a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail is integrated within the Portage Bay Bridge design. This connection is not currently in the Baseline Design and yet has the potential to serve thousands of people wanting to bicycle and walk to destinations across Seattle and the Eastside.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
632	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge		
	at both ends.	
633	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
634	This is THE MOST IMPORTANT element of the design. The Portage Bay Bridge must integrate a bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. It is totally crazy to be constructing a 21st century bridge and not including a way for people on foot or bike to get across it.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
635	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
636	access and safe use is key.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
637	these connections are critical to a frowards thinking design and society in genereal. Yes these connections need to be made.	Sep 27, 2012 10:23 AM
638	integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Sep 27, 2012 10:22 AM
639	There has to be a safe sensible and efficient connection with the Burke Gilman Trail as well as all other nearby bike paths. I would bike commute to 148th st redmond if there was a safe efficient way to get there.	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
640	Please insure that there will be a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:19 AM
641	A high priority for me as a commuter and recreational bike rider. Frequent the I-90 bike paths and would really appreciate a cross over on the north end.	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
642	high priority, but not necessary or even desirable to put it on the bridge here. Better is bike ways that are integrated into street level taking into consideration traffic levels and grade.	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
643	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
644	Please add bike and ped paths	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
645	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in “Preference 8” in the online survey.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
646	Important improvement, let's make eastside bike friendly into Montlake and Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
647	Bicycle route will enable more bike commuters reducing overall traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
648	this should be requied and is highly needed as there is no path today.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
649	Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use.	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

650	This is super important. With this major infrastructure piece Seattle has a chance to shape what a modern city should be in terms of Bicycle and pedestrian (and runner, and baby walker, and dog walker, and power walker and roller skater etc. etc.). The connections are what make keep the users safe and open up the flexible commute options. Please give this due consideration.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 AM
651	Bike and pedestrian paths across and around the bridge are critical. These will help reduce traffic and appeal to the seattle / east side residents. and are critical for attracting new talented workers to the metro area.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
652	agree that pedestrian & bicycle connections need to be included.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
653	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
654	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
655	Yes, this is definatly needed, As bus prices will only raise, if we are redoing the bridge we might as well make it the best possible, No half-done efforts this time, never again.	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
656	Don't "study" it, just DO IT (Include a shared use path along this section of bridge)!!! Why leave this piece of the puzzle missing? Why not just include it from the get go, and save some $$ on a study, and having to make changes to the design later down the road? Unless WSDOT really never intends to implement such a shared use path, which is what I suspect. Have you ever ridden your bike around Portage Bay? It sucks! A shared use path ON THE BRIDGE would dramatically increase connectivity between the east and west sides of lower capitol hill, and this city is DYING for better east/west connections.	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
657	yes, a path across makes crossing the lake more practical	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
658	A path that allows motor vehicles but not bicycles doesn't only impact this area. It can make the difference in many people choosing whether to bike their entire route or stay in a car. There's no easy "work around" for a bicyclist or pedestrian who would benefit from being able to access this route. Please include safe bike/ped infrastructure in the plan.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
659	For get studying! Just build pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the bridge! How can this even be a question in this day and age? The inability to cross 520 on your bike or your feet is one of the most glaring failures in road design in the Northwest!	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
660	Excellent concept but still falls far short without bicycle access across the lake.	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
661	Just make sure there's a dedicated bike/pedestrian lane with safe entrances and exits. Would be short-sighted not to. Consider the city we are becoming!	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
662	Yes please -- this is the most important thing to me. I live in Wallingford and work on the East Side -- I would bike almost every day if the connection were a little easier and safer. PLEASE include this bridge.. it would be a shame to build a great new highway that neglected giving the same connectivity to cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	Thanks!	
663	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
664	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
665	Portage Bay Bridge: My primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
666	yes yes yes!!! it would be so awesome to be able to safely bike or walk across the 520 bridge. please provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
667	Essential and absolutely critical to the long-term success of the project. Safe bicycle routes will encourage the use of that transportation method, particularly between Redmond and downtown Seattle. Direct connections to the Burke Gilman Trail seem like an obviously essential design element.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
668	A bicycle and pedestrian pathway across the Portage Bay Bridge would be very desirable	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
669	This needs to be safe and convenient for cyclists and peds. 14-foot wide is what I am hearing works.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
670	absolutely needed. Bike paths add such a small cost to the over all cost of these projects and should be maximized!	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
671	This is a must. I really don't understand why SDOT and WDOT can't get with the program, and implement safe and accessible infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists of all types as a defacto standard. There shouldn't even be a question about providing as part of the general transportation plan. Get with the program, people.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
672	Definitely needed.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
673	Please integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
674	Please include a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail as part of the Portage Bay Bridge design. It’s only a half-mile connection, and if built would connect the Eastside of Lake Washington to North Capitol Hill in Seattle by a completely separated trail that is safe, convenient, and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities to ride and walk on.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
675	YES! Get alternative to car - make biking safte - this is higher priority that car flow - take space away from cars and make a bike path	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
676	Yes, Bicycle and pedestrian connections.	Sep 27, 2012 9:47 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

677	There needs to be stronger connections in this area for bikes. Montlake needs to be bridged to downtown via portage bay. Also, connections should be legible and seamless; otherwise, they're a waste.	Sep 27, 2012 9:47 AM
678	There should be a safer route through downtown Bellevue and Kirkland to the bridge as it is pretty dangerous going through those places on a bike right now.	Sep 27, 2012 9:47 AM
679	YES!!!!	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
680	This is my preference.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
681	Bike & pedestrian connections are very important to me.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
682	This must be done.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
683	Integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
684	need a safe bike/pedi trails on bridge	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
685	Yes please. Please ensure we have Bike options	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
686	This is the reason I came to this report. For a city trying to be more conscious of future of our environment, the more bicycle friendly we can be at every turn the better. Fast, smooth, and wide for bikes please.	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
687	This is my strongest preference.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
688	Bicycle access is key.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
689	bicycle and pedestrian access and use is very important to me. There is a significant amount of bicycle traffic that would benefit from access to 520	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
690	The more bike access the better. Bicycle commuters are increasing taking more cars off the road.	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
691	yes, you MUST do this. We have suffered without this for way too long.	Sep 27, 2012 9:37 AM
692	Bike trails must be built for both up hill and down hill cyclists. The uphill ones need occasional pullouts. The down hill ones need space, no silly curvy bits, and where there are curves, the path surface must be banked - 10 degrees or so. Put the view pull outs on the uphill riding side of the path!!	Sep 26, 2012 11:59 PM
693	We need this.	Sep 26, 2012 5:56 PM
694	Very important!	Sep 26, 2012 2:59 PM
695	Huge Huge Huge...building a bridge without bike/ped access is nuts	Sep 26, 2012 11:16 AM
696	Not just study, but actually provide. Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is essential for the project. People need to get around the neighborhoods, not be limited only to points north and south of a freeway. There are only disadvantages	Sep 26, 2012 11:12 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	that result from isolating neighborhoods like that.	
697	think this would be good to take bike traffic off montlake/23rd	Sep 25, 2012 8:15 PM
698	Of course. The way this is worded, it needs to happen. Is the 520 people responsible for all of that work? No. If a bike lane needs to be on the Portage bay bridge, then yes the 520 people should build it. I think the city, cascade bike, and transportation choices should team up to study the bigger picture. Or is that the city of seattle's job with their bicycle master plan? Maybe that plan is missing the mark if a study still needs to happen. Again, keep the 520 costs down so the project can get funded and you can show progress.	Sep 25, 2012 9:34 AM
699	Please do. I am in favor of providing safe, isolated passage for pedestrians and bicycles. This will encourage more people to choose self powered transportation and significantly reduce the risk of harm. Giving bicycles and pedestrians an isolated corridor also makes drivers more comfortable and less distracted trying to 'avoid' vulnerable users.	Sep 25, 2012 9:16 AM
700	I support a 14-foot shared-use trail along the Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 25, 2012 8:57 AM
701	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:48 AM
702	Good	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 AM
703	I know the Cascade Bike Club wants me to advocate for a path on this bridge ... but to me it seems like a path going no-where. If the idea is to connect all the way from Bellevue to Seattle, I can see the appeal, but I would want to know what is going to happen when the path on the bridge ends in the Roanoke area ... If there was a reasonable plan to connect from the end of the bridge to downtown for walkers and bikes ... I would be all for it ... but to me it looks like a path that goes no-where ... really what is in East Lake / North Capital hill that I want to go to ?	Sep 24, 2012 10:47 PM
704	You only get to build these things once in a generation. Please make sure to include a bike / ped facility along the bridge. This facility will service the whole community and if it is not included at this stage we won't have this option again for another generation. Whenever we create new transit facilities they should be engineered to support cars, buses, transit and bikes. leaving any of them out reduces options and flexibility.	Sep 24, 2012 9:50 PM
705	Yes, yes, yes! I want these things!	Sep 24, 2012 9:14 PM
706	Why on earth would you want to put bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the middle of a six-lane vehicle bridge? Shouldn't those facilities be included in the buildouts on either end of the bridge rather than in the middle, or is the underlying design idea to *increase* interaction between pedestrians, bicycles, and high-speed vehicles over water?	Sep 24, 2012 6:13 PM
707	I support this design. The final design should integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 24, 2012 5:48 PM
708	Putting a bike lane along the bridge would make a safe connection, assuming	Sep 24, 2012 5:41 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	you can go right to the Roanoke lid, and from there either to Harvard or down to Eastlake (ie the issue isn't just the route, but the connections). However, I've rode across I-90 enough times to know that the ride is very unpleasant. Simply providing a better connection from the montlake bridge to W Montlake Pl would solve much of the problem. There is apparenlty already some kind of path there, but its connect to the west side of the bridge, while 99.9% of bikes ride on the east side. My current path is either (1) university bridge to eastlake (2) monlake bridge, across 520 on 24th E, jog to 25th E, boyer, interlaken, delmar, 11th, miller, Harvard.	
709	Please put a bike lane on bridge like I-90 has.	Sep 24, 2012 4:17 PM
710	This is a needed improvement. Traveling by bike is an economcial and great way to reduce traffic, good bike lanes seprated from traffic encouage ridership.	Sep 24, 2012 2:18 PM
711	Absolution support this! We need to provide for bicycle and pedestrian access whenever we make road improvements. This is especially important in this case, as there are no good alternative routes.	Sep 24, 2012 1:58 PM
712	I would like to see an integrated 14 foot bicycle and ped trail with safe access at both ends.	Sep 24, 2012 1:09 PM
713	excellent	Sep 24, 2012 1:02 PM
714	Yes, this is a must!	Sep 24, 2012 12:56 PM
715	Absolutely put in a bike/ped path. Such a lost opportunity for the city and the neighborhood if you do not	Sep 24, 2012 12:43 PM
716	YES, YES, and YES. The bicycling and pedestrian connection through this neighborhood are tremendously important, and current hodge-podge of options is very lacking. Having strong bicycling-oriented design in the area will help the thousands of cyclists who commute via neighborhood to study (at UW), to work (in downtown Seattle, South lake Union, University District, Wallingford and Fremont neighborhoods) and for recreation throughout the city. Please make this experience better, faster and safer while we have a good chance to do so.	Sep 24, 2012 12:39 PM
717	YES. A complete bicycle facility along 520, to match I-90, would be of great benefit to cyclists.	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
718	This is critical for continued increase in bicycle capacity and safety	Sep 24, 2012 12:30 PM
719	We NEED more bike corrodors, it is the future of transportation and to connect the city to the east side and NE Seattle. Please make sure there is a bicycle thoroughfare	Sep 24, 2012 12:22 PM
720	I am a commuter cyclist and such a connection would be a great improvement; today I have to bike on narrow roads and compete with aggressive cars for space. A direct link like the one described would make my commute safer and more pleasant.	Sep 24, 2012 12:08 PM
721	Yes please. This is a common corridor I bike along and seeing a bike route	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	would be great.	
722	Yes on the bike & people walkway. Drove to Eastern Washington last June, amassed at the number of bikers and joggers on the I-90 bridge.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
723	Please ensure safe commuting options. Great plan.	Sep 24, 2012 12:00 PM
724	Awesome idea this will help out bike commuters immensely.	Sep 24, 2012 11:58 AM
725	This is very important to me. I make decisions about where I live and where I work related to the bikability of the commute. Having a solid route across the lake and on either end of 520 would be a huge improvement.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
726	Yes, please do this. Make it easy for bicycles to safely commute into Seattle and Capital Hill.	Sep 24, 2012 11:57 AM
727	Have them bike around.	Sep 24, 2012 10:00 AM
728	separate ped and bike flows for safety and capacity.	Sep 23, 2012 6:50 PM
729	I am deeply dismayed that so far there seem to be no plans for a bikeway on this part of the project, and sincerely hope that you reconsider as the question wording here seems to imply you are doing. I understand you're getting some pushback on account of the width that it would add to the bridge, but it's a small percentage, and won't have the noise or pollution impacts on the neighbourhood that car lanes do.	Sep 23, 2012 6:43 PM
730	yes	Sep 23, 2012 2:33 PM
731	The most significant element of this project for me is the inclusion of a bicycle/pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge. This trail would provide a critical link for bicyclists coming not only from the east side across the 520 bridge but for bicyclists from NE Seattle to link to Capitol Hill, South Lake Union and downtown. I currently commute by bike between Laurelhurst and South Lake Union and frequently ride up Delmar to 10th Ave E and over Capitol Hill to get to work. A lower slope bike lane on the bridge would be a huge improvement as it would eliminate the need to ride up a steep hill on inadequate bike lanes, through dangerous intersections, and on dark streets/trails that do not feel safe after dark.	Sep 22, 2012 4:31 PM
732	absolutely-this is a 50+ year investment-all evidence points to increased use and reliance on non-motorized transportation options such as walking and biking - we need to construct now what will certainly become a critical non-motorized connection through this part of the city	Sep 22, 2012 12:35 PM
733	The Portage Bay Viaduct needs to include a bike lane. WSDOT needs to do a better job in selling the notion that it will never be used as a car lane in the future. This will help with one of the chief concerns from the Roanoke and the North Capitol Hill communities. The Prep space should be used to enhance the access to the bike lane on the Viaduct. The crosswalk at Delmar and Interlaken needs to be made safe. This may meaning widening of the sidewalk on the south side of Delmar. Traffic calming features in this area should be used to	Sep 22, 2012 11:03 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	increase the safety of walkers and bikers. They could be design to help slow the traffic at the Bagley Viewpoint. The intersection of the bike lane with the Bill Dawson Trail needs to be carefully design to create a sense of safety. The wall for the storm detention pond is unacceptable and dramatically reduces the sense of safety in this area.	
734	This is my priority. Please strongly consider develop a bicycle path that crosses Portage Bay and connects to bike routes on Capitol Hill near I-5. It would an incredible shame to not make the new 520 as multimodal as possible. Thanks for your consideration.	Sep 22, 2012 10:25 AM
735	yes. important to take advantage of this opportunity to support and encourage the increase numbers of bikes and pedestrians - which should help reduce vehicle congestion and parking issues on the eastside and in seattle.	Sep 22, 2012 10:01 AM
736	This is the most important piece if we want to really become a livable and environmentally friendly city.	Sep 22, 2012 2:39 AM
737	Seattle must move forward as a leader in mixed use routes. The current connection from North Capitol Hill to Montlake is long, confusing and daunting without a motor vehicle. These neighborhoods are too close in proximity to allow only cars to travel with ease between the two.	Sep 22, 2012 2:35 AM
738	Bicycle and pedestrian connections are important in this area of the city; especially due to the dense populations of the University District and Capitol Hill.	Sep 21, 2012 3:31 PM
739	Yes, this is a good idea. Please consider noise levels on the bridge for users, especially people using the proposed view points.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
740	I really appreciate the bike and pedestrain features as well as the park/lid.	Sep 20, 2012 9:16 PM
741	That would be the most important choice you will make. Additionally, a tunnel under 520 as is currently proposed for the bicycle pedestrian bridge just exacerbates the grade up to Roanoke. If anything, incorporate a gentle overpass if WSDOT really must construct the bike trail on the south side of the Portage Bay Bridge while putting it on the north side of the larger 520 span. Who really is pushing for the current south/north chicane? Are they serious? The key for this is to make it as easy to navigate on a bike or with feet and to put as much thought into it as one would for the cars.	Sep 20, 2012 3:09 PM
742	Absolutely	Sep 20, 2012 10:33 AM
743	Yes!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! This would be a great connector for DT/Eastside. Just keep the path safe.	Sep 19, 2012 3:22 PM
744	There absolutely needs to be a bike and ped facility on the Portage Bay Bridge. You cannot funnel hundreds or thousands of people a day from the Eastside into Montlake and then dump them out onto the streets to find their way westward.	Sep 19, 2012 12:23 PM
745	YES YES YES-- This is a Major commute route that would highly BENEFIT less traffic if SAFE Bicycle Lane is placed on this route!! THis should be a no brainer-- the amount of cyclist from MS alone would reduce traffic so much!!	Sep 19, 2012 12:16 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

746	This seems ideal versus having to go around the bay, one either side, as it is now.	Sep 18, 2012 3:16 PM
747	Preferable.	Sep 18, 2012 12:05 PM
748	Very important. Need good bicycle connectivity.	Sep 18, 2012 11:48 AM
749	Great idea...	Sep 18, 2012 6:38 AM
750	I say No, I want the new bridge to be as narrow as possible	Sep 17, 2012 9:28 PM
751	Maximize bike and ped connections at all opportunities.	Sep 17, 2012 5:13 PM
752	Yes, we need to encourage biking and walking in Seattle in all city planning	Sep 17, 2012 4:36 PM
753	The bicycle lane should be included in the design.	Sep 17, 2012 4:24 PM
754	THIS ONE	Sep 17, 2012 3:16 PM
755	I love the idea of Seattle becoming a city of walkable, bikeable bridges--not only for healthy daily mobility, but also for the wonderful experience of walking & cycling bridges, which provide for a different view of the city, and of its connection to waterways, and of the way in which water and terrain shape a city. I'm thinking of experiences walking & cycling the Golden Gate bridge, as well as the many fabulous bridge facilities throughout Portland, as well as Redding's amazing Sundial bridge, as well as recent facilities for peds & bikes on the bridges that span the cut and have already made north-south non-motorized travel much easier in Seattle, but also of little neighborhood bridges (the Princeton bridge in NE Seattle, the pedestrian/bike "bridge" across the Ravenna ravine on 20th Ave. N.E.) that allow you to move through the tree tops as you cross a ravine.	Sep 17, 2012 3:04 PM
756	There should absolutely be continuous, bicycle and pedestrian friendly access for the full width of the 520 bridge.	Sep 17, 2012 11:16 AM
757	yes, biggest priority!!!! fewer cars. the more roads you build, the more cars will show up. stop building more roads or else we will turn out looking like Los Angeles!!! and traffic will be even worse.	Sep 17, 2012 9:29 AM
758	Absolutely needed in this area	Sep 17, 2012 6:11 AM
759	This is absolutely necessary in my opinion - in the future our community will rely even more on bikes and walking as a means of transportation and so anything that we can do now to prepare for this will continue to make Seattle a great place to live.	Sep 16, 2012 7:33 PM
760	At the minimum a Blike lane on the PB Bridge is a great alternative to using the city's Del Mar Drive, and ideally should connect to the new SrR520 North Side cross-lake bridge Bicycle lane.Possibly bytaking out one of the two center transit lanes and making them reversible since the will use the I-5 Reversible I-5 Express lanes btween SR 520 and the Seattle CBD.	Sep 16, 2012 4:01 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

761	This is important to me.	Sep 16, 2012 1:17 PM
762	Yes, bike and pedestrian connections are a good idea. Not sure what the "facility" means or whether it's necessary. Just safe lanes, and easy ingress and egress.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
763	I am in support of the Portage Bay Bridge for such purposes. I live in the North Capitol Hill area, but I do not support/agree with the North Capitol Hill Association's opposition to this "wider" facility.	Sep 16, 2012 10:00 AM
764	VERY important, there is alot of bike and pedestrian traffic in this area.	Sep 16, 2012 9:02 AM
765	This is VERY VERY important for the City of Seattle.Prioritize this at all times..	Sep 16, 2012 7:21 AM
766	I STRONGLY SUPPORT THIS. A 21ST CENTURY FREEWAY MUST ACCOMODATE BIKE & PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL TO RECCONNECT NEIGHBORHOODS AND SUPPORT HUMAN POWERED MOBILITY!	Sep 16, 2012 2:19 AM
767	Would be nice	Sep 15, 2012 9:24 PM
768	It would be inexcusable to build this bridge without a bicycle and pedestrian facility. This will be a key connection between the East Side and the employment centers in South Lake Union and Downtown, and will also provide improved connection between UW and Capitol Hill in a more direct and more comfortably-graded facility than any current routes. Please do not revert to 1950s design and build another bridge with no non-motorized access!!	Sep 15, 2012 8:36 PM
769	A bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge is an essential component. It will be heavily used as a connection between the East Side, the University District and South Lake Union, and will also provide a reasonable-grade access to North Capitol Hill. Expanding this bridge without providing bike and pedestrian access would be an inexcusable throwback to 1950s style highway design and a huge setback for efficient bicycle travel in Seattle.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
770	no comment	Sep 15, 2012 7:48 PM
771	North Capitol Hill can be kind of a tough place to make a transit connection from. It'd probably be worth putting some effort into making a nice connection for people to get to Eastlake and to Montlake, where they could connect with various buses and the new Link Station respectively	Sep 15, 2012 6:10 PM
772	The more buicyle friendly the better.	Sep 15, 2012 1:38 PM
773	Love it, but I would like more details on how the trail connects to Delmar/10th.	Sep 15, 2012 1:32 PM
774	Just as across the Lake, ANY bridge should have AT LEAST ONE decent bike/pedestrian pathway (with "peninsulas" at every XXX feet so people and bikes can get out of the way if they need to stop (enjoy the view, rest the dog, fix a flat, etc), and not be exposed in the (hopefully fast) bike traffic. The WORST design today is the I-90 bike/pedestrian path. Way too narrow, and way too exposed.	Sep 15, 2012 12:52 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

775	Bicycles and pedestrians have NO PLACE on this bridge. Including them will massively increase the cost, reduce the capacity for motor vehicles and make everyone less safe. Keep the bikes and pedestrians in the design process, but keep them at ground level - possibly by REMOVING all cars from any part of Interlaken and that area and creating bike/pedestrian ONLY surface level streets. Consider taking the Burke Gilman trail concept and running it all the way from the Arboretum along the waterway, under the Montlake Bridge, through the area by Fisheries, under SR 520, wrapped around the Montlake Playfield and along the shoreline or sidewalk, back under SR520 by Queen City, down along the street/ROW that serves the houseboats, under the University Bridge and hooking it into the round-Lake Union trail. REMOVE motor vehicles from this route and dedicate it to pedestrians and bikes and get the bikes OFF Boyer and Fuhrman Avenue. Cyclists are not safe on Fuhrman, get them off onto their own dedicated bike route.	Sep 15, 2012 12:31 PM
776	Fine	Sep 15, 2012 11:21 AM
777	I support this proposal to connect this gap that currently has one going on Boyer Ave and up a huge hill and possible stairs. The connection should consider western integration with both the lid and Boyer Ave E.	Sep 15, 2012 10:54 AM
778	Most important	Sep 15, 2012 1:14 AM
779	Would like pedestrian and bicycle options to cross the entire span of the bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 7:33 PM
780	Better bicycle connections are essential.	Sep 14, 2012 5:52 PM
781	We already have a decent bike and pedestrian path on the portage bay bridge. We need one on 520!	Sep 14, 2012 5:51 PM
782	Add bike path.	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
783	My gosh, enough study! How can we possibly build a bridge -- a mega project like this! -- without having safe, direct crossings for people not in cars? It's mind-boggling that excluding walking and biking across the bridge would even be considered in this day and age. I'm ashamed for our city that I even have to advocate for it. Build it already!	Sep 14, 2012 5:15 PM
784	I doubt many bicycle riders or pedestrians will use the Portage Bay Bridge due to steep incline	Sep 14, 2012 4:42 PM
785	This MUST go beyond study. It MUST be done. We are moving into a new era where, at bare minimum, bikes and pedestrians are going to make up a larger and larger percentage of trips. Why WOULDN'T we have facilities for these greener, cleaner methods?!	Sep 14, 2012 4:29 PM
786	Sounds great. Connections to transit (if feasible) also great. Anything to provide another way to get around without a car.	Sep 14, 2012 4:20 PM
787	If the Portage Bay bridge is to be widened, it should have the auxiliary lane for merging traffic. The auxiliary lane has major safety features and expedites flow. The auxiliary lane was dropped in order to keep the footprint as narrow as	Sep 14, 2012 2:41 PM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

	possible. The narrowness principle applies here too.	
788	good	Sep 14, 2012 2:01 PM
789	YES!!!!!!!! Please do this!	Sep 14, 2012 1:52 PM
790	There absolutely needs to be good bike/ped access to the new bridge. I like the idea of a bicycle facility. Parts, mechanics, bike parking. That would all be great.	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
791	Always when possible and reasonable.	Sep 14, 2012 1:48 PM
792	the greater the access to non-motorized transport, the better - thanks for including that as part of the options	Sep 14, 2012 1:36 PM
793	Yes very important	Sep 14, 2012 1:19 PM
794	Forget about it. Bicycles and pedestrians don't pay anything for the bridge. Only cars pay.	Sep 14, 2012 1:14 PM
795	Absolutely!	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
796	No more need to study it, but build it - a 10-12' path that will accomodate the peds, bikes, strollers, dogs, and lost coyotes, and an occasional black bear migrating from Ballard to Sand point.	Sep 14, 2012 12:55 PM
797	Don't just study, make the bicycle/ped facility on the Portage Bay Bridge a fundamental element of the design. This will end up being more important than any single auto lane. If we want to make the bridge narrower, drop it to 4 auto lanes, or 5	Sep 14, 2012 12:54 PM
798	As a cyclist, and year round bicycle commuter, I love this idea.	Sep 14, 2012 12:52 PM
799	yes please	Sep 14, 2012 12:41 PM
800	Yes. This bridge needs a bike facility!	Sep 14, 2012 12:36 PM
801	Thank you	Sep 14, 2012 12:33 PM
802	I know this seems like a strange after thought, and I thought it was superfluous when I first heard it, but something similar to the floating bridge in regard to path and view points would really be amazing on this bridge. Connections from montlake to the hill are difficult at best in regard to routes, safety and steepness, this seems a good opportunity to help ease all of that.	Sep 14, 2012 12:24 PM
803	Top priority. This would be great!	Sep 14, 2012 12:23 PM
804	Yes please.	Sep 14, 2012 12:13 PM
805	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:04 PM
806	Good	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM

Page 4, Q5. Preference 8: Bicycle and pedestrian connections: Study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge

807	And light rail??? Has the potential to move far more people efficiently than bikes.	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
808	not sure how this fits in with the uphill climb to the I-5 merge, but bikes & walking are good	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
809	YES! We NEED to help bicyclists and pedestrians get around safely!	Sep 14, 2012 11:56 AM
810	Yes please!!! Please make it easy for people who walk and bike to use this bridge and please connect multiple communities to the bridge. The 520 bridge serves the region and many people will use it on foot and on bicycle!	Sep 14, 2012 11:55 AM
811	I woudl use this connectons if available to visit friends by bike in the Eastlake neighorhood from my Montlake neighborhood	Sep 14, 2012 11:50 AM
812	Pedestrian and bike trail that connects Bellevue, across Lake Washington, and continues to Roanoke area is desirable. A trail on one side or the other across the Portage Bay bridge (or under it) is appropriate tax dollars spent.	Sep 14, 2012 10:40 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

1	The amount of detail for this area is disturbingly lacking. More attention must be placed here. Please continue to work on making the Montlake Blvd East corridor world-class. It must be given the highest level of coordination, teamwork, and planning to ensure the needs of all modes of transportation are equally met. I bicycle from Greenlake down to the Burke-Gilman trail and then to the Montlake freeway interchange multiple times per week all year round. The connection for pedestrians and cyclists from the Burke-Gilman trail and the future UW light rail station to the Montlake lid must be fully supported by well-thought out and safe infrastructure for the users of these world-class facilities. More space needs to be given to non-motorized traffic along this connection if pedestrians and the ever-increasing numbers of cyclists in the area are to interact safely. The Bill Dawson trail should be improved for safety and expanded to connect both sides of Montlake Blvd East at the Montlake lid separated from traffic. As much separation as possible through this area ensures all modes can flow easily.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	Important	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 PM
3	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Works for me!	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 PM
4	The existing bicycle park-and-ride like facility here should be kept in the final design.	Oct 5, 2012 11:04 PM
5	We need to get more creative in solving the problem here: Keep the 4 lanes of traffic, add a dedicated bike path, and meet historical preservation constraints. I'm hoping that SDOT can be successful in finding ways to improve traffic flow, obviating need for 2nd bridge. But can't we do something like lane-sqeezing to get at least a 6 foot dedicated bike lane, and then give the bikes one of the Montlake bridge's sidewalks. So yes is my answer, but I feel like we need to get more out of the box thinking to resolve this. This is a critical element of any long term bike master plan, especially considering the hookup to the light rail station.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 PM
6	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 PM
7	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 PM

	pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
8	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 PM
9	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

10	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 PM
11	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
12	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 6:23 PM
13	The Bill Dawson trail is too narrow now, and rather scary to walk alone--though I do it nearly daily. It needs to be wider, taller, well lit, perhaps nearer to the water and thus within range of the eyes of those working at NOAA and NF. We need to be and feel safe as we cross under 520. And put the bike/ped lane on the south side of 520 to connect Dawson trail to Delmar path.	Oct 5, 2012 6:20 PM
14	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area. We go through here a lot on bikes - needs attention.	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
15	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 PM
16	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 4:44 PM
17	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
18	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 4:39 PM
19	What are the grades for the bike path to climb over the hill why not keep it low in a trench like the highway and go under Monthlake?	Oct 5, 2012 4:10 PM
20	Once again the buses get everything and the cars nothing yet the cars pay for the work with gas taxes, license fees and tolls. This is highway robbery.	Oct 5, 2012 4:08 PM
21	Yes, please do, thanks. I suggest also working with Seattle Neighborhood Greenways group.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
22	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 3:40 PM
23	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
24	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
25	Great idea.	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
26	emphasis should be on clearing up the traffic flow, ensuring bicycle safety, and eliminating the conflict points between cars and bikes.	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
27	Endorse	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
28	Anything that reduces car/bike interactions is preferred. Avoid putting bikes across intersections.	Oct 5, 2012 3:08 PM
29	Please find a safe way for bike/ped users to get through/over Montlake Bvld.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
30	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
31	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area. I do not think the 2nd drawbridge will do much and note that the Seattle City Council just voted against it.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
32	Make a way for all the bike commuters to be able to get through this area safely and without too much delay.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM
33	this is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
34	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and	Oct 5, 2012 2:57 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	biking in this area.	
35	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
36	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 2:45 PM
37	This area is currently very inhospitable for bike/peds, and I'm afraid the new design doesn't significantly improve that. The double-hairpin ramp to access the Bill Dawson trail on the west side of Montlake looks difficult to navigate by bicycle, especially on a path shared with pedestrians. The tunnel looks like it'll feel sketchy to be in.	Oct 5, 2012 2:43 PM
38	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 2:35 PM
39	Nice.	Oct 5, 2012 2:31 PM
40	We really need good bike access with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:21 PM
41	yes.	Oct 5, 2012 2:20 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
42	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
43	Sorely needed.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
44	Yes, I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area. It's much needed!	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
45	I ride my bike to the Montlake area to catch a Bellevue bus. I support improved bicycle and pedestrian access. I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
46	Preference 9: I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 1:48 PM
47	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. I walk or bike to and from the many busses that travel in this part of Montlake everyday - please, please, make them safer than how they are today and how they are currently planned. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These	Oct 5, 2012 1:28 PM

	connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
48	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
49	yes, important.	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
50	My concern here is totally gridlock. I'm not a civil engineer, but I don't see how this IMPROVES the current situation. I love the lid and park, however, I'm concerned that the access to the 520 remains the same EXCEPT you've now taken away the Lake Washington on/off ramps. By sending more cars to the Montlake bridge system, I can't see how it's not utter gridlock at peak times. Will we still need to U-turn to head towards I-5 or will it be a left hand turn. Does 23rd/24th get any wider or just on the bridge? I'm concerned.	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
51	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 PM
52	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:52 PM
53	Do not waste time and/or money on this type of project. It is supposed to be a bridge for autos, not pedestrians and cyclists.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
54	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
55	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM

	their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
56	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
57	agree, this is very major bike/ped route.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
58	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
59	I strongly support further planning and implementation of safe, direct, and reasonable walking and bicycling options in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
60	I strongly believe we need more thinking/ planning about how pedestrians and cylcists can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's ped and bike traffic is growing quickly, mostly on the west side. - Crossing SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be direct, safe and easy. With this standard, we must re-imagine the ped/bike connections through this area. The connections must work for kids, older people, and folks with disabilities. Managing 7 lanes of traffic is a challenge for these groups. This is a critical north-south path for pedestrian and bike commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Having folks bypass the on-ramps easily and safely will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The side walks East/West and walkways on the Montlake Bridge should give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bikes and peds from Montlake, west of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be separated from HOV traffic and car traffic. We need a connection from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by a bridge over the ramps to	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM

	connect to Hamlin without conflict with motorized traffic. This may help the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make life safer for everybody. - The currentBill Dawson trail is not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway is gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We should make route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, anyone feels comfortable walking to the bus station through, and people on bikes feel secure. Route people at ground level or extend west lid if needed. Make the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided through this area.	
61	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
62	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
63	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
64	I support further planning to increase safety. Given the current set-up it unsafe for pedestrians and bikes so it would seem it is only going to get worse - so new planning is required	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
65	I support further planning for bikes and peds in this area. There are many important connections in the area and should be made accessible to everyone including elderly, children and should be ADA. Separation of cyclists, peds and traffic by some type of vegetation added landscaping to make the overall walking and biking experience pleasant and safe. The Bill Dawson connection would need to be very well lit, have security cameras imbeded into the ceiling to discourage unsavory activities. The community safety would be better served to use an alternate route such as a west lid addition. Make a solution that bypasses on ramps for pedestrians, add landscaping to make it pleasant and allow for traffic flow without mixing in pedestrian crossings. Pleas study this further and present to the neighborhoods. THE BILL DAWSON TRAIL SHOULD CONNECT FROM THE MONTLAKE PLAYFIELD TO THE WEST MONTLAKE PARK WITH A CONNECTING TRAIL ALONG THE SHORELINE IN FRONT of NOAA AND SET BACK NOAA's FENCE BY A FEW FEET TO ACCOMMODATE THIS TRAIL CONNECTION. THIS CONNECTION WOULD MAKE A GREEN LOUP FROM SOUTH PORTAGE BAY ALL THE WAY TO THE ARBORETUM WATERFRONT TRAIL AND INTO THE ARBORETUM WHICH IS A 5 MILE WALKING TRAIL IF THIS CONNECTION IS MADE. THIS POSSIBILITY SHOULD AND MUST BE DISCUSSED WITH NOAA ! NOAA can protect their security with vegetation behind their set back fence and their is no excuse for not allowing access to this connection!!! Make a solution	Oct 5, 2012 12:10 PM
66	Good idea - improvements needed here as this is hazardous for all types of traffic in current configuration	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
67	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side.	
68	Additional attention should be given to providing an expanded pedestrian and bicycle pathway west of Montlake Blvd., this pathway would provide improved access to the west side of the Montlake Bridge and the U of W buildings and Hospital. It would also provide additional access to the facilities on the west side of Montlake Blvd. Individuals wishing access to areas west of Montlake Blvd. would have a safe alternative.	Oct 5, 2012 12:01 PM
69	This seems very logical.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
70	I support improvements and planning for biking and walking in this area around the hospital, stadium, burke gilman and the campus. As it should be.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
71	yes-- this has always been a difficult area to bike through. Right now, it is particularly challenging.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM
72	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:41 AM
73	Yes, good. Do that.	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 AM
74	Very important. This area is criticle for the UW and people all over eastern Seattle.	Oct 5, 2012 11:35 AM
75	yes - strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 11:32 AM
76	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:31 AM
77	This is vital to maintaining the cohesion of Montlake with the rest of the city. A high priority should be placed on improving cycling and public transportation in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
78	The huge number of pedestrian and bicycle commuters in this area make should make this a high priority. Simple fixes such as widening sidewalks (parking strips are quite large between Shelby and Hamlin) and creating more of a buffer between street traffic and sidewalk traffic (by adding in parking strips, if possible) would do a lot to make this a more foot- and -bike friendly area. Many chicldren live in this area and there are local day care centers who walk children along Montlake. Their safety should be a high priority.	Oct 5, 2012 11:27 AM
79	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station.	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
80	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 AM
81	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
82	This is very important to me.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
83	yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
84	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
85	very important and significant	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
86	Strongly support this. Currently it's a mess to get with your bike from one end to the other.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
87	I support this wholeheartedly.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM
88	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
89	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini	Oct 5, 2012 10:38 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
90	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:35 AM
91	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
92	I strongly support having safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking access in this area. The Bill Dawson trail is not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable and scary at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, that everyone can be comfortable walking on to busses etc., and that help people on bikes feel excited to get out of their cars. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink this area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
93	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
94	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
95	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
96	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
97	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
98	This includes minimizing lane widths and turning radii to the greatest extent possible.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
99	Absolutely. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM
100	The MPCC strongly supports this Preference for the same reasons as has already been expressed regarding provisions for pedestrian and bicycle amenitites.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
101	I strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 AM
102	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 AM
103	I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car. Pedestrian facilities should not be an afterthought, nor should pedestrians be expected to go up and over or down and around to avoid cars. Pedestrians are like water, and if they see a flat route, they will take it, even if it is unsafe. Therefore, the pedestrian routes should be both safe AND direct.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
104	Cyclist and pedestrian amenities should be a top priority.	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
105	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
106	This a critical link to the light rail station and should be a major ped/bike facility	Oct 5, 2012 9:36 AM
107	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
108	Agree.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

109	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
110	I want a lid.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
111	Yes! Montlake Boulevard is awful to bike on now.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
112	Yes, absolutely.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
113	Not necessary but I'd recommend pedestrian overpasses for bikes and walkers.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
114	Absolutely. The more cyclists and walkers using the corridor, the fewer motor vehicles.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
115	More creative solutions need to be reached for how to improve the bike/ped level of service through this corridor. Most of the improvements for motor-vehicles that dedicate more width, more lanes, more fluidity will either not significantly reduce the congestion or encourage more congestion within the decade following the project completion. This is also a major bike and ped corridor and they are also functioning at LOS F. A fraction of the width being granted to motor-vehicles could be granted to peds and bikes to make this LOS A. Where can we get the greatest impact for our limited resources?	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

116	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
117	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 8:58 AM
118	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
119	EsentialEssential	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
120	Do not support a bike lane on Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 8:50 AM
121	There is the potential for large volume increases here for pedestrian and bicycle use ... BUT having to cross 7 lanes of traffic will be a big obstacle. It will improve commuting for cars and pedestrians and cyclists if bypasses are constructed that separate the cars from other commuters. Please figure this out. Also, high speed cyclists are a concern to pedestrians .... I wish they could be segregated as well. The Bill Dawson trail feels unsafe and it should re-designed to bring it to ground level, or better yet, build them a lid if needed.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
122	The sidewalks are heavily used by cyclists connecting across the Montlake Bridge, including cyclists going both directions on the "northbound" (east)	Oct 5, 2012 8:45 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	sidewalk. Sidewalks should be wide and have good sightlines.	
123	Bike/Pedestrian paths must be continuous through the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 8:42 AM
124	This area really needs attention for better bicycle access. And the Bill Dawson Trail is an embarrassment for a city that boasts such great paths as the Burke-Gilman and Interurban Trails.	Oct 5, 2012 8:32 AM
125	yes, trying to get to the arboretum from UW and cutting through 4 lanes of fast moving traffic is scary. Let's change that.	Oct 5, 2012 8:16 AM
126	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
127	Preference 9: I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 7:53 AM
128	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 7:43 AM
129	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
130	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 AM
131	yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
132	Definitely important.	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
133	I have biked this intersection every day for years, it remains the most dangerous part of my entire commute. The freeway off ramps must provide a clear transition between freeway driving and congested city streets. Merging drivers typically aggressive and over the speed limit, yet the off ramp merges directly into the path of cyclists. The sidewalks are overgrown and carry moderate pedestrian traffic, making it difficult to use them instead. Further, the steel bridge deck forces cyclists onto the sidewalk on the bridge span. Most drivers do not understand this, and therefore have difficulty anticipating bicyclists actions. Strong effort is required to reduce traffic speed (note that reducing speed in this congested area does not have to affect throughput–most of the safety issue comes from drivers at unsafe speeds who are forced to slam on the brakes after short distance). Further, a clear bike route must be established, more like the University Bridge. All bike traffic between downtown Seattle and everything and northeast Seattle is channeled through these two bridges, making a safe writing experience paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 AM
134	Again - keep it simple with a simple bike path.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
135	how about making the sidewalks low speed bycicle friendly and shareable with pedestrians. this would be a great way to accomodate the heavy vehicle traffic and the bikers. this model works well in large cities in Japan	Oct 5, 2012 7:06 AM
136	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 6:50 AM
137	good	Oct 5, 2012 6:45 AM
138	strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 AM
139	Yes, I strongly support this.	Oct 5, 2012 6:06 AM
140	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM

	sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
141	Great	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
142	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
143	High priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
144	Support.	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
145	Ok	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
146	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 4:56 AM
147	This is very important. I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 AM

	the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
148	This is one of the most dangerous parts of the bike commute. Their needs to be a bike sharrow with green bike lanes to the intersections so bikes can get through and traffic understands their intentions more clearly (for instance, trying to get over to south Montlake).	Oct 5, 2012 12:39 AM
149	This area is fairly dangerous for bicyclists given the heavy vehicle traffic in the area and the lack of bike lanes. The sidewalks also seem narrow and are in poor condition. This should be a top priority of the work in the Montlake area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 AM
150	This really doesn't say anything about what the plan is so it would be hard to comment on it.	Oct 5, 2012 12:03 AM
151	Please do this. I use the western sidewalk daily and crossing the ramps is slow as it is. Ideally, I'd want to feel safe letting elementary school kids cross 520 on the western side by themselves.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 PM
152	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 PM
153	Of course. This is a tricky area to navigate and is currently poorly executed for peds and cyclists.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 PM
154	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
155	Important for bicycle connection to U District.	Oct 4, 2012 10:34 PM
156	yes	Oct 4, 2012 10:33 PM
157	Create a separated grade/pathway for peds and bicycles to cross the Montlake interchange. As a pedestrian it is unpleasant to walk on Montlake Blvd. at present, with an additional 3 lanes of traffic and more on and off ramps I can't see how this experience will be improved. The lid needs to be accessed by bikes and pedestrians through the Montlake interchange, not to the east of where the majority of the users use the space.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
158	Support	Oct 4, 2012 10:21 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

159	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
160	The under-bridge pathway is scary enough with the existing bridge; double it, and I probably won't use it. As it is, I don't cross under it after dark, and I bicycle commute everyday, so that means I must cross on the surface streets, far more dangerous for me and slows car traffic as they wait for me to cross in crosswalks. Ped/bike crossings must be seperate from car traffic - it is far too busy and only increasingly so, especially with the lightrail coming in which will increase foot traffic. Seperating pedestrians and cyclists would be ideal, especially as there is such a large volume of both that it is difficult to safely share - these are commuters cycling, not leisurely recreational riders most days of the week.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
161	Yes please!	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 PM
162	I support this idea and it's important for safe travel. This is how I ride my bike now to get to the Gilman trail and making it safer would be great.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
163	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

164	I strongly support further planning to support safe and effective foot and bike traffic across 520 to the University. This is a very high traffic area, especially during peak hours. It is currently used extensively by bikes, pedestrians, cars, buses, etc. There needs to be greater access, wider sidewalks (especially for travel during football games, boat races, etc) that are easy to see around, well lit, good surface, etc. This is a critical point of transportation to one of our city's richest gems - the UW. Furthermore, since this will connect to the UW Med Center end of the UW, it will allow patients' families area to 'get away' during visits (the current green space behind the hospital is pathetic).	Oct 4, 2012 9:41 PM
165	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
166	a more direct bike access through this area is necessary as it is an essential connection on a major bike route, the Lake Washington Loop. Direct access without having to fight multiple on/off ramps will be a significant improvement. Similarly walking pathways that allow pedestrians to cross the Montlake bridge without crossing many lanes of traffic will be a major improvement	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 PM
167	this is important.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
168	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 9:24 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

169	Yes. This will become a heavily traveled bike route with addition of ST link rail service to Husky station, etc.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
170	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
171	The current routes seem to be very poorly laid out. Shoving everybody to one side of the bridge and trying to make them go under and over and around is just not going to work with the levels of foot and bicycle traffic in that area.	Oct 4, 2012 9:14 PM
172	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
173	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd is heavily used by pedestrians and bicycles, and this volume will certainly increase.The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for all users - children, older persons, the handicapped and the visually impaired. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. It is also important to give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes do not create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel safe and excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
174	Very, very important.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
175	Yes, improve cyclist access and safety.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
176	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	biking in this area.	
177	Good, this area sees a lot of pedestrian traffoc	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
178	YES!	Oct 4, 2012 8:32 PM
179	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
180	please.	Oct 4, 2012 8:16 PM
181	The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody.	Oct 4, 2012 8:05 PM
182	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
183	There needs to be either bike lanes or a bike track along Montlake Blvd, especially between Roanoke and the Pacific triangle.	Oct 4, 2012 7:45 PM
184	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 7:21 PM
185	I strongly support this especially with the new transit station being built near by.	Oct 4, 2012 7:20 PM
186	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 6:56 PM
187	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
188	Also improve experience for motorists	Oct 4, 2012 6:34 PM
189	These are all good plans. Emphasis on bike paths please.	Oct 4, 2012 6:11 PM
190	No tax payer money this is extra above and beyond - this is not a requirements - cyclists wno not need ant visual character and expereince at taxpayers and toll fees expense. There are many other areas a cyclist can go for free on existing cycle trails for a visual experience	Oct 4, 2012 6:02 PM
191	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
192	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 5:33 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
193	If there's a lid in this area, it would be great to provide additional area for commercial activity and more housing density.	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
194	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
195	Support	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
196	Eliminate plans for bikes - pedestrians only	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
197	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
198	Now that is what I am talking bout, working together to get cyclist and pedestrians to connect and be safe on the roads. I am for this!!!	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
199	not really an issue for my cycling needs	Oct 4, 2012 4:57 PM
200	must	Oct 4, 2012 4:44 PM
201	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 4:44 PM
202	We definitely need a design that will allow pedestrians and cyclists safe, easy crossing of SR520 and all ramps connected to it, especially on the west side.	Oct 4, 2012 4:36 PM
203	I support any option improving cycling conditions.	Oct 4, 2012 4:28 PM
204	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor	Oct 4, 2012 4:27 PM
205	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 4:05 PM
206	Sounds good, it's awkward for pedestrians (especially when there are a lot going to games) and cars that have to take a U-turn to go South	Oct 4, 2012 4:00 PM
207	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
208	focus on safety, reduce cost elsewhere	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
209	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 3:27 PM
210	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
211	This area is hard to navigate by bike! I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
212	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
213	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
214	Yes, a network that is clear and easy for all levels of users will be used more.	Oct 4, 2012 3:05 PM
215	Strongly support.	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
216	Oddly vague, but important!	Oct 4, 2012 2:49 PM
217	I strongly support further planning as to how people can bike can safely and comfortably through this area. Montlake Blvd's is a major bicycle link, and safe route for bicyclists and pedestrians across SR520 is an absolute must. This is a critical north-south corridor connecting commuters to the University, Hospital, and Burke-Gilman trail. A connection allowing these users to bypass highway on-ramps will be critical for this interchange. The currently uncontrolled bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd are not only a hazard for pedestrians and cyclists, but also cause significant interference with traffic moving though the area.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
218	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
219	I like this since it's better for bikes and peds.	Oct 4, 2012 2:42 PM
220	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
221	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
222	This design needs to ENSURE that it is safe and comfortable for pedestrians to use this street, ESPECIALLY when crossing freeway off ramps. These are formidable even for adults in daylight; include children or darkness and it's scary. Please consider this in the design.	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
223	this corridor does need some improvement	Oct 4, 2012 2:01 PM
224	I am very much in favor.	Oct 4, 2012 2:00 PM
225	YES! We must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:59 PM
226	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 1:55 PM
227	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to	Oct 4, 2012 1:41 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
228	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
229	The connection from the Burke-Gilman trail to this bridge is vital, probably the most important part of the bridge plan for cyclists. Why is it that every time a report or design proposal comes out I have to look so hard for information on how it will work? Is there a coherent plan for this? Or even a commitment to some level of service? Or is it just the typical crap, "We'll throw in some bike stuff wherever there's space." Unlike a lot of the useless gold-plated greenwashing going into this project, people will actually use this.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
230	unclear	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
231	Absolutely. This should be a priority.	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
232	The narrow sidewalk needs to be improved into an actual path	Oct 4, 2012 1:12 PM
233	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
234	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
235	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 1:03 PM
236	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
237	Preference 9: I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
238	OK	Oct 4, 2012 12:48 PM
239	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:40 PM
240	Support	Oct 4, 2012 12:34 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
241	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
242	Yes with the goal of safely and comfortable use of this area. This is an important norh-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW and the Burke Gilman trail. Bypassing the on-ramps easily and comfortable is a goal. Keeping pedestrians and bicycles away from HOV traffic and car traffic will make the entire area enjoyable for everyone particularly during peak commuting hours.	Oct 4, 2012 12:25 PM
243	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
244	I strongly support WSDOT not just studying but actually implementing a pedestrian and bicycle trail on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
245	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
246	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
247	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
248	YES! Again, this should be a given, not a question. Strong support!	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
249	Yes. I strongly support all efforts at assisting pedestrians and cyclists move efficiently and safely through this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
250	This is an area I travel over every few days on bike, and would welcome improvements, as it feels a little unsafe currently, with many intersections to cross.	Oct 4, 2012 12:08 PM
251	Nice addition. Most cyclists currently take route that is marked by features 12/13, but that is unclear for people who are less familiar with the area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
252	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
253	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
254	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM
255	This corridor currently has some areas that compromise the safety to bicycles and pedestrians. This is a great opportunity to make this corridor safe and easy to navigate for all users. I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
256	Sounds like a great idea.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

257	Yes, this area has needed a safe bike and pedestrian route.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
258	I support this preference. WSDOT should continue working with Seattle and Metro towards the goal of safer and easier experiences for both cyclists and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
259	as long as this does NOT include a second Montlake bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
260	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
261	YES	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 AM
262	Yes, very much support. It's super important to support cyclists and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
263	i endorse this. currently cyclists are shifted onto the sidewalk, which is unsafe for pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
264	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
265	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
266	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
267	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
268	Of course. Another no-brainer.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 AM
269	I strongly suppor this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:11 AM
270	I strongly support further planning for safe, direct, and comfortable walking and biking in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 11:04 AM
271	good	Oct 4, 2012 11:00 AM
272	I own our home a half mile from this location and strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 10:59 AM
273	agree with current design, but allow for safe crossing of a going to be busy boulevard.	Oct 4, 2012 10:35 AM
274	This whole plan seems to forget the importance of resolving bicycle and pedestrian safety NOW. We cannot wait for another two decades to "continue to improve safety". We need separated lanes in the current plan that will help bikes get across this difficult passage. I would prefer a plan that actually fixes the current situation and doesn't just leave it for later.	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
275	Yes, agree with need for further study	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 AM
276	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM

	underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
277	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 AM
278	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station.	Oct 4, 2012 7:07 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
279	I oppose spending money for pedestrian and bicycle facilities that will be used by hardly anyone.	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
280	This is a major walking and biking corridor which needs to be widened and made safer for both.	Oct 4, 2012 6:48 AM
281	Yes please! We need walking and biking access	Oct 4, 2012 6:07 AM
282	improved safety and ability to travel is important - this is an especially busy area and should feel safe and readily accessible	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 AM
283	Improve bicycle and ped. access on BOTH sides of the street. Don't make the bikes cross back and forth to a single bridge crossing. Design for future use - this is one of the biggest choke-points in the city for non-motorized transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 2:17 AM
284	- The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic.	Oct 3, 2012 9:45 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
285	This is the travesty part of the WSDOT Plan. An already awful traffic situation on Montlake Boulevard will be twice as bad if this plan is built. The simple widening of 520 will add 25% more cars to Montlake and the elimination of the existing Arboretum access to 520 will add 50% more cars to Montlake. And the addition of a 5th traffic light in this short 3-block stretch will result in a permanent parking lot. If this plan is built both WSDOT and the City of Seattle will be the laughing stock of Traffic Engineering World as well as the brunt of citizen complaints from every driver held up in the impending snarl of traffic. A bypass bridge from Marsh Island to UW needs to be put back on the table to at least eliminate the northbound traffic from 520 from Montlake Boulevard.	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
286	Support: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 9:06 PM
287	OK.	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM
288	Yes - ver important.	Oct 3, 2012 7:01 PM
289	6 lane Montlake- 6 lanes make it like Aurora- too wide, cleaves the neighborhood. hardly makes sense to add another bridge over the Cut, when the lane just go back to 4 going north past the stadium. better to keep access to/from Lk WA blvd; dumping it all onto Montlake will overwhelm it.	Oct 3, 2012 6:16 PM
290	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area.	Oct 3, 2012 4:02 PM
291	Please see comments on preference 8. This is a major bicycle and pedestrian zone. It's not enough to hope that drivers and cyclists obey signs. There needs to be a concerted effort to incorporate the family residences and pedestrians in the area with the bikers (they are usually bigger culprits in running lights, not yielding to pedestrians) and drivers. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic should not be a viable option for pedestrians. Shelby and Hamlin Streets should be incorporated with the rest of Montlake in all of the safety, wayfinding, visual character and experiences.	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

292	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 3:49 PM
293	Agree	Oct 3, 2012 3:41 PM
294	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd’s pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic.	Oct 3, 2012 3:06 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
295	YES! Bikes!	Oct 3, 2012 2:46 PM
296	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor. I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be	Oct 3, 2012 1:58 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
297	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 1:50 PM
298	Other than adequate width of sidewalks, this part should not require much money, time, or effort.	Oct 3, 2012 1:46 PM
299	Pedestrian and bicycle experience should be uppermost in the design of the lid.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
300	yes, yes, yes!	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM
301	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
302	absolutely	Oct 3, 2012 12:04 PM
303	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 11:56 AM
304	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area	Oct 3, 2012 11:38 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
305	OK everyone is trying to get through this area in cars, on bikes, on foot. I know this one is tough, please try to make it nice to walk/and bike across in a direct and friendly way.	Oct 3, 2012 11:01 AM
306	This is critically important. I used to ride from Madison Park through this area, and it was uncomfortable to say the least.	Oct 3, 2012 10:49 AM
307	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
308	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 10:30 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

309	Yes, this intersection is very bad at the moment	Oct 3, 2012 10:19 AM
310	It's surprising there are not more bike/car accidents in this area--I know that we've had many near misses in trying to navigate from Montlake to UW. There really needs to be a dedicated bike/pedestrian lane in this area if we're going to be serious about alternatives to car travel.	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
311	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
312	Yes. I am particularly concerned about the safety and appeal of the Bill Dawson trail: "Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
313	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake	Oct 3, 2012 9:36 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. I bike this corridor a dozen time of the year and seems like major improvement is needed for bike and ped safety.	
314	An unbelievable mess. All the time and planning and this is the net. Still a lame u-turn route. Still no place to go once you get off the 520.	Oct 3, 2012 9:05 AM
315	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:41 AM
316	Yes, although the second Montlake bridge is unnecessary and poorly conceived.	Oct 3, 2012 8:28 AM
317	Yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 AM
318	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older people, the handicapped and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 8:15 AM
319	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM

	children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	
320	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 7:40 AM
321	This area is so messed up that anything to help cyclists s/b done. Don't waste time on "visual Character" just make the road system work better.	Oct 3, 2012 7:11 AM
322	Yes, please do.	Oct 2, 2012 11:49 PM
323	The current setupof Montlake is ok enough. It would be great if bridge lifting was sheduled for recreational boats to only two to four times a day. There i alsothe new light rail station by Husky Stadium which will cause more pedestrian-cyclist contention on the current shared sidewalk and onthe Burke-Gilman.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 PM
324	yes	Oct 2, 2012 10:50 PM
325	This would be great for the community.	Oct 2, 2012 8:58 PM
326	I want direct bicycle routes. Please no wandering routes with lots of turns for recreational cyclists. I use my bike for transportation.	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
327	Cycling this area is a nightmare today. Please help us :)	Oct 2, 2012 6:58 PM
328	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated	Oct 2, 2012 6:16 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	
329	Absolutely, this will encourage cyclists and pedestrians.	Oct 2, 2012 5:48 PM
330	bike lanes please	Oct 2, 2012 4:49 PM
331	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor	Oct 2, 2012 4:23 PM
332	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
333	Strongly agree.	Oct 2, 2012 3:16 PM
334	Yes, this is a great area for biking and walking--both because it is flat and easy to access and because it's a way between different parts of the city.	Oct 2, 2012 12:31 PM
335	This is important.	Oct 2, 2012 12:22 PM
336	Definitely. As a multifaceted commuter (I bike, walk, and drive depending on the situation), this is needed more in Seattle to make the roads safer for everyone.	Oct 2, 2012 12:05 PM
337	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 2, 2012 11:48 AM
338	I strongly support. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and away from traffic. It must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. It is imperative that the need to cross 7 lanes of traffic be eliminated in favor of a solution that does not put pedestrians and bicycle in the potential way of drivers. Also, because this crossing is used more and more by pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, and the Burke Gilman trail, any solution that allows these people to not cross the on-ramps will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is NOT a good route for pedestrian and a very poor one for cyclists: safety issue underneath a huge span of highways, dark, gloomy in the best of times, destined to be a homeless encampment just like similar	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	areas all around Seattle. It is especially unsuited to pedestrian traffic. Route people at ground level; build them a mini west lid if needed. Rethink your entire approach. - A Safe Route To School must be provided. Bill Dawson takes children away from the Montlake Elementary school and the Public library. it is not a substitute for a safe and direct ground route parallel to Montlake Blvd E. and leading to 22nd Ave E. I strongly support preference 9.	
339	they better	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
340	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 2, 2012 10:09 AM
341	I don't see a place to comment (further) in this section on the need to connect from here directly to a bike/ped facility on the new Portage Bay bridge. The "Bill Dawson Trail" does NOT provide the connectivity required to meet the needs of path users wishing to access north Capital Hill and South Lake Union/Downtown. It should only be considered as access to the Montlake neighborhood west of Montlake Blvd and south of 520. Important but totally insufficient to meet the needs of a large fraction of the potential nonmotorized users of the new facility planned for the floating bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 10:04 AM
342	OK	Oct 2, 2012 9:44 AM
343	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 2, 2012 9:04 AM
344	Since Montlake Blvd is expected to carry more traffic due to the closure of the 520 Arboretum ramps, pedestrians walking between 520 and the Montlake Bridge will cross more intersections and access lanes than they do today. Providing simple crosswalks does not improve, and thus encourage, walking along Montlake Blvd. WSDOT should study alternatives that give pedestrians traffic-free passage to and from UW, Husky Stadium and the light rail station — and create a safe-route-to-school between Shelby/Hamlin and Montlake Elementary. Please use the considerable resources of the lid to make safe, direct and traffic-free routes for pedestrians along the Montlake Blvd corridor.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 AM
345	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 1, 2012 9:25 PM
346	agree - safety should always come first especially with so many cyclists on the road.	Oct 1, 2012 8:02 PM
347	would have killed the web designer to put the questions beside the image? pref 9 is a good idea	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
348	yes. be sure to include bicycling connection from 520 through portage bay and into roanoke/eastlake.	Oct 1, 2012 2:36 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
349	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 1, 2012 2:24 PM
350	Highest priority or any of the Montlake interchange issues for me. With all the transit options and bike trail options near Husky Stadium, having a safe way for bike/peds to get there from south side is paramount. This stretch of road is dangerous now and without major safety improvements will only get worse with the new design.	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
351	Absolutely. This is currently a challenging area to navigate by cycle or on foot and every opportunity to improve the experience should be undertaken.	Oct 1, 2012 12:44 PM
352	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Oct 1, 2012 10:21 AM
353	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 30, 2012 7:48 PM
354	In favor	Sep 30, 2012 4:57 PM
355	Yes	Sep 30, 2012 3:19 PM
356	Integrated paths on BOTH SIDES of Montlake Blvd E are essential for safe connections with UW Med Center and UW campus via NE Pacific St and Montlake Blvd NE.	Sep 30, 2012 10:31 AM
357	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 30, 2012 7:26 AM
358	This appears very complex. I leave it to your engineers!	Sep 30, 2012 7:12 AM
359	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 30, 2012 3:42 AM
360	if this work decrease auto-based mobility in the area, it will be a failure.	Sep 29, 2012 11:41 PM
361	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM
362	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 29, 2012 7:37 PM
363	Yes, please provide a safe path for cyclists, that does not require dismounting for	Sep 29, 2012 4:48 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
	stairs. I cycle commuted from Bellevue to UW across I-90, and more students would do so if this route existed.	
364	Yes. Please put in better bike facilities between Montlake and the stadium.	Sep 29, 2012 4:30 PM
365	This would be a great opportunity to put in real bike lanes, separated by planting or barriers. I see tons of cyclists on this road despite it not really having many amenities - and if people felt safe biking traffic would be reduced	Sep 29, 2012 1:41 PM
366	You need to actually work with them...	Sep 29, 2012 1:36 PM
367	Please create separated bi-directional bike lanes from the Burke-Gilman trail to and across the bascule bridge, connecting with the new SR520 bicycle path. This route should provide an overpass for bicyclists and pedestrians that allows them to cross from the stadium area to the Burke-Gilman trail to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 29, 2012 1:19 PM
368	The intersection is too complicated. The real problem is the I-5 interchange where nothing is being done to improve access to Seattle Center. Failure to fix will divert some traffic to here.	Sep 29, 2012 10:08 AM
369	Please do	Sep 29, 2012 9:32 AM
370	Of course.	Sep 29, 2012 6:58 AM
371	Make all paths safe.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
372	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
373	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor	Sep 28, 2012 9:49 PM
374	absolutely. it's a must.	Sep 28, 2012 9:18 PM
375	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 PM
376	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor	Sep 28, 2012 8:15 PM
377	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 28, 2012 7:26 PM
378	Since Seattle refuses to expand the bridge capacity (no second bridge), this will continue to be a huge bottleneck in Seattle's road system.	Sep 28, 2012 5:56 PM
379	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
380	YES!	Sep 28, 2012 5:11 PM
381	With bicycle commuters coming from the north or Univ of WA it will be important to have a good way to turn left onto the SR-520 route. The right hand loop seems to accomplish this in a safe manner. Please keep a good radius at the 180 deg turn for tandem bicycles and parents trailing children in trail-a-bikes or trailers.	Sep 28, 2012 4:17 PM
382	Sounds good.	Sep 28, 2012 3:49 PM
383	Very important!	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
384	prefer	Sep 28, 2012 2:23 PM
385	Yes, and look into separate bicycle facilities on Montlake Blvd E.	Sep 28, 2012 2:14 PM
386	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 2:02 PM
387	Yes, there needs to be some graceful, consistent way for cyclists and pedestrians to move between the 520 interchange and the Montlake bridge on Montlake. I'd prefer cycle tracks and clear, consistent sidewalks. But what's most important to me is that it's a direct path (don't send me down the side streets to get across three blocks), that it's clear, and that cyclists and drivers all know what to expect.	Sep 28, 2012 1:24 PM
388	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 28, 2012 12:27 PM
389	yes, please. Maps, signs, clear markings are key to getting grandma to use this stuff	Sep 28, 2012 12:12 PM
390	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 28, 2012 11:43 AM
391	Yes Yes!	Sep 28, 2012 11:35 AM
392	Bicycles! BICYCLES! RAH RAH RAH! My wife would bike commute daily if she could get from the bike path to UW.	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
393	Yes.	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
394	Sounds good.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 AM
395	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 28, 2012 10:19 AM
396	The current layout is highly unsatisfactory as the bridge sidewalk (and the sidewalks on by the road itself) are narrow and busy with cyclists and	Sep 28, 2012 10:01 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
	pedestrians. There needs to be a separation between cyclists and pedestrians from the Burke-Gilman trail to 520.	
397	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 28, 2012 9:55 AM
398	Yes, Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM
399	Like...I cycle thus route and the area the routes are confusing and risky in places	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
400	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 AM
401	YES - COMMUNITY AND FUTURE ACCESS FOR PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLES MUST BE PRIORITY OVERALL.	Sep 28, 2012 7:05 AM
402	YES, One significant concern about the current bridge and this access to the bridge is that a bike or pedistrian can not cross the bridge. This must be addressed	Sep 28, 2012 6:24 AM
403	Important!!!!!! I support this.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 PM
404	See if a new bridge is required. Maybe widen sidewalks.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
405	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 PM
406	This corridor desperately needs a cycle track.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
407	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 PM
408	Please make it safer to cycle	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 PM
409	Please improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 PM
410	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:05 PM
411	Yes, make it simple, which I understand can be the most difficult process to achieve	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM
412	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 7:40 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
413	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:04 PM
414	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 6:33 PM
415	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 6:30 PM
416	Yes please!	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
417	Yes, along with preference 15.	Sep 27, 2012 6:07 PM
418	YES!	Sep 27, 2012 6:06 PM
419	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 5:59 PM
420	Cool. I bike.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
421	Yes, yes and yes. Navigating his area and crossing the Montlake cut I find nerve wracking at times as both a cyclist and a pedestrian. Rather than have trees down the middle, I would tend toward removing these, moving car traffic lanes more centered, and then use the extra space provided for wider pedestrian and bicycle ways down either side.	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
422	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 4:58 PM
423	Provide a separated bikeway that connects easily to north and south bound bicycle transit onto Montlake Blvd. Ensure a direct connection north bound to the Burke Gilman Trail and southbound to the current cyclist bypass through Montlake.	Sep 27, 2012 4:55 PM
424	YES, please improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E	Sep 27, 2012 4:52 PM
425	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
426	currently no safe cycling passage anywhere along here.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
427	Yes, please do a great job for cyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 4:29 PM
428	Yes, this will be a high traffic area for cyclists and pedestrians due to the university and sporting events in the area.	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
429	good	Sep 27, 2012 4:07 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
430	Agree. Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 3:58 PM
431	Forget all the aesthetic stuff, pick the design so that bicycles can transit through the area rapidly without running over peds.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
432	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
433	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 3:41 PM
434	agreed.	Sep 27, 2012 3:21 PM
435	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 3:03 PM
436	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 2:49 PM
437	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
438	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. 2.Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. 3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. 5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:43 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
439	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:22 PM
440	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM
441	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 2:15 PM
442	West of Mntlake, ensure that there is a continuous separated path for peds adn bikes across the Portage Bay Bridge	Sep 27, 2012 2:09 PM
443	A safe north/south passage for cyclists and pedestrians in this area is key, in addition to routing cyclists onto Portage Bay Bridge and the 520 bridge access.	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
444	Do it!	Sep 27, 2012 1:48 PM
445	We need to seriously push for the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. This area is already very unsafe for bikers and there will be tons more traffic coming from North/Univeristy wanting to get on 520 bike path!!	Sep 27, 2012 1:37 PM
446	A must.	Sep 27, 2012 1:28 PM
447	makes sense but sounds like more of the same move ahead with Pref. 11 and 13	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
448	excellent	Sep 27, 2012 1:23 PM
449	High priority.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
450	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 1:08 PM
451	improved crossings for Montlake are important for safety. With the addition of the light rail station, improved separations for peds and bikes will help ensure safety and efficiency.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
452	I feel this very important.	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
453	So obvious a task you shouldn't even mention it	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
454	It appears that what is being proposed in the plan looks a lot like what we've already got, only worse for cyclists. Currently, bikes are routed onto sidewalks on both sides of Montlake Blvd that are too narrow for the bike and ped traffic already on them. The crossing over Shelby on the west side of Montlake Blvd is extremely dangerous, because drivers coming out of the neighborhood on Shelby do not stop for the red light when they are making a right turn. Cyclists travling north on the side walk are not visible to the cars. (I realize this is an SDOT issue) The plan appears to be calling for ped only on the west side of the street. This is unacceptable. If a cyclist is approaching by bike from the Portage Bay/Montlake Playfields trail, is he then required to cross over or under to the	Sep 27, 2012 12:43 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
	east side of Montlake Blvd in order to proceed north to the Montlake bridge? If your desination is the Burke Gilman Trail, this will involve much crossing back and forth of Montlake Blvd.	
455	Montlake Area: Our primary recommendations for the Montlake Area, many of which are identified in the survey, include: Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:35 PM
456	This is critical..the intersection is a mess and needs improvement. Again, safety of pedestrians and bicyclists should be strongly considered.	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
457	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
458	yes. anything we can do to improve the experience for current and future bike/pedestrian traffic here would be great. this is a highly used corridor by bikes/peds.	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
459	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 PM
460	yes	Sep 27, 2012 12:20 PM
461	The highest priority should be on improving transit speed and reliability the most.	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
462	Crucial.	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
463	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
464	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
465	I support this	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
466	Yes - this is very important and should be high priority	Sep 27, 2012 12:01 PM
467	Frankly, I don't like any of these options, but I guess this is best.	Sep 27, 2012 11:59 AM
468	yes - very important that the cycling and walking paths work well	Sep 27, 2012 11:56 AM
469	You need to create safe transportation for cyclists. If it's not there cyclists have to make dangerous commutes which makes drivers unhappy.	Sep 27, 2012 11:51 AM
470	In favor...	Sep 27, 2012 11:43 AM
471	sidewalks are in horrendous shape and circuitous once on the south side of Montlake Bridge making cycling difficult. Improving this area would be great.	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
472	Hard to tell from 2 dimensional view thought would be to have busses lower.	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
473	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
474	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
475	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:35 AM
476	YES.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
477	Work to keep bicyclists flowing smoothly through this area to transit and bicycle parking. Currently difficult to cross the street E/W, and limited sidewalk leads to a lot of contention between pedestrians and bicyclists, especially during UW events.	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM
478	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 11:27 AM
479	If we have to save money by not doing something, this is something that could be left for later.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
480	improve bicycle access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E	Sep 27, 2012 11:18 AM
481	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
482	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
483	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
	meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	
484	Yes! I am a frequent bike commuter and also ride recreationally. I think that the lack of a bike path across 520 is pretty limiting. I live in Bothell and it would be VERY nice to have a lake crossing via bike that is closer than I-90! I feel strongly that adding bicycle and pedestrian lanes is a CRITICAL aspect of any new road work as it will provide better transportation and health opportunities for years to come.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
485	This can be a heavy traffic area: clear signage and a traffic light crossing for cyclists and pedestrians would be necessary.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
486	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
487	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
488	high priority to improve bike/pedestrian N-S access here.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
489	Currently, bikes and pedestrians share a narrow sidewalk with light poles. Bikes can't go on the street due to metal grates. A wide bike path should provide enough room for safe riding both along 520 and to access 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:04 AM
490	Support this	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
491	Moderately mportant.	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
492	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
493	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
494	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
495	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
496	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 AM
497	yes. please created adequate signage!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
498	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
499	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	corridor.	
500	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:40 AM
501	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
502	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:38 AM
503	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
504	bicycle commuters need to be able to transit into/out of the city safely	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
505	It also provides soundproofing for houses that live next to the freeways, I know this by experience.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
506	YES. make cyling / commuting by bike attractive in that area !!	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
507	Please plan for the future with separated, bi-directional bicycle facilities from a SR520 Bike lane to full connectivity with Montlake Blvd. in both directions and, ultimately, the Burke-Gilman trail.	Sep 27, 2012 10:26 AM
508	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:25 AM
509	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
510	Yes, very important!	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
511	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
512	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	
513	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
514	ok	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
515	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
516	This is important. Yes. All others on this page should consider the neighborhood's views and balance them with costs. We need to be realistic if we want to get this built, no?	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
517	yes, please!	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
518	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
519	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
520	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
521	yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
522	Essential and absolutely critical to the long-term success of the project. Safe bicycle routes will encourage the use of that transportation method, particularly between Redmond and downtown Seattle. Direct connections to the Burke Gilman Trail seem like an obviously essential design element.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
523	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
524	Needed.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
525	Yes. This is a must. And again, it seems like a no-brainer to me. Just do it.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
526	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
527	yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
528	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

529	Great idea to improve the cyclist & pedestrian safety & landscaping. I bike through here regularly. Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
530	This is my preference	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
531	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
532	Yes. We don't want any more quadrapelic victims.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
533	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
534	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
535	I like this whole lid concept that makes bicycle and pedestrian friendly areas.	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
536	Safe bicycle access is very important to me	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
537	yes,	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
538	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
539	yes, this is important.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
540	Critical - this used to be my commute route, and this area was always a bit terrifying to go through as both a driver and cyclist.	Sep 26, 2012 3:03 PM
541	Not just work with the city, but actually do it. This project is being paid for with public money and needs to benefit all users, not just the ones who will spend the least amount of time here.	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
542	Vague	Sep 26, 2012 11:18 AM
543	believe this is imporant	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
544	Really? This should be standard process. Of course you will work with other agencies to determine details. The drawings are so conceptual right now that it is assumed that more coordination will happen.	Sep 25, 2012 9:51 AM
545	I am very much in favor of improving bicycle and pedestrian safety and accessibility everywhere but especially in this area. The proximity of the educational facilities and shopping across from major residential makes this an especially good candidate for accessibility and safety improvement.	Sep 25, 2012 9:25 AM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
546	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:52 AM
547	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 AM
548	Montlake Boulevard is a nightmare for bikes. It is busy with cars, the lanes are extra narrow, many cars have just come off 520 at 60 mph and are not ready to deal with the bikes on the road. Bicyclists have been permanently injured riding over the Montelake bridge. If WSDOT and the City can not find a safe way to separate bikes from traffic and move them through this north south corridor, the WSDOT should use it's power to make it illegal for bikes to be on Montelake blvd for at least 0.5 mile north and south of the 520 overpass. It is a huge problem for cars when a bike is in the lanes especially during rush hour, and it's not safe (even if it is legal for bikes to go along Montelake over 520 at 5mph. Providing a separate route for bikes would be good. But either way, bikes should not be allowed on Montelake Blvd for 0.5 mile north and south of 520 ... the same as bikes are not allowed on I-5 or I-90 in the city.	Sep 24, 2012 11:15 PM
549	I support this.	Sep 24, 2012 9:19 PM
550	Neither option seems to provide easy through access for bicycles or pedestrians without clogging the transit interface.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
551	This is a *major* bicycle route, and needs widening. Currently there are constant pedestrian/bicycle conflicts. Ideally there would be a separate bike route, so bikes don't need to be on the sidewalk anymore.	Sep 24, 2012 6:07 PM
552	Evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 24, 2012 5:52 PM
553	Yes, we need to improve the east-west connections for bicycles. Very important to me.	Sep 24, 2012 2:06 PM
554	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor	Sep 24, 2012 1:11 PM
555	Yes please.	Sep 24, 2012 12:57 PM
556	Montlake through this area - and in the bigger picture, Lake Washington Boulevard to the Burke-Gilman trail - has been a pain for cycling for quite some time. Could we expand on this to include bicycle facilities from the arboretum through to East Shelby?	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
557	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	Sep 24, 2012 12:18 PM
558	I bike this route on my way home from night school at UW and it can be quite unsafe, trying to cross the Montlake bridge and then get over to the neighborhoods on the east where the bike path travels.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM
559	Very much in favor of this.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
560	Forget the bike what about CARS. Remember who is paying the tolls for this	Sep 24, 2012 10:04 AM
561	All I know is that the status quo is terrible, so I'm sure you can improve on it!	Sep 23, 2012 6:48 PM
562	yes, there are many pedestrians and cyclists in this area, and they should be a priority	Sep 23, 2012 2:41 PM
563	Very important as this is the main N-S connector and is used by transit, cars, pedestrians and cyclists.	Sep 23, 2012 8:21 AM
564	The current situation on Montlake Blvd East is very difficult for both cyclists and pedestrians, as bicyclists are forced to ride on the sidewalks. It would be ideal if a way could be found to create separated facilities for bikes and pedestrians to improve safety for both.	Sep 22, 2012 4:40 PM
565	The switchback to get from Montlake Blvd. to the Bill Dawson Trail is not safe design. The Right-of-Way north of the proposed route should be fully utilized. The stairs down to the tunnel on the west side is that a safe approach. Pedestrians will come to the end of the tunnel at a 90 degree angle from these stairs. The problem is more server on the east side of the Blvd. in that there are two walls that restrict the feeling of safety. Way finding will be very difficult to get individuals from the west side of the Montlake Bridge to the Transit Station without crossing several lanes of traffic. The feeling of safety and a better sense of a better experience is not enhanced by the visual character of the design. Too many intersections. Too many lanes. Crossing times for biker and pedestrians on the overpass from Roanoke to Hamlin on the east side of the Blvd. will increase. With the closure of the Lake Washington Blvd. ramps, the increase of traffic in this area will further decrease the sense of safety for bikers and walkers.	Sep 22, 2012 12:30 PM
566	shold make it safer for bikes and pedestrians and easier for west-bound exiting cars to understand how to go south	Sep 22, 2012 10:07 AM
567	Yes	Sep 22, 2012 2:42 AM
568	Yes, this is important for this area.	Sep 21, 2012 3:42 PM
569	The outlined improvements should accomplish these goals.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
570	Fine. It will require a separated cycle track.	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
571	Yes	Sep 20, 2012 10:36 AM
572	A tremendous amount of traffic will travel through the 520 interchange. The draft report was silent about the amount of traffic the interchange will be expected to handle. The recently released consultant's report on the Montlake Bridge concluded that it is not currently a constraint on traffic flow, that the Pacific Avenue interchange and the 520 interchange are the typically the causes of traffic backups. How well do the proposed designs deal with the amount of traffic concentrated at the 520 interchange? The artist renderings make the lid experience seem bucolic, but if the interchange is curb-to-curb cars, the experience for cyclists and pedestrians will be unsettling at best.	Sep 19, 2012 9:26 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
573	Need a safe commuting route for cyclists and Peds!	Sep 19, 2012 12:17 PM
574	Smoothe, unobstructed passage on the North/South axis is essential to both pedestrian and bike safety.	Sep 18, 2012 12:20 PM
575	Seems reasonable.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM
576	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM
577	If a pedestrian is on the West side of the Montlake Blvd. at the bridge, they have to know that they need to cross Montlake Blvd at Shelby to get to the Transit Station. Otherwise they need to go down through the tunnel and up the other side. The third option forces the Pedestrian to go across 16 lanes of traffic thru 4 intersections.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM
578	definitely. highest priority.	Sep 17, 2012 9:59 AM
579	Support	Sep 17, 2012 6:14 AM
580	Yes, very important to have safe, visually pleasant experience for cyclists and pedestrians, as well as surrounding neighbors!	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
581	Bicycle and pedestrian facilities welcom	Sep 16, 2012 10:02 AM
582	significant bike and pedestrian traffic. Must be addressed.	Sep 16, 2012 9:17 AM
583	Consider connection to Burke Gilman Trail.Bike safety/access is CRITICAL!!!!	Sep 16, 2012 7:25 AM
584	Dedicated lanes for bikes and pedestrians are needed for safe travel.	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
585	nice wording, but it seems that you will do what you want no matter what the feedback	Sep 15, 2012 9:26 PM
586	Please prioritize bicycle and pedestrian access and preservation of green space in all these areas.	Sep 15, 2012 8:37 PM
587	For all of these areas, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle mobility and preservation of green space.	Sep 15, 2012 8:11 PM
588	Like.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
589	This is important. Honestly though these images are too small for me to really judge all the details very effectively. I'm going to skip the rest of the questions on this page as a result	Sep 15, 2012 6:12 PM
590	Car traffic in this area is already horrible and should be the number one focus	Sep 15, 2012 2:56 PM
591	Eliminate ALL signals. Keep the traffic flowing. Make Montlake a "classic" CLOVER LEAF. Add more lanes to Montklake Blbd AND the bridge.	Sep 15, 2012 1:41 PM
592	How do bikes pass through this area going N/S (from Montlake Playfield to the Montlake Bridge) and North to Montlake from SR-520? It seems like it would be much like today - along the sidewalk on the west side of Montlake Blvd. Is there	Sep 15, 2012 1:38 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians

	enough space on top of the bridge for the cars on northbound Montlake Blvd to queue up to head West on SR-520? Queues here may block access to the Eastbound SR-520 ramp. The Bill Dawson Trail needs to be widened and provide better visibility under the bridge. Currently there are two blind corners which makes cyclists a hazard. You've identified and documented the issue. Glad you're fixing this. I like the wide turn/switchback connecting the Dawson trail to Montlake. The merge between the Dawson Trail and Montlake should be a T-intersection to encourage user to stop and check for traffic. The rendering shows it as a Y merge which may cause people to just whiz through without looking (which cyclists love doing on downhills)	
593	Yes!	Sep 15, 2012 12:59 PM
594	Take what ever land you need to enhance the free flow of motor vehicles through the area and physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles.	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
595	Yes. A lid with all that traffic to cross over is not a real useful lid for people.	Sep 15, 2012 11:26 AM
596	Improvements would be nice.	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
597	This makes the most sense.	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
598	The eastbound on ramp will be a pinch point for traffic flowing from the Arboretum, Madison Park, Madrona, Broadmor, Martin Luther King Way via E Lake Washington Blvd. Add the cars that flow from W. Montlake Pl. E (going east) and 24th Av E (going north and wanting to turn on to the eastbound on ramp). This is a major design flaw which need attention. What should happen is the decrease in reliance of this intersection for vehicles traveling east by adding back into the design a new ramp from Lake Washington Blvd E. Haven't your engineers driven this path during peak rush hour or analyzed existing and future traffic trends for number of vehicles passing over the E Montlake Pl E - E Lake Washington Blvd intersection?? Please don't underestimate this important fact.	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
599	If you haven't noticed, Montlake Blvd is dreadful for walking and biking. Of course it should be improved.	Sep 14, 2012 5:20 PM
600	Of course, safety and way finding afor bikes & pads is critically important. This can be done within a large lid park context.	Sep 14, 2012 4:36 PM
601	Yes, this will continue to be a confusing area to move around in.	Sep 14, 2012 3:45 PM
602	The NOAH site seems to suffer from impairment of its access. It seems to have to rely on E. Hamlin or E.Shelby Street for traffic going to the north, and its exitiing traffic seeking to go to Lake Washngton Boulevard will be snarled in SR 520 traffic. This occurs somewhat now, but the revisions seem to make it worse. The Shelby-Hamlin residents are unlikely to welcome NOAH traffic on their residential street. There's also the concern of some that people should have a refuge and the benefit of eyes overseeing activities such as might be supplied by a coffee shop/newsstand on Montlake Boulevard.	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM
603	sure	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM

Page 5, Q1. Preference 9: Montlake Boulevard East: Continue to work with the City of Seattle and King County Metro to improve safety, wayfinding, visual character and experience for cyclists and pedestrians		
604	Yes please! The bike path across the Montlake bridge is very narrow, and feels unsafe to share with peds and other bikers. Crossing Lake Wash Blvd at #12 is currently a bit difficult due to the way traffic backs up at Montlake during rush hour. It would be nice if this intersection was more ped/bike friendly.	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
605	Great idea	Sep 14, 2012 1:54 PM
606	Don't do it! Forget about cyclists and pedestrians until they pony up actual money for THIS project. Cyclists and pedestrians are just taking advantage of people who do pay.	Sep 14, 2012 1:49 PM
607	need better bicycle and pedestrian connections	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM
608	Sure. This area is hard to navigate because of lane designation and the limitations imposed by the center plant strip (e.g. required u-turns).	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
609	Yes. maybe a separate bridge on the east side of the current (and maybe new) vehicular traffic bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
610	yes ... the onramp to 520 (west bound) is dangerous because people don't yield to pedestrians trying to get to the bus stop	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
611	Good	Sep 14, 2012 12:42 PM
612	Top priority. This would be great!	Sep 14, 2012 12:25 PM
613	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
614	This just sounds like fluff. Focus on making traffic flow safely through the area which will trickle down to the cyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
615	Yes please!!! Please make it easy for people who walk and bike to use this bridge and please connect multiple communities to the bridge. The 520 bridge serves the region and many people will use it on foot and on bicycle!	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
616	yes agree on all those objectives for Montlake Blvd. I walk from the south to the north side of 520 often and it is unpleasant.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
617	Fine, as long as I can turn left from northbound Montlake Blvd. to westbound SR 520.	Sep 14, 2012 11:06 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

1	Continue bicycle connection north on 24th and then west to Montlake bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 PM
2	Important certainly.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 PM
3	I think we discussed not only trees, but use of berm to give neighborhood as much buffer as possible, both for visual and noise. Is the shared use path the route that bikes going to/from Bellevue will use? If so, we have to keep the bike path 'flow' through the lid and not mix w/ peds and park use, so that we keep the bike commuters apart.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 PM
4	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 PM
5	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - Bill Dawson trail is unfotunately not a a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 PM
6	I would like to see you lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 PM
7	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

8	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 5, 2012 8:33 PM
9	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 PM
10	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 PM
11	If you're suggesting sending all those cyclists and peds who use the Dawson trail to instead mix with fast traffic, don't do it.	Oct 5, 2012 6:20 PM
12	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
13	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 PM
14	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 4:44 PM
15	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
16	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:08 PM
17	This is a great idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
18	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 3:40 PM
19	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM
20	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
21	Seems like a good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
22	OK	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
23	The priority should be moving vehicles, bicycles, and people efficiently and safely, not improving or maintianing the home values for a small minority.	Oct 5, 2012 3:08 PM
24	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
25	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west. I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect East-West.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
26	Make a way for all the bike commuters to be able to get through this area safely and without too much delay.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

27	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 2:57 PM
28	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
29	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 2:45 PM
30	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 2:35 PM
31	Good plan as long as path is still usable.	Oct 5, 2012 2:31 PM
32	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east west	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
33	good.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
34	I support this preference to better connect east and west for pedestrians and bicycles.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
35	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
36	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 1:48 PM
37	This is an excellent design. Having the offramp to Montlake be as low and stay as low as possible should mitigate noise. Having this offramp be as far south as possible will help with noise also.	Oct 5, 2012 1:45 PM
38	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 1:28 PM
39	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
40	Yes, for better east-west trail connection	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
41	good	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
42	Sounds great.	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
43	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 PM
44	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:52 PM
45	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

46	I am not in favor of additional time, effort, and money for a shared-use path just for Montlake residents so they don't have to look at traffic. Let them plant their own trees and pay for their own open space.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
47	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
48	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
49	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
50	I like the riparian buffer this proposes to create/maintain.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
51	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
52	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
53	This is good for better east west connections for bike and peds.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
54	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
55	I prefer this as it integrates the traffic and park like nature of the area. This will be a good compromise between helping with the flow of cyclists, and reducing the burden on the neighborhood.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
56	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
57	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
58	I support this so the multi-use trail to better connected between east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
59	Yes, allow for east west multi use trail connection to function better.	Oct 5, 2012 12:10 PM
60	Good	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
61	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
62	This is a good idea if you incorporate a pedestrian and bicycle access lid on the west side of Montlake Blvd. otherwise individuals wishing access to activities and routes west of Montlake would have to be eventually funneled over or under Montlake Blvd. south or north of the Montlake Bridge an additional multiuse lid to the west of Montlake Blvd, and over the Montlake Bridge would mitigate much of this traffic cross over and provide more safe and visually appealing alternatives.	Oct 5, 2012 12:01 PM
63	Sounds like a lot of disruption.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

64	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
65	Not sure what this means.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM
66	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 11:41 AM
67	Good ideas	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 AM
68	yes - open space in this design is great. particularly if there are ped and bike paths through them.	Oct 5, 2012 11:32 AM
69	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 11:31 AM
70	It is important that any changes to this area mitigate or improve the overall aesthetics of the area. This should be done by integrating green space, parks and multi-purpose fields and reserves.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
71	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west. but, I am curious to know how, with the elimination of the Lake Washington Blvd. exit ramp, how will cars exiting from west-bound 520 be able to make cross all north-bound lanes of Montlake Blvd. in order to turn left onto Hamlin. As a resident of the west side of the Shelby-Hamlin neighborhood, I currently exit on LW Blvd. and turn right onto Montlake so I have enough time to merge left for the left turn onto Hamlin to enter my neighborhood. Will there be ANOTHER signal added to this area to faciliatate the crossing of two lanes of traffic within 200 feet?	Oct 5, 2012 11:27 AM
72	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
73	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 AM
74	Lower vehicle traffic is better	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
75	Not important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:13 AM
76	yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
77	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
78	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
79	If that better connects west/ east, I am all for it.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
80	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

81	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
82	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 10:38 AM
83	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 10:35 AM
84	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
85	Strong support this preference so a trail can better connect east-west access.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
86	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
87	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
88	Yes lower the on ramps to 520 westbound too and lid the area just west of the montlake blvd. Lower the whole project so you can build a bigger lid	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
89	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
90	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
91	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
92	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
93	Absolutely.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM
94	The MPCC supports this Preference.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
95	I strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 AM
96	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 AM
97	I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car. Pedestrian facilities should not be an afterthought, nor should pedestrians be expected to go up and over or down and around to avoid cars. Pedestrians are like water, and if they see a flat route, they will take it, even if it is unsafe. Therefore, the pedestrian routes should be both safe AND direct.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
98	Good idea to make the east-west multi-use trail more useable	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps		
99	I like the idea of preserving trees and open space, but that needs to be balanced with project costs and improving traffic congestion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
100	Disagree if bike/ped access to Montlake Park needs to cross Montlake Boulevard.	Oct 5, 2012 9:36 AM
101	Agree.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
102	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
103	I want a lid.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
104	If I understand this correctly, the I-90 lid is a great example of how this benefits the neighborhood and people walking and cycling through.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
105	Sure, as long as this means the trail connects.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
106	Um sure.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
107	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
108	okay	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 AM
109	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
110	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 8:58 AM
111	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
112	A multi-use east-west connector makes sense here.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
113	I support this. It makes sense.	Oct 5, 2012 8:32 AM
114	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
115	Preference 10: I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 7:53 AM
116	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 7:43 AM
117	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM
118	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 AM
119	yes, option B more attractive	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

120	I'm pretty sure this is a good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
121	Looks good.	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 AM
122	No.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
123	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 6:50 AM
124	good	Oct 5, 2012 6:45 AM
125	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connecdt east-west	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 AM
126	Yes to this as well.	Oct 5, 2012 6:06 AM
127	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
128	sounds like a good idea	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
129	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
130	High priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
131	Ok	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
132	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west	Oct 5, 2012 4:56 AM
133	Let us protect the neighborhoods that need to stay strong in our city.	Oct 5, 2012 4:01 AM
134	I support.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 AM
135	A bike and pedestrian trail to connect east-west would be extremely valuable.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 AM
136	Sounds good.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 PM
137	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 PM
138	No shifting of the shared use path if it prevents the path from continuing over Portage Bay	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 PM
139	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
140	Good idea.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
141	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

142	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
143	THIS IS THE ONE I SUPPORT!	Oct 4, 2012 10:06 PM
144	Support this idea.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
145	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
146	Support.	Oct 4, 2012 9:41 PM
147	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
148	ok	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 PM
149	i'm for it, seems expensive, but it will definitely improve the area.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
150	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
151	Preserve as many trees as possible. It takes 25 - 50 years for the trees to grow back. I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
152	It's only money, right?	Oct 4, 2012 9:14 PM
153	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM
154	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
155	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
156	I'm sure everybody will prefer the trees while they're stuck in traffic on the off ramp. They'll probably wish they could rid a light rail across this new bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
157	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
158	Keeps the trail grade separated from vehicle traffic	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
159	YES!	Oct 4, 2012 8:32 PM
160	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
161	this isn't useful.	Oct 4, 2012 8:16 PM
162	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 8:05 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

163	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
164	This looks good. Also will separate traffic headed for Northbound Montlake from that for southbound.	Oct 4, 2012 7:45 PM
165	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 7:21 PM
166	I support this so that the multi use trail for bike and peds will better connect from east to west.	Oct 4, 2012 7:20 PM
167	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 6:56 PM
168	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
169	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 6:34 PM
170	No addtional taxpayer monies should be spent- Seattle can use their tax strucutre for trees for their neighborhoods	Oct 4, 2012 6:02 PM
171	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
172	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
173	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 5:33 PM
174	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west and to buffer the neighborhoods from auto traffic	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
175	Support	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
176	NO	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
177	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
178	Yeah as long as you don't take away the shared-use paths where they go it's ok.	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
179	yes yes	Oct 4, 2012 4:57 PM
180	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 4:44 PM
181	Yes. I support this preference.	Oct 4, 2012 4:36 PM
182	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 4, 2012 4:27 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

183	Sure, sounds good.	Oct 4, 2012 4:05 PM
184	Sounds good	Oct 4, 2012 4:00 PM
185	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
186	good	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
187	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 4, 2012 3:27 PM
188	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
189	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
190	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
191	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
192	Good idea.	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
193	I support this preference.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
194	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
195	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
196	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
197	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
198	YES! We must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:59 PM
199	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 1:55 PM
200	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 1:41 PM
201	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
202	Sounds fine to me.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps		
203	no	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
204	A good idea, so that the shared-use path has a better E-W connection.	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
205	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
206	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
207	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 1:03 PM
208	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
209	Preference 10: I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
210	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:40 PM
211	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
212	We support this prefrence in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east and west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:25 PM
213	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
214	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
215	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
216	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
217	I support preference 10 in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
218	Strong Support, as it helps east-west connections and activates the lid.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
219	Yes. I strongly support this because of better east-west movement and connection of paths and common routes I travel.	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
220	Seems like a nice design.	Oct 4, 2012 12:06 PM
221	No strong preference.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

222	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
223	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
224	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM
225	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
226	Sounds good.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
227	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
228	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
229	sure.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
230	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
231	Support this, it improves east-west trail connections	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
232	not a priority	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
233	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
234	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
235	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
236	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
237	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:11 AM
238	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 11:04 AM
239	I own our home a half mile from this location and support this goal for my family to access schools and parks.	Oct 4, 2012 10:59 AM
240	keep all off ramps, etc as low as possible and preserve greenery and quiet as much as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 10:35 AM
241	Fine	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

242	To my eye, higher westbound off-ramp option appears to offer more contiguous space in the Montlake lid (the area south of the off-ramps). I don't know if anyone will want to use the little slice of land north of the off-ramps if they are lowered, since it is so close in proximity and height to the off-ramps. The visual difference appears minimal in the rendering of the E lid area (below).	Oct 4, 2012 9:44 AM
243	Yes, agree	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 AM
244	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
245	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 AM
246	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 7:07 AM
247	support	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 AM
248	Prefer lower ramps, but in a budget tradeoff, would accept the higher design if necessary to afford other improvements.	Oct 4, 2012 2:17 AM
249	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 9:45 PM
250	Push the ramps together and locate them in the middle of the lid. This elimination of the thin green spaces between them will avoid the danger of these impossible-to-supervise strips and make the roadways less expensive to build by combining structures..	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
251	Support	Oct 3, 2012 9:06 PM
252	No opinion, but some of my neighbors are concerned about pedestrian and bicycle safety in this area.	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM
253	Good	Oct 3, 2012 8:34 PM
254	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 7:01 PM
255	yes, lower is better, less impact	Oct 3, 2012 6:16 PM
256	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 4:02 PM
257	This seems like an appropriate response to connecting the pedestrians and preserving the neighborhoods east of Montlake Blvd., but it doesn't address pedestrians trying to cross north/south along Montlake Blvd.	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
258	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 3:49 PM
259	Lowering the ramps is fine but don't terminate them in a T intersection; keep a design closer to the current westbound-to-northbound merge over the Montlake	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

	Bridge. Otherwise the off-ramp backups will be horrendous (esp. but not limited to UW football/basketball game days).	
260	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 3:06 PM
261	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 1:58 PM
262	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 1:50 PM
263	Sounds good.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
264	sounds good	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM
265	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM
266	preserve neighborhood integrity and charm	Oct 3, 2012 12:04 PM
267	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 11:56 AM
268	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 11:38 AM
269	Cool.	Oct 3, 2012 11:01 AM
270	I like this idea to keep the trees	Oct 3, 2012 10:49 AM
271	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
272	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E	Oct 3, 2012 10:30 AM
273	no opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
274	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
275	I support this.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
276	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 9:36 AM
277	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:41 AM
278	This is key to lessening the impact of the massive construction of ramps and expanded freeway	Oct 3, 2012 8:33 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

279	I support this option.	Oct 3, 2012 8:28 AM
280	The regional shared use path should be grade separated from as many cross streets as possible. Do not worry about cutting existing trees to make the end result better. New trees will be planted and in a few years the trees will grow.	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 AM
281	I support this preference in order for the multi-use trail to better connect east-west.	Oct 3, 2012 8:15 AM
282	I strongly support further planning as to how people who walk and bike can safely and comfortably use this area. Montlake Blvd's pedestrian and bicycle volumes are increasing quickly, especially on the west side. - The crossing of SR 520 and its ramps on the west side must be safe, direct, and comfortable. Using these criteria there is no choice except to re-imagine the pedestrian and bicycle connections through this area. These connections must be suitable for children, older person, handicapped person and the visually impaired. Crossing 7 lanes of traffic will never be safe or comfortable to these groups. This corridor is also a critical north-south corridor for pedestrian and bicycle commuters on their way to the Hospital, UW, the Burke Gilman trail, and future light rail station. Any solution that allows these people to bypass the on-ramps easily and comfortably will result in a better functioning interchange for motorized traffic at peak commuting time as well. - The West side sidewalk and the East side sidewalk as well as their continuation on the Montlake Bridge must give pedestrians a certain measure of safety from cyclists. - The bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake, east of Montlake Blvd and 24th Ave E. to the east side of Montlake Blvd must be away from HOV traffic and car traffic. There needs to be a way to connect from 25th Ave E. and Miller E. to the Arboretum trail and then on the East Lid followed by some kind of bridge over the ramps to connect to Hamlin without having to be in conflict with motorized traffic. Again, this will improve the efficiency of the Interchange at peak commuting hours and will make the experience safer for everybody. - The proposed Bill Dawson trail changes cannot unfortunately create a good route for pedestrians or cyclists. The enclosed, poorly watched, and dark area underneath a huge span of highway will be gloomy and uncomfortable in the best of times and downright frightening at night. We must build a route that parents feel safe letting their kids travel to school on, the elderly feel comfortable walking to the bus station, and people on bikes feel excited to get out of their car and onto the saddle. Possible solutions: Route people at ground level or build them a mini west lid if needed. Allow the landscape architects and engineers to rethink the entire connectivity of this area. - A Safe Route To School must be provided along this corridor.	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM
283	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 3, 2012 7:40 AM
284	Lower the ramps and improve and creat bike trails on both areas.	Oct 3, 2012 7:11 AM
285	That would be great, faster for cyclists, especially with a bike path on the Portage Bay bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 PM
286	yes, this would be very important. if the ramps are too high, connectivity is lost.	Oct 2, 2012 10:50 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

	the lid should be continuous with the area to the north	
287	This would be nice, but it's not a necessity.	Oct 2, 2012 8:58 PM
288	See comments Preference 9	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
289	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 4:23 PM
290	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
291	No opinion.	Oct 2, 2012 3:16 PM
292	This sounds the most ecologically friendly and beautiful routing possibility. I like this.	Oct 2, 2012 12:05 PM
293	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 11:48 AM
294	I support.	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM
295	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
296	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 10:09 AM
297	OK	Oct 2, 2012 9:44 AM
298	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 2, 2012 9:04 AM
299	Lowering the westbound off ramps will enable the design to shift the shared-use path onto the lid. The community has recently come to agreement that moving the path to the lid would remove the need for a dark and dangerous path under the freeway on the east side of the lid. Locals who are familiar with the transient residents of the arboretum do not want to give them an additional place to congregate and do business or commit crimes. This is a good idea.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 AM
300	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 1, 2012 9:25 PM
301	agree for open space	Oct 1, 2012 8:02 PM
302	more green is better	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
303	yes. be sure to include bicycling connection from 520 through portage bay and into roanoke/eastlake.	Oct 1, 2012 2:36 PM
304	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 1, 2012 2:24 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

305	Very important	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
306	Yes, lower the ramps and have a better path and open space on the lid.	Oct 1, 2012 12:44 PM
307	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 1, 2012 10:21 AM
308	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 30, 2012 7:48 PM
309	Definitely, yes, lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th..	Sep 30, 2012 10:31 AM
310	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 30, 2012 7:26 AM
311	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 30, 2012 3:42 AM
312	Has potential.	Sep 29, 2012 11:41 PM
313	2.Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM
314	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 29, 2012 7:37 PM
315	Great!	Sep 29, 2012 4:30 PM
316	Yay for preserving trees! Not sure what "open space" is here - I would hate to see a big wind-swept plaza	Sep 29, 2012 1:41 PM
317	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 29, 2012 1:19 PM
318	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 9:32 AM
319	Yes.	Sep 29, 2012 6:58 AM
320	Keep the open space.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
321	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
322	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E	Sep 28, 2012 9:49 PM
323	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 PM
324	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 8:15 PM
325	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and	Sep 28, 2012 7:26 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps		
	pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	
326	Too expensive	Sep 28, 2012 5:56 PM
327	The current Lake WA Bicycle Route on 24th works with the dog leg through the alley to the south of Lake WA Blvd. The crossing of Lake WA Blvd is a risk point as the traffic is pretty heavy most of the time. Having the east and west traffic lanes separated allows the cyclist to cross half the road and have a place to wait for the next break in the middle. Going to the Arboretum on Lake WA Blvd is a bit of a stress raiser for most cyclists but it can be done and we enjoy the ride through the Arboretum as a low traffic way to get to E Madison. Long range plans should consider a better lane between the south end of the park and E Madison.	Sep 28, 2012 4:17 PM
328	Hmm, will this improve traffic?	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
329	don't care	Sep 28, 2012 2:23 PM
330	Yes.	Sep 28, 2012 2:14 PM
331	No comment	Sep 28, 2012 2:02 PM
332	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 12:27 PM
333	good goal: preserve open space and trees, agree!	Sep 28, 2012 12:12 PM
334	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 11:43 AM
335	Don't care about tree preservation relative to long term ped and especially bike commuters	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
336	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 10:19 AM
337	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 9:55 AM
338	Option B is best! bury ALL the roads! bury the HOV ramps.	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 AM
339	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM
340	Neutral	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
341	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 AM
342	great	Sep 28, 2012 6:24 AM
343	Need better westbound 520 to southbound 24th. Widen 520 to accommodate appropriate intersection. Move traffic through surface streets faster. Eliminate	Sep 28, 2012 12:38 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps		
	houses.	
344	I like this option. Keep 24th as an easier route from the Arb, across the Montlake Cut and to provide easier access from the 520 bike path to the U	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
345	Yes, definitely! This reduces visual impact of roadways and continuity of green space along eastern edge of lid.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 PM
346	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 PM
347	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
348	yes	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 PM
349	Please lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 PM
350	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:05 PM
351	yes if possible	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM
352	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave	Sep 27, 2012 7:40 PM
353	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:04 PM
354	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 6:33 PM
355	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 6:30 PM
356	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
357	I think the lowered option would provide more opportunity for cycle and pedestrian paths and safer connections between the bridge and the community for non motorized users.	Sep 27, 2012 6:07 PM
358	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 5:59 PM
359	Neat.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
360	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 4:58 PM
361	Yes; excellent idea to improve the human-powered experience.	Sep 27, 2012 4:55 PM
362	Yes lowering these should improve it for both bikers and pedestrians	Sep 27, 2012 4:52 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

363	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
364	good but cyclists and pedestrians still need access to everywhere. I.e. we need transportation alternatives, not restricted and limited use paths.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
365	Yes, preserve the residential feel of the area as much as possible.	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
366	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
367	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 3:41 PM
368	don't understand this option.	Sep 27, 2012 3:21 PM
369	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:49 PM
370	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
371	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:22 PM
372	I'm less concerned with the appearance of the bridge and connections than I am with its functionality, but if this can be done with minimal impact to construction time and cost, that's nice.	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM
373	Yes, lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:15 PM
374	Again, a North-South connection for cyclists through this area at 24th Ave E is important as well as the East/West and lid connections.	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
375	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 1:57 PM
376	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 1:48 PM
377	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 1:37 PM
378	no comment	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
379	2.Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 1:08 PM
380	This sounds ideal. Once again, ensuring separation here between peds and bikes will keep things safe.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
381	Good, those trees will get the appreciation they deserve.	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
382	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

	bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor.	
383	this sounds good!	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
384	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 PM
385	yes	Sep 27, 2012 12:20 PM
386	To the extent that this can be accommodated and provide safe, convenient access to the shared-use path--not quirky entries or multiple street crossings to access the share-use path.	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
387	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
388	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
389	This would be desirable	Sep 27, 2012 12:01 PM
390	In favor...	Sep 27, 2012 11:43 AM
391	good	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
392	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
393	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
394	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:35 AM
395	don't know.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
396	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM
397	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:27 AM
398	Sounds good.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
399	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:18 AM
400	2.Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
401	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
402	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

	pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	
403	Good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
404	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
405	Not important	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
406	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
407	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
408	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
409	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 AM
410	Retain and improve bike connections to proximal routes.	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
411	trees and open space can create more of a user-friendly plaza type area	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
412	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
413	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
414	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
415	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:38 AM
416	2.Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
417	bicycle commuter safety is paramount	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
418	Sounds like an good idea	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
419	Esthetically would be very nice, I'm sure cost is an issue.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
420	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:25 AM
421	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
422	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles,	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

	pedestrian, etc.	
423	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
424	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
425	ok	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
426	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
427	All others on this page should consider the neighborhood's views and balance them with costs	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
428	sounds good is done at reasonable cost	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
429	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
430	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
431	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
432	lower is always better for appeal	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
433	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
434	Great.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
435	Excellent idea.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
436	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
437	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
438	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
439	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
440	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
441	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
442	the lower the visual impact and noise impact the better	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

443	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
444	sounds nice	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
445	I'm all for preserving trees and open space. What's the downside here? Expense?	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
446	OK	Sep 26, 2012 11:18 AM
447	believe this is hugely important to make montlake contiguous once again and preserve the original goal of the project	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
448	Ok. I like the idea of lowering the off ramp. Cyclists don't have to deal with all that traffic.	Sep 25, 2012 9:51 AM
449	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:52 AM
450	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 AM
451	This looks a lot nicer in the design, but maybe it costs more and is not really worth it . It seems like the High Transit/HOV lane option creates a straighter shot on the bike path on the north of 520, and honestly I would prefer that... longer cleaner sight distances is safer, and less stopping and starting on bike is easier.	Sep 24, 2012 11:15 PM
452	Sounds like a good idea. Does it impact the wetlands beneath?	Sep 24, 2012 9:19 PM
453	Unfortunately I cannot comment on this, as there is no way to reference the impact on 24th Ave E from the materials provided.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
454	Fine, other than once you get to the south side of 520, and across Lk Washington Blvd, but 24th is the only low traffic connection to the south, so you need to preserve this connection. The only other alternative would be to run a grade-separated path parallel to Lk Wa Blvd. and then connect to the current route at Roanoke or Miller. The key to keep bikes off Lk Wa Blvd (or get the cars off it).	Sep 24, 2012 6:07 PM
455	Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 24, 2012 1:11 PM
456	Yes please.	Sep 24, 2012 12:57 PM
457	This is also important - what's the point of lidding a freeway if it doesn't provide access?	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
458	Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Sep 24, 2012 12:18 PM
459	This is a great idea and would make my bicycle commute safer.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM
460	Sounds like a win.	Sep 23, 2012 6:48 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps		
461	yes	Sep 23, 2012 2:41 PM
462	Very important. Trees and open space must be preserved or created.	Sep 23, 2012 8:21 AM
463	Location of the regional shared-use path should be optimal for connecting with a new bicycle/pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 22, 2012 4:40 PM
464	This is the better solution.	Sep 22, 2012 12:30 PM
465	less important	Sep 22, 2012 10:07 AM
466	Yes	Sep 22, 2012 2:42 AM
467	Agreed.	Sep 21, 2012 3:42 PM
468	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
469	Great. Why again does the bicycle path go under 24th and onto the north side of 520 only to dead end at a park?	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
470	Absolutely	Sep 20, 2012 10:36 AM
471	My gut reaction is that lower is better, because that traffic's visual and auditory presence will be lessened.	Sep 19, 2012 9:26 PM
472	I like the path tunnel under 24th, so that pedestrians and bicyclists do not have to cross multiple lanes of traffic at multiple points. I hope that there is a good connection with the Arboretum trails.	Sep 18, 2012 4:13 PM
473	Don't get this.	Sep 18, 2012 12:20 PM
474	This is a good idea.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM
475	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM
476	This is the best concept. However, The original design suggested that a switchback be created on the west side of Montlake to provide access to the Bill Dawson Trail. The switchback would have created a difficult set of turns and produce a conflict between pedestrians and bikers. You would have to dismount to safely make the turn. The Community Design process developed a ramp within the right-of-Way that avoided the need for the switch back. The current drawings go back to the original design and show a switchback. With this design, the switchback will again require the average biker to dismount their bike to safely make the connection to the Trail. The new design adds a stairway which accesses the Trail at 90 degrees to the tunnel creating another conflict between pedestrians and bikers. The new stair design creates a blind corner where an individual cannot see ped/bikes coming down the tunnel. This situation is the same on the East side of Montlake.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM
477	Yes, please--the current shared-use path under 520 is dark, dangerous, steep, sharply curved, has no sight-lines, and is consequently difficult to share as well as to ride or (particularly after dark) walk.	Sep 17, 2012 3:24 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps		
478	Seems reasonable. Need more info though	Sep 17, 2012 6:14 AM
479	All the suggestions are great improvements and should be consistent with the need to protect the Arboretum from increased traffic, and keeeping Lake Washington Blvd. a park-like setting for enjoyment by the community, Arboretum users, and not an acces road for SR 520 Commuters.	Sep 16, 2012 4:29 PM
480	Yes, important to preserve trees and open space	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
481	sure	Sep 16, 2012 9:17 AM
482	I support this.	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
483	Please prioritize bicycle and pedestrian access and preservation of green space in all these areas.	Sep 15, 2012 8:37 PM
484	For all of these areas, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle mobility and preservation of green space.	Sep 15, 2012 8:11 PM
485	Like.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
486	not important to me	Sep 15, 2012 2:56 PM
487	Maybe, hard to see how this will look/work. Sounds good though.	Sep 15, 2012 12:59 PM
488	Don't do this if it materially increases the project's cost or detracts from the free flow of motor vehicles through the area. Physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles.	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
489	Makes sense	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
490	Seems like little benefit for the masses.	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
491	This sounds much better than routing bikes & pads away from or under the lid.	Sep 14, 2012 4:36 PM
492	The lid should have the maximum area. Size gives much more opportunities for recreation and a bigger sense of openness. The public interest in a viable park/recreation area supervenes over that of the immediate neighbors for seclusion.	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM
493	I'm having trouble visualizing/understanding what this means	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
494	I'm in favor of this. I think it's nice to put a mixed use path with landscaping between housing and large roads.	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
495	We do NOT need trees and open space - we need more space for SOVs.	Sep 14, 2012 1:49 PM
496	Lower roadways would enhance the appeal and sight lines of the lid	Sep 14, 2012 1:41 PM
497	this seems amenable, as long as there is a continuous trail under/over montlake blvd	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM

Page 5, Q2. Preference 10: Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Avenue East and shift the regional shared-use path onto the Montlake lid to preserve trees and open space between the neighborhood and the westbound off-ramps

498	As drawn, the westbound off-ramps look like they will become more of a backup point than they are today. The long curve of the existing off-ramp makes it a lot easier to see the oncoming traffic and merge quickly.	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
499	overall scheme - trees can be replaced. Don't plan a 60 year plan over trees that will be dead in 30-60 years. Plant new trees that will fit within the future landscaping plans and grow with a life span of 30-90 years.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
500	sounds good	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
501	If the cost differential is not significant	Sep 14, 2012 12:42 PM
502	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
503	Make it easy to walk and bike	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
504	I really HATE the idea of westbound off-ramps I don't want to see vehiclular traffic (other than transit) on the lid. I would like to see the share use path on the lid with out vehiclular traffic.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
505	Trees will need to be replanted anyway, so don't let existing trees prevent the appropriate design - remember we will have to live with this design for more than 100 years and the trees will come and go in that time. The bike trail should cross under 24th Avenue (and Montlake Blvd).	Sep 14, 2012 11:06 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
1	Go back to the drawing board. There is not enough separation of paths from freeway off- and on- ramps. The limited money should be used to create safe connections that encourage walking and biking foremost. I am deeply surprised that there is no access to transit travelling from and to I-5 at this hub (i.e. no flyover stop). Accessing all areas of the transit facilities must be safe and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists no matter if arriving from the north or the south.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	Yes, including possible shuttle transit to light rail station, stadium and university.	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 PM
3	Is this mobility hub related to the on/offboarding of the east/west express buses? I thought they were going to have stops near to the curret ones. But specifically about the hub: I can see it making a lot of sense. But it's important that it have nice protective walls to shield from the park and from ELWB -- no one wants to look at a bunch of buses. So yes, good idea to explore further and mitigation could be straightforward.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 PM
4	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 PM
5	No	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 PM
6	I would like to see the design and implementation promote bicycling across the Montlake Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 PM
7	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
8	Keep the Flyer Bus stops on SR520 so people/cyclists can get on/off buses that are crossing the lake but not entering/exiting at Montlake	Oct 5, 2012 8:33 PM
9	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	uses.	
10	I support improvements to improve transit/pedestrian connections and bike access here. The current situation is awkward for pedestrians who have to cross highway onramps to catch the bus. There are not enough east-west crosswalks in the area so you have to be very familiar with the intersection in order to easily navigate it on foot. I avoid this area altogether on bike.	Oct 5, 2012 6:23 PM
11	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
12	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 PM
13	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 4:44 PM
14	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
15	Once again the buses get everything and the cars nothing yet the cars pay for the work with gas taxes, license fees and tolls. This is highway robbery.	Oct 5, 2012 4:08 PM
16	I think this idea has great potential. The last thing we want is a transit "island" in the midst of a bunch of large, busy, uncrossable roads.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
17	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 3:40 PM
18	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM
19	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
20	Can a lid be put over the west side of Montlake Blvd., the side where most pedestrian and bike use occurs?	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
21	and eliminate any potential obstructions to automobile traffic to avoid creating	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	further traffic bottlenecks that affect the surrounding community.	
22	OK	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
23	Anything that reduces car/bike interactions is preferred. Avoid putting bikes across intersections.	Oct 5, 2012 3:08 PM
24	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
25	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safs and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
26	Make a way for all the bike commuters to be able to get through this area safely and without too much delay.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM
27	this is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
28	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 2:57 PM
29	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
30	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 2:45 PM
31	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 2:35 PM
32	Needed	Oct 5, 2012 2:31 PM
33	We really need good bike access and transit with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:21 PM
34	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
35	yes.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
36	I support the development of a mobility hub for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. I	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	think the design needs more development and refinement to better support active users.	
37	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
38	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 1:48 PM
39	- The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 1:28 PM
40	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
41	good	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
42	Sounds great.	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
43	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 PM
44	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:52 PM
45	Forget it! Don't waste the money on these things.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
46	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
47	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	
48	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
49	Yes. This is a very major bike/ped connection to transit. It is currently a bottleneck and should be improved for ease of connections as possible.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
50	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
51	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
52	This is east of Montlake Blvd. We need 30 ft of ped/bike space west of the street too, bridging the on/off ramps to the south of 520 into the rest of the neighborhood. Green space isolated by crosswalks is not very useful.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
53	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
54	Bike-bus interconnections are vital; it's how I get around 95% of the time.	Oct 5, 2012 12:23 PM
55	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
56	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
57	I support further planning to address the goals	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
58	The entire area through the montlake interchange should have a continuous lid with separation of auto traffic from pedestrians.	Oct 5, 2012 12:10 PM
59	Mobility hub is required to allow safe access to public transport	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
60	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	
61	This is essential, in addition to the traffic already in the area it should be that increased traffic pressure will build with the addition of the Light Rail transfer station at the University of Washington Stadium. Any plan should include integrated transit hubs for maximum connection efficiency and safety.	Oct 5, 2012 12:01 PM
62	Yes! But I'm sure that is expensive, get grants, etc. good idea!! This is a special place!	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
63	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users. There also isn't any near enough parking in that area if you're going to allow parking. Half the commuters using the bridge would park there to avoid the toll.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
64	Whenever you put transit, bicycle, and pedestian facilities all in one, generally speaking, the "bikabiility" suffers. Design should make certain that bikes are not asked to stop so much that the flow is impeded. If this occurs, then you will find that bikes will no longer take this route.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM
65	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 11:41 AM
66	Excellent program for the lid, physical design for an existing node in transit systems	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 AM
67	strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 11:32 AM
68	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 11:31 AM
69	This is vital to maintaining the cohesion of Montlake with the rest of the city. A high priority should be placed on improving cycling and public transportation in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
70	I think this lid is too far to the east. A lot of bicycle and pedestrian traffic is on the west side of Montlake Blvd. - kids walking to Montlake elementary, the local market, to and from bus connections, etc. If the lid is in a place that is difficult to access (too many lanes to cross, etc.) it will simply become an unused area for our local drug-users and homeless. Please don't let that happen...this lid should be a welcoming area for local families.	Oct 5, 2012 11:27 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
71	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
72	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 AM
73	This is a great idea but none of the other hubs work. How will this be different to be successful.	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
74	Moderate value.	Oct 5, 2012 11:13 AM
75	This is of high importance.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
76	strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
77	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
78	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
79	Yes, support this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
80	A hub could be useful.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM
81	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, THERE NEEDS TO BE A NEW APPROACH TO THE DESIGN. THE CURRENT DESIGN IS NOT WELL THOUGHT OUT AND WILL CREATE PROBLEMS. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
82	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of	Oct 5, 2012 10:38 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	
83	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 10:35 AM
84	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
85	Like the goal in mind, but would prefer a different design.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
86	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
87	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
88	While I support the goals of this preference to creat a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
89	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
90	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
91	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
92	This is critical. My highest priority. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	
93	The MPCC supports the goal of this Preference.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
94	I strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 AM
95	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 AM
96	I am strongly in favor of including facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Everyone is a pedestrian, and any road project should make walking a safe, enjoyable option. I pay an enormous amount of taxes for road projects that I should be able to use, even though I do not own a car. Pedestrian facilities should not be an afterthought, nor should pedestrians be expected to go up and over or down and around to avoid cars. Pedestrians are like water, and if they see a flat route, they will take it, even if it is unsafe. Therefore, the pedestrian routes should be both safe AND direct.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
97	A multi-mode hub with bicycle facilities is needed; new design is necessary	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
98	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
99	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:36 AM
100	Maximize for bus pedestrian and bike access.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
101	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
102	I strongly support this option.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
103	I'm all for this!	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
104	Sure.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
105	Waste of money. There is plenty of park space in that neighborhood as is.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
106	Mobility and directness for cyclists, and pedestrians going to or from bus stops, ought to be the first concern.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
107	consider building to enable small shops/cafes. The connections across and along Montlake need to be improved for peds. The crossing distance and the	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	potential signal cycle length will be significantly too long.	
108	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
109	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 8:58 AM
110	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
111	Essential	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
112	The top priority should be on the West side of Montlake Boulevard and this is where the efforts here need to be focussed. More study needs to be done here to come up with the optimal solution to this important issue.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
113	In my opinion the biggest connectivity problem is transferring buses from WB 520 to SB Montlake Blvd. The sheer time required for this walk makes certain bus transfers impractical.	Oct 5, 2012 8:45 AM
114	yes please! This area is a mess currently.	Oct 5, 2012 8:32 AM
115	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
116	Preference 11: While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 7:53 AM
117	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 7:43 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
118	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM
119	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 AM
120	yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
121	Active use might be nice, but maybe not critical. But a nice transit facility is always appreciated.	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
122	Is anyone actually going to use this lid to have fun? It looks crossed by freeway on ramps.	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 AM
123	No.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
124	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 6:50 AM
125	good	Oct 5, 2012 6:45 AM
126	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 6:06 AM
127	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
128	yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
129	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
130	High priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
131	Support.	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
132	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
133	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub	Oct 5, 2012 4:56 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users	
134	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 AM
135	YES!	Oct 5, 2012 12:27 AM
136	Making it safe (e.g.,separating them) for vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic is important.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 AM
137	Way too many traffic lights for cars, bikes, pedestrians to have to deal with. I count five traffic signals between E. Roanoke and the Montlake Bridges, which is probably a quarter mile stretch of road! How will these be timed? And when the Montlake Bridges go up, how will traffic continue to flow through these intersections for those not waiting on Montlake Ave? Right now, those intersections are constantly blocked because cars go through lights anticipating the traffic on the arterial will move but if the bridge is up, it doesn't and they end up blocking other cars from going through to their destination. Hard to imagine this won't worsen with even more intersections and lights going in.	Oct 5, 2012 12:03 AM
138	Please make the bike paths useful. I don't care about the open space here per se; if the lid is an isolated empty space, I don't think we need it - let's save the money.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 PM
139	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 PM
140	Yes. This should have world class bicycle parking with varied security options.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 PM
141	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
142	nope	Oct 4, 2012 10:33 PM
143	Need to extend the West Montlake lid to the west of Montlake Blvd. Not really a lid if it doesn't cover the freeway and reconnect the neighborhoods both east and west of the Blvd. Move Bill Dawson trail to top of lid instead of under freeway (better sight lines, safer, more inviting).	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
144	Support	Oct 4, 2012 10:21 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
145	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
146	Support this preference. But, prioritize moving people (peds, bikes, cars, buses) across the bridge & lid over greenspace.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
147	Where is the bike trail going? It doesn't appear to continue over Portage Bay. This should be continued beside, or better yet, under the roadway. It looks like it goes under the roadway and then ends.	Oct 4, 2012 10:10 PM
148	Good idea!	Oct 4, 2012 10:06 PM
149	I support the lid idea.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
150	Improved bicycle and pedestrian access to a 14 foot bicycle and pedestrian path along SR520	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
151	Support if this does not become a place for homeless to live/bathe/use toilets and ruin the safety and cleanliness. Also needs to have easy access - more than just a standard sidewalk entrance. Currently the sidewalk concrete islands are not large enough for all the pedestrians during peak travel. I have often had to stand in the road next to islands while waiting for lights to change. Bikes take even more room and need to be accomodated or worked into the street traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 9:41 PM
152	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
153	agree with this	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 PM
154	i like.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
155	Yes, important. But creating green space on the lid in a community that has a lot of available green space is of low importance. Making pedestrian and bike connections should take precedence	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
156	I live very close to the lid and this is a priority. As bicycle traffic increases there is too much traffic on 25th Ave E resulting in bad accidents near my house between bikes and pedestrians and bikes and cars mainly b/c the bikes are going to fast and not paying attention. There needs to be safe places for pedestrians to walk and little kids to bike without fearing they will be run over. While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	needs to be a new approach to the design.	
157	Like #9, seems to be laid out in a funky fashion. Go and walk around some in the area and try to imagine how that's going to be attractive enough to "work" by getting people comfortable using this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:14 PM
158	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM
159	I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users. However, I question its location and design. The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements do and will continue to occur on the west side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. Why not use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating a greenspace that gets little use? As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
160	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
161	Transit hubs are good in general as long as they don't cause transit backups.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
162	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
163	YES but please make it work for active users. All users need to be considered.	Oct 4, 2012 8:32 PM
164	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
165	that'd seem to be the point.	Oct 4, 2012 8:16 PM
166	- The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and	Oct 4, 2012 8:05 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	likely not suitable for most active uses.	
167	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
168	very important	Oct 4, 2012 7:48 PM
169	All good. ALL freeway buses should stop here, not just the ones that exit for Montlake Blvd (i.e. the 545 should stop here).	Oct 4, 2012 7:45 PM
170	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 7:21 PM
171	This is a great idea and I support the general idea. Still I think it needs to better incorporate all active users, not just those looking to catch the bus from the lid.	Oct 4, 2012 7:20 PM
172	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 6:56 PM
173	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
174	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 6:34 PM
175	This is a good plan but it needs to include a path across the bridge for bikes and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 6:11 PM
176	No tax payer money - this is not a bridge requirement	Oct 4, 2012 6:02 PM
177	Yes - the current transit and bike stations at Montlake are not very successful	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
178	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
179	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 5:33 PM
180	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
181	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	
182	NO lid	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
183	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
184	Nice I like this!!	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
185	make it easy to get to the arboretum, bus, and the train.	Oct 4, 2012 4:57 PM
186	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 4:44 PM
187	What we really need here is safe crossings on the West side of Montlake Blvd. as well as on the East side.	Oct 4, 2012 4:36 PM
188	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 4, 2012 4:27 PM
189	Fine. Hide that shitty freeway.	Oct 4, 2012 4:05 PM
190	Will be fantastic, but would prioritize Roanoke Lid/Park > Montlake Lid/Park. But this is a phenomenal idea.	Oct 4, 2012 4:00 PM
191	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
192	do not include costly facilities. sidewalks are sufficient.	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
193	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 3:27 PM
194	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
195	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
196	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
197	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
198	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	
199	A multimodal hub somewhere in the project area is valuable, however the majority of pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur on the West side of Montlake. It would be valuable to consider how a lid could be developed in this area.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
200	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
201	I prefer this because of bike and pedestrian usefulness, safe connections and active park space.	Oct 4, 2012 2:42 PM
202	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
203	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
204	Yes please!	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
205	YES! We must have safe pedestrian, bicycle, and efficent transit connections	Oct 4, 2012 1:59 PM
206	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 1:55 PM
207	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 1:41 PM
208	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users. all modes of transportation need to be able to travel THROUGH with limited delay rather than travel TO. A hub implies a change of transportation mode and a period of lower speed, and while this is a convenient transfer point, there are multiple destinations proximal to this area which require easy, rapid, and uninterrupted transportation access to all users, active and lazy alike.	
209	The Montlake Flyer Stop provides a really important connection between UW and much of the eastside that will never be duplicated with UW-focused bus service, and it does so efficiently. If the lid is designed so freeway buses can quickly get to the surface, make a stop, and continue, and such buses are given very strong signal priority, this service pattern could be preserved.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
210	YES	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
211	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
212	This is my preference	Oct 4, 2012 1:22 PM
213	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
214	I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, but there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
215	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 1:03 PM
216	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
217	Preference 11: While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	
218	That would be nice, but the main focus should be to protect the homes/permanent residents along the boulevard from noise, pollution. Bikes and pedestrians are important, but the residents should be the main focus as we have to live with it every day.	Oct 4, 2012 12:48 PM
219	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:40 PM
220	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
221	Use the lid dollars for noise reduction and the largest lid possible.	Oct 4, 2012 12:25 PM
222	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
223	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
224	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
225	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
226	I like the idea, and it should be continued, but there needs to be a new approach that better meets the needs of active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
227	I support the idea behind this, but it could be better implemented.	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
228	Generally support. Lid for connectivity seems like a good idea, but "active uses" seem somewhat less likely to develop unless there is a strong connection to UW for access from students there.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
229	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
230	I support this preference.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
231	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	
232	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
233	I like this idea	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
234	This one is transformational - support whole heartedly.	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
235	Another great idea.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
236	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
237	The goals of this are good, but the design needs a new approach that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
238	As long as there is similar transit connections with buses on 520. If not, then this would make more sense at the light rail station.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
239	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
240	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 AM
241	Supported, with priority on active uses and bike/ped facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
242	Only if this "lid" has appropriate bicycle and pedestrian connections. Please don't make this much of an "island" apart from the other infrastructure.	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
243	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
244	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
245	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	
246	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
247	If well-designed, this would be a great thing.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 AM
248	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design that better supports active users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:04 AM
249	I own our home a half mile from this location and support this.	Oct 4, 2012 10:59 AM
250	mobility hub extremely important. This will be a big exit to the UW.	Oct 4, 2012 10:35 AM
251	Good.	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
252	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 AM
253	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
254	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	
255	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 4, 2012 7:07 AM
256	Is this a bridge for cars or bicycles? You people seem to hate automobiles, and want to spend money we don't have on a bicycle bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
257	very much needed, but might need more follow through of thought/ application	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 AM
258	Seems sensible, already a major node for mixed-mode commuting, i.e. bus from eastside then bike to work. With the new 520 trail, volume will only continue to increase.	Oct 4, 2012 2:17 AM
259	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 9:45 PM
260	The mobility hub can be a good thing. What keeps this part of the design from being the first casualty to the inevitable value-engineering of your design-build delivery process?	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
261	Support: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Oct 3, 2012 9:06 PM
262	OK.	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM
263	Good	Oct 3, 2012 8:34 PM
264	Definitely. Needs to happen.	Oct 3, 2012 8:18 PM
265	of course	Oct 3, 2012 6:16 PM
266	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub	Oct 3, 2012 4:02 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design.	
267	The Montlake lid needs to be looked at way more carefully. Has the thought of putting a lid closer to the 520/Montlake Blvd. interchange been looked at instead of focusing the lid so far east of Montlake Blvd? There are way more pedestrians on Montlake Blvd, not east of Montlake Blvd. This will solve the pedestrian vs. car issues so that pedesestrians can enjoy the green space.	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
268	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 3:49 PM
269	Agree	Oct 3, 2012 3:41 PM
270	Playfield siting here would be great. Given the mobility needs it may not fit here, in which case locating the fields slightly to the east (#15) would also work.	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
271	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 3:06 PM
272	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 1:58 PM
273	What the heck is a "mobility hub"??? What "facilities" would be needed? All this area needs are bus stops so peds and cyclists can get on and off the cross-	Oct 3, 2012 1:46 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	bridge buses, and sidewalk/trail connections to get to and from the bus stops.	
274	West side of the lid is not a particularly useful place. Focus on making 23rd Ave work for all modes.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
275	I like it	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM
276	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM
277	Develop hub at University Link Light Rail to enhance connections	Oct 3, 2012 12:04 PM
278	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 3, 2012 11:56 AM
279	YES!!	Oct 3, 2012 11:30 AM
280	I am a fan of putting a lid on the west side of montlake blvd, where most people are going to be crossing I5.	Oct 3, 2012 11:01 AM
281	All of the items you listed here are vital to this becoming a successful space! Creating it as a hub that includes "to" and "through" functions will help it be safe - visibility is key toward that goal too.	Oct 3, 2012 10:49 AM
282	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
283	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 3, 2012 10:30 AM
284	This would be a high priority--lids like this make neighborhoods possible--it would be a crime if this option were eliminated, particularly given the enormous negative impact 520 has on the character of the neighborhood.	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
285	YES	Oct 3, 2012 9:52 AM
286	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
287	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses. (I support Central Greenways)	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
288	Sounds like a good idea	Oct 3, 2012 9:36 AM
289	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:41 AM
290	yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:33 AM
291	It is unclear what this would entail. If it requires a large building, then forget it.	Oct 3, 2012 8:28 AM
292	Sounds good to me.	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 AM
293	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multi-modal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today – on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a “lid” is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	Oct 3, 2012 8:15 AM
294	While I support the goals of this preference to create a multimodal hub somewhere in the project area that is safe and pleasant for all users, there needs to be a new approach to the design. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today - on the West side of	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. It would be prudent to use the limited lid dollars to fix the highest need multimodal problems rather than creating poorly used greenspace. - As long as access to the lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small and likely not suitable for most active uses.	
295	This sounds good but must keep each mode of transprtation seperated except directly at the hub. As a bike rider I've had a multitude of near misses by the bus drivers.	Oct 3, 2012 7:11 AM
296	Yes! Transit and pedestrian facilities here are very important. I'm concerned that the southbound transit stop is too far from the lid transit stops. The northbound stop is great.	Oct 2, 2012 11:49 PM
297	That would be nice	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 PM
298	yes, this would make up in part for the much greater footprint compared to the current bridge	Oct 2, 2012 10:50 PM
299	I like it! We need more alternate means of transportation.	Oct 2, 2012 8:58 PM
300	See comments Preference 9	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
301	It would be great to have some sort of safe and secure bike storage here too. Would help out UW games and commuting.	Oct 2, 2012 6:58 PM
302	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 2, 2012 6:16 PM
303	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:23 PM
304	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
305	This is a good idea if it can be done cost-effectively.	Oct 2, 2012 3:16 PM
306	This sounds fabulous.	Oct 2, 2012 12:31 PM
307	Yes, please do this.	Oct 2, 2012 12:22 PM
308	This sounds great. The ease on picking up a bus at the Montlake station shouldn't change.	Oct 2, 2012 12:05 PM
309	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 2, 2012 11:48 AM
310	You need to take a new approach to the design of this area of the lid. The West Montlake lid should be called the Central Montlake Lid. - The bulk of the pedestrian and bicycle movements will occur -much as they do today- on the West side of Montlake Blvd. That is where a "lid" is most needed. - As long as	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	access to the he lid between 24th Ave E. and Montlake Blvd E. is through crosswalks across on and off-ramps, it is not suitable for much beyond catching buses. It is an island, cut off from Montlake on all sides and it is very small. - Consider how rail stations are organized with tunnels to access the platforms; tunnels would not be safe here because of low traffic, making them great places for homeless people to seek shelter and perfect areas for mugging; so they are not practical here. You cannot develop safe connections to this hub. Since the lid design does not allow this traditional solution, this portion of the lid is a wasteland unsuited for a hub. Get rid of it.	
311	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
312	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 2, 2012 10:09 AM
313	OK	Oct 2, 2012 9:44 AM
314	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 2, 2012 9:04 AM
315	We urge WSDOT to redesign the North-South pedestrian and bicycle connections from the University of Washington and light rail station to Montlake and beyond. Of particular safety concern is the Montlake Bridge; the west side crossing of SR 520 over 7 lanes of traffic; and the lack of safe, direct, or comfortable connections to south of the project. As stated by the Seattle Design Commission, “we recommend WSDOT to re-examine choices to improve multimodal connectivity.” We consider the West Montlake Lid to be the missing portion that could provide the solution for connectivity and eliminate the need for an O&M building. Importance of this request: “In both the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans, the Montlake Bridge [and by extension the crossing of SR 520] has been identified as a critical linkage in the non-motorized network with existing deficiencies” (Nelson/Nygaard 2012). 1) The west side of Montlake Blvd. pedestrian/bike LOS is currently failing and getting worse. 2) The east side of Montlake Blvd. pedestrian/bike LOS is poor and will get worse under current design due to the new Bus and Light Rail Stations. 3) Safe and direct pedestrian and bicycle connections to schools, libraries, parks, the UW, regional trails, and hospitals, are non-existent in the current plans and must be re- designed. 4) No safe and direct connection between North and South Montlake especially along the west side of Montlake Blvd. 5) This project area is a critical east-west and north-south junction for citywide and regional bicycle connectivity (as shown in Seattle’s BMP and PSRC’s Regional Bicycle Network).	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 AM
316	Hubs enabling bike and pedestrian use are the best choice.	Oct 2, 2012 8:09 AM
317	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 1, 2012 9:25 PM
318	*rapid* transit is good	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
319	yes. be sure to include bicycling connection from 520 through portage bay and into roanoke/eastlake. note: as a cyclist I much rather ride my bike in any weather than wait for the bus. connections to transit are great, but I want to ride	Oct 1, 2012 2:36 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	from east side of 520 to destinations in u district and downtown. I would also like to connect to madison park.	
320	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 1, 2012 2:24 PM
321	Extremely important to encourage transit and bicycle usage across bridge which will help keep auto usage on bridge down.	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
322	yes, support for foot and bike traffic is important!	Oct 1, 2012 10:21 AM
323	Use available funds to make the largest lid possible with the main goal noise reduction	Sep 30, 2012 3:19 PM
324	Absolutely essential. Focus on the transportation and less on the "space for active uses": this is, primarily, a transit hub. Provide bicycle parking and/or locking bicycle boxes or garage facilities.	Sep 30, 2012 10:31 AM
325	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 30, 2012 7:26 AM
326	Pomote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 30, 2012 3:42 AM
327	no add'l comments	Sep 29, 2012 11:41 PM
328	3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM
329	This is important to me as bus and bike commuter.	Sep 29, 2012 9:16 PM
330	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 29, 2012 7:37 PM
331	Yes, please.	Sep 29, 2012 4:48 PM
332	Wonderful! This is such a key hub for bike and bus transportation in the region.	Sep 29, 2012 4:30 PM
333	This would be wonderful. It seems like it really leverages the Burke-Gilman too, especially if the path from the Burke-Gilman to this area is clear	Sep 29, 2012 1:41 PM
334	I don't like this design. The off ramps from the HOV lanes at 23rd should be designed to get people from 520 to the UW as quickly as possible. It should'nt have to meander through a park for some of that time.	Sep 29, 2012 1:36 PM
335	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 9:32 AM
336	Of course.	Sep 29, 2012 6:58 AM
337	Make the mobility hub compatable with all transportation modes.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
338	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
339	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails	Sep 28, 2012 9:49 PM
340	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 8:15 PM
341	Too expensive	Sep 28, 2012 5:56 PM
342	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM
343	YES!	Sep 28, 2012 5:11 PM
344	This should be useful to cycle commuters who combine bus with bike to travel from the U of WA to the east side.	Sep 28, 2012 4:17 PM
345	Great idea!	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
346	prefer	Sep 28, 2012 2:23 PM
347	Yes and promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 2:14 PM
348	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 2:02 PM
349	This is exciting!	Sep 28, 2012 1:24 PM
350	yes	Sep 28, 2012 12:51 PM
351	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 12:27 PM
352	yes - we need stuff like this to incentivize non-vehicular commuters - make it cool. Lets not make it a homless encampment tho...	Sep 28, 2012 12:12 PM
353	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 11:43 AM
354	The lids are nice. It'd be nice to integrate bikes and the lid. But I'd rather bike commute along 520 than have a nasty detour to get downtown.	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
355	Yes please.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 AM
356	I would love to see it get a lot easier to take a bicycle to the the eastbound bus stop and from the westbound bus stop. Currently eastbound it's a pretty scary descent of an exposed steel staircase while carrying the bicycle and westbound, you have to cross 520 traffic exiting onto Montlake (often at high speed) northbound. I just hope the new design thinks about bike to bus transitions and does more to keep bicyclists safe.	Sep 28, 2012 10:31 AM
357	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 9:55 AM
358	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
359	Neutral..if no bike path on bridge this becomes higher priority	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
360	Yes but priority is to get bikes and peds onto a bike path on bridge. If need to travel another block to get on not a problem.	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 AM
361	IMPORTANT TO GIVE OPTIONS AND SAFETY	Sep 28, 2012 7:05 AM
362	Great	Sep 28, 2012 6:24 AM
363	yes, yes, yes!	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 PM
364	Good idea to have a lid over the whole area. Big benefit to the community and provides easier transition and access for non-car users.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
365	I am all for new and improved bicycle lanes/paths.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 PM
366	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
367	yes	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 PM
368	Safe connections are a top priority for cyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 9:22 PM
369	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 9:05 PM
370	Yes absolutely	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM
371	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 7:40 PM
372	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:04 PM
373	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 6:30 PM
374	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
375	Yes, help those who want to use transit and alternative commute options. Without a park and ride in Montlake it is very hard fir those of us who live in Eastlake or north of the canal (universtiy and surrounding neighborhoods) to commute across the bridge without driving to Northgate! Most of the busses go downtown rather than to Montlake and it takes 2 or 3 transfers to get to Bellevue.	Sep 27, 2012 6:07 PM
376	YES!	Sep 27, 2012 6:06 PM
377	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 5:59 PM
378	Sounds good.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
379	Yes, places where different parts of the transportation infrastructure can connect are key.	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
380	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 4:58 PM
381	Also implement the plan. The lid should be accessible only by foot or bicycle traffice - NO CARS.	Sep 27, 2012 4:55 PM
382	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Sep 27, 2012 4:52 PM
383	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
384	please!	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
385	Yes, transit, cycle, and pedestrian facilities. I use this transit hub every day to cross the lake.	Sep 27, 2012 4:29 PM
386	Yes, this will be a high traffic area of biks, pedestrians and cars, so this is important.	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
387	nice	Sep 27, 2012 4:07 PM
388	Agree. Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 3:58 PM
389	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
390	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 3:41 PM
391	agreed.	Sep 27, 2012 3:21 PM
392	Yes. Good plan.	Sep 27, 2012 3:03 PM
393	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:49 PM
394	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
395	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:22 PM
396	Sounds good	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
397	A good idea, promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:15 PM
398	My prefered option	Sep 27, 2012 2:14 PM
399	Again, a North-South connection for cyclists through this area is key. Cyclists should be able to cross the ramps and paths through this area on their North-South journeys, i.e. at 24th Ave E. Safe connections to transit are also desirable.	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
400	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 1:57 PM
401	This would be amazing!	Sep 27, 2012 1:48 PM
402	This is a fantastic idea, more green space and makes for easy bicycle navigation like on Mercer Island.	Sep 27, 2012 1:28 PM
403	This is a must but blend it with 13	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
404	excellent	Sep 27, 2012 1:23 PM
405	High priority and goes hand in hand with supporting bicycle/pedestrian use of the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
406	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Sep 27, 2012 1:08 PM
407	Agree with this.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
408	this is a great design feature.	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
409	nice!	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
410	Absolutely needed	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
411	Great idea!	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
412	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
413	it looks like the mobility hub (transit portion) may take up a fair bit of real estate in this plan. perhaps having transit access along the edge only?	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
414	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 PM
415	Include small pedestrian oriented commercial space such as cafe or corner store.	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
416	A hub like this is highly desirable--why create a need to travel from point A to point B to transfer from one transit source to another?	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
417	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	
418	I support the mobility hub with good transit connections.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
419	This would be very nice	Sep 27, 2012 12:01 PM
420	YES	Sep 27, 2012 11:51 AM
421	sounds good	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
422	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
423	Yes, Awesome, do it!!! I am way too old to use a skateboard park, but this seems like a nice place to have one. The noise will be drowned out by the freeway and away from residential areas. You also might consider a mountain bike park.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
424	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:35 AM
425	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
426	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM
427	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:27 AM
428	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
429	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:18 AM
430	3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
431	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM
432	Yes! I am a frequent bike commuter and also ride recreationally. I think that the lack of a bike path across 520 is pretty limiting. I live in Bothell and it would be VERY nice to have a lake crossing via bike that is closer than I-90! I feel strongly that adding bicycle and pedestrian lanes is a CRITICAL aspect of any new road work as it will provide better transportation and health opportunities for years to come.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
433	Good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
434	souinds cool.	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
435	good idea but no strong opinion	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
436	Safe connections are critical -- separating commuting bikes from cars and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 11:04 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
437	Important for mixed use, and as a gateway	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
438	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
439	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
440	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
441	Agreed.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
442	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 AM
443	Definitely do this. Transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are absolutely essential.	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 AM
444	many bike racks, please, in a few different styles, as not all bikes fit well on all racks.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
445	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
446	I support the proposal.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
447	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:38 AM
448	3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
449	bicycle friendly is key to our congestion issues and seattle's love of the outdoors.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
450	This would be nice, This area would be alot nicer for the frisbee games I already play there.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
451	Must have a good way to put peds and bikes on and off transit. more options results in more use.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
452	This should be a priority	Sep 27, 2012 10:26 AM
453	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:25 AM
454	Seems like a nice way to integrate multiple uses and satisfy a variety of needs. Keeps the area more active and might deter crime.	Sep 27, 2012 10:19 AM
455	nice	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
456	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
457	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
458	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
459	YES!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
460	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
461	All others on this page should consider the neighborhood's views and balance them with costs	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
462	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
463	yes!	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
464	A mobility hub would be great	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
465	Essential and absolutely critical to the long-term success of the project. Safe bicycle routes will encourage the use of that transportation method, particularly between Redmond and downtown Seattle. Direct connections to the Burke Gilman Trail seem like an obviously essential design element.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
466	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
467	Definitely a good thing, very exciting.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
468	Yep.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
469	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
470	doesn't matter if you have mobility hub if the bus can only carry 2 bikes - forget the hub and make a bike path	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
471	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
472	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
473	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
474	This sounds good.	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
475	good	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
476	yes,	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
477	Please	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
478	I like this. It's a busy area and this will be helpful.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
479	Absolutely support this idea	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
480	Well of course. How is not doing this even an option? There's so much traffic (north-south as well as east-west) that it's a hub no matter what happens; it's best to take advantage of this then frustrate everyone.	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
481	OK, makes sense	Sep 26, 2012 11:18 AM
482	good idea	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
483	Lots of questions in one. I think that this was part of the preferred alternative. The next piece of work is what you describe in p9. Can the Montlake bridge be widened to include a bus stop southbound? That would mak the transfer from westbound 520 buses to the local buses more tolerable. Otherwise I have to wait for two signals to get to the local top by the store. If a southbound stop is on Montlake across from the lid stop, I could walk under Montlake and right up to my local stop. How could that happen?	Sep 25, 2012 9:51 AM
484	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:52 AM
485	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 AM
486	I have to be a huge fan of safe connections to and from the lid. Bike facilities not so much, because there is a high activity bike thief gang that works that area, and It won't be safe for people to leave bikes there.	Sep 24, 2012 11:15 PM
487	Transit is a very important thing to consider here. It is hard to tell from the images whether it will be possible to transfer at montlake on east / west buses like the 545. We do this today. Please ensure that which ever option you choose you will still be able to transfer from east west buses like the 545 to north south buses like the 43 and 48. These connections are essential and we should go with which ever option preserves this ability.	Sep 24, 2012 9:54 PM
488	This sounds terrific.	Sep 24, 2012 9:19 PM
489	The mobility hub is an excellent idea, but please don't have that be the only good path across the lid N-S.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
490	Important to be able to walk from UW light rail station to montlake bus stop. Good bike storage would encourage bike/bus at montlake. If the "active use" part ends up as good as the mercer Is lid over I-90, that is a real plus for that neighborhood.	Sep 24, 2012 6:07 PM
491	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 24, 2012 1:11 PM
492	excellent	Sep 24, 2012 1:02 PM
493	Yes please.	Sep 24, 2012 12:57 PM
494	Not sure how useful a transit hub here would be - I'd definitely like to see the	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
	University station on the light rail be the local transportation hub. Good connectivity from here to there would be a better option, IMO.	
495	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 24, 2012 12:18 PM
496	This is a great idea that makes good use of an otherwise "lost" space. This is a key transit point and, with safer and more plentiful commute options, it will encourage more use of public transit and thus reduce traffic on the road.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM
497	Very much in favor of this.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
498	Sounds like the most important preference from my perspective.	Sep 24, 2012 11:58 AM
499	if SR-520 was not required to have six lanes between Montlake and I-5 per state, a transit t-intersection could be provided; through routes could stop just east of Montlake Boulevard East to replace freeway stops; U District oriented routes could turn at signalized intersection.	Sep 23, 2012 6:53 PM
500	yes	Sep 23, 2012 2:41 PM
501	Very important for the many users of this area. The lid will be wonderful and safe connections to and from the lid are a "must". This is a very active area - please strive to accommodate the many people who will use and enjoy the lid!	Sep 23, 2012 8:21 AM
502	Sounds great.	Sep 22, 2012 4:40 PM
503	Without the Hop-in and the gas station, you will be unable to create a mobility hub on the west side of Montlake Blvd. where tranist, cars, bikes and pedestrians meet to go south on Montlake Blvd. on to 24th.	Sep 22, 2012 12:30 PM
504	sounds expensive, especially with other parks nearby	Sep 22, 2012 10:07 AM
505	Yes	Sep 22, 2012 2:42 AM
506	This would be very helpful to the transportation in the area.	Sep 21, 2012 3:42 PM
507	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
508	I see so many lanes for cars and so few for anyone else.....	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
509	Explore sound mitigation	Sep 20, 2012 10:36 AM
510	I'm not sure what a "mobility hub" is comprised of. A transit center seems given. What else would there be?	Sep 19, 2012 9:26 PM
511	This area currently has a ton of bicycle traffic and the conditions are horrific to say the least. A lid park with wide shared use paths is absolutely needed here.	Sep 19, 2012 12:30 PM
512	Sounds good if it can be done.	Sep 18, 2012 12:20 PM
513	OK, but not necessary.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
514	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM
515	There have been several suggestions to improve ped/bike safety at the intersections of 20th, 22nd, Roanoke, 23rd, Roanoke, Montlake Blvd. and East lake Washington Blvd. One solution could be the expansion of the lid on the West side of Montlake. To get from Roanoke and Montlake Bldv. on the North side of 520, a ped/biker needs to cross seven lanes of high density traffic. The interaction between buses, cars, bikes and pedestrians at this intersection has not been properly addressed.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM
516	Make sure that this hub includes visible, easy-to-use, secure, and readily available bike parking.	Sep 17, 2012 3:24 PM
517	Support	Sep 17, 2012 6:14 AM
518	Without iadditional mprovement of Bus. Bike and Pedestrians access across the Montlake "CUT', particulary after the Husky Stadium LRT Station opens in 2014(?) the LRT users will be frustrated becaue the current bridge is at capacity for them to get to the LRT station. The Nelson Nygard recent study stated that current Montlake Blvd.Ped, Bike routes were at capacity and the bus routes are unable to keep to their schedules due to no preferential lights or lanes for Transit to move thry the Peak Hour traffic congestion in the area. I live further north and avoid Montlake if driving, and when caught in the peack can count on at least wasting 20 minutes between the U-village and the Montlake Bridge or vice versa. Currently there are few bus routes on 25th NE due to this congestion, but surely the feeeder bus system to the new ST Stadium Station will be a new major component for improving access and a goal of the reduction of personl SOV Auto traffic.	Sep 16, 2012 4:29 PM
519	Do not want built structures/mobility hub , but space for active uses is good.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
520	Approve.	Sep 16, 2012 10:02 AM
521	this should help people connect and ease the use of public transit. Space for active uses? like what and who would use this?	Sep 16, 2012 9:17 AM
522	I support this.	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
523	Please prioritize bicycle and pedestrian access and preservation of green space in all these areas.	Sep 15, 2012 8:37 PM
524	For all of these areas, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle mobility and preservation of green space.	Sep 15, 2012 8:11 PM
525	Like.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
526	ok	Sep 15, 2012 2:56 PM
527	The transit connection from SR-520 to Montlake Blvd South is still poor. I see a lot of people at the current stop (on the island) in the morning. A Hamlin bus stop could help, even if it's further north. The SR-520 stops do seem well connected to the northbound Montlake stop and the bike path via 24th Ave E. I assume the transit lanes get priority at both 24th Ave E and Montlake Blvd…	Sep 15, 2012 1:38 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses

	otherwise the reliability of these buses would suffer. I was going to say there should be a coffee shop by the bus stops, but it looks like you already have that covered by "retail buildings" Bike lockers and bike racks? Where would the ST 545 stop when heading though this area from downtown? Please don't tell me it would need to exit, wait at the busy intersection and make a couple of turns before getting to the bus stop.	
528	Absolutely. Deck over as much as possible of the Montlake interchange. There is no point in not developing a greenscape on top of SR-520 wherever possible.	Sep 15, 2012 12:59 PM
529	Take what ever land you need to enhance the free flow of motor vehicles through the area and physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. Lots of BIG trees.	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
530	Sounds good	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
531	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
532	this makes sense if the lid is cost and time effective	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
533	Looks like you're worried about forcing the vehicles to inundate the E Montlake Pl E -E Lake Washington Blvd Intersection so you added the 24th Ave exit. The elimination of the the eastbound on ramp is an over looked problem that will make the E Montlake Pl E -E Lake Washington Blvd a major pinch point during morning rush hour. The elimination of the on ramp eastbound needs attention. Again your forcing a major pinch point to occur and leaving common sense out of the equation. Remember the city will be increasing density and this will happen along Martin Luther King Way and the Madison Valley (20 years)	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
534	This makes a lot of sense.	Sep 14, 2012 5:20 PM
535	Definitely. This, alongside preference 10 sounds right.	Sep 14, 2012 4:36 PM
536	Good idea	Sep 14, 2012 3:45 PM
537	This area used to be part of the Arboretum before SR 520 came. It was part of the Olmsted Plan for a Boulevard from Steward Park to the University of Washington. That plan had vision and made all sections part of the whole. This design needs to return to Olmsted principles and envision the lid as an entrance/exit foyer to the Arobretum --- sort of an "ALOHA" with stress on plantings, and a meadow for recreation. The Japanese have developed walkways between major streets through floral gardens that while busy are not too obtrusive.	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM
538	what is a "mobility hub"? Can't use jargon for a public survey	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
539	YES YES YES YES YES YES.	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
540	great idea	Sep 14, 2012 1:54 PM
541	We do NOT need a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. PERIOD.	Sep 14, 2012 1:49 PM

Page 5, Q3. Preference 11: West Montlake lid: Develop a mobility hub that includes transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safe connections to and from lid, and space for active uses		
542	safe connections for ped/bike are really the key, will there be continuous bus access westbound and eastbound on 520, if they end at montlake or cannot continue east or west, this seems like a loss for transit	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM
543	Increase ease for bicycles	Sep 14, 2012 1:21 PM
544	Agreed. It's much better to have this on the lid than to have to descend those terrible stairs.	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
545	Yes, but don't go overboard. Keep the cost down with functional landscaping on the lid that will mostly be passed by by college students - quick glance -but not a monumental memory item. Functional should win over other elements.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
546	lids are always good ... creates new space and hides the blight that is freeways and traffic	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
547	Yes, please	Sep 14, 2012 12:42 PM
548	Top priority. This would be great!	Sep 14, 2012 12:25 PM
549	Do not know	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
550	Sounds good	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
551	like getting from the Montlake Freeway Flyer stop to the SB busses without a long detour? excellent!	Sep 14, 2012 12:00 PM
552	Of course!	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
553	I think the transit hub should remain lower and only surface bike and pedestrian traffic to the lid...that woudl truly create the connection and greenspace from Arboretum south to Husky Stadium.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
554	No. This is not a specific destination separate from the transit bus stops in the area. Don't muck up the open space with more "stuff".	Sep 14, 2012 11:06 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

1	Good	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 PM
2	I think one of the big opportunities is to use the uphill grade to create a berm to provide visual and noise buffer to the houses on the south side of ELWB. Make the berm artificially higher as needed.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 PM
3	We live at [redacted] and are one of the few homes--perhaps the ONLY home--on this part of the street that does not have alley access. Because we MUST access our home from E. Lake Washington Bvd., and currently when heading westbound on the Blvd. simply make a left hand turn into our drive way, and when wanting to head westbound when leaving our house simply make a left hand turn from our driveway, the functionality of the new design is critical to our interests and property value. That said, any homeowner, or visitor of a homeowner, who lives along that strip of Blvd. (which will face the one-way only eastbound street paralleling the two way street) will be impacted by the design. Any of us--and us particularly--will want to be able to take a U-turn from the Blvd. when they are heading westbound (say, from the Madison Park neighborhood)--so they can access the oneway (heading eastbound) easily. Doing this at 24th Ave. E., instead of 23rd/Montlake (which is inherently far busier), is key. Likewise, while we recognize that turning left from our driveway will no longer be an option--and that this is part of a shared sacrifice we are willing to make--it is important that we are, however, able to at some point head westbound on the Blvd. (frankly, as soon as possible), to, e.g., go grocery shopping at U Village. Incorporating a turn about, perhaps where the road curves currently, to do this is key. And this will be critical for anyone along the Blvd. who plans to accesses their house from the street (and many do), and needs to head westbound at any point. While we will not be the only ones impacted by these potential limitations of the design (should this access issue to the Blvd. not be properly considered), as property owners whose immediate access to our home will be impacted, we may be the only ones currently appreciating this potential limitation of the design. So please do not diminish the significance if we are the only ones commenting. To reiterate, the inconvenience will be significant for anyone who lives along this stretch of the Blvd. We attended several comment sessions, and tried to make this point on the boards that were presented, so we hope this community need will not be overlooked. Thanks much.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 PM
4	The highway and ramps should be appropriately buffered from both neighboring houses and other buildings as well as nearby public open space, neighborhood streets, and pedestrian and bicycle paths and facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 PM
5	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
6	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 PM
7	Love all of these ideas. I live on the "bend" of E. Lake Washington Blvd across from the water. I woudl like to see the median and buffer(s) extend all the way to the end of ELWB not end somewhere before that as indicated in the visuals. I have a driveway and need to be able to get in and out of it and traffic backups make that next to impossible. I would also prefer large sound wall on SR520 after the end of the lid heading east. Noise currently breaks sound limits by	Oct 5, 2012 6:23 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

	decibal so the more buffers we can create the better for residents who have to deal with this day in and day out. I would also love to not have a parking lot right across from my home below the bridge as indicated in the picture. Thank you for the chance to comment, much appreciated. I really do love the idea of calming traffic on ELWB and extending the footprint of the arboretum and bringing more trees, shrubs, etc. into this part of the neighborhood. Turing the WSDOT peninsula into a parkspace will really be nice as well.	
8	Yes, and do the same on the Portage Bay side of the project. BIG trees and lots of them!	Oct 5, 2012 6:20 PM
9	As long as the costs don't constrain the overall project, I can see some limited value of this.	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
10	While I'm sure the homeowners would like this, it needs to be done without decreasing visibility on the road and without adding too much cost.	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 PM
11	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:08 PM
12	I strongly favor this idea. Landscaping medians seems silly to me since nobody can actually use the space, so I'm glad the planted buffer is being placed on the south side.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
13	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
14	Seems reasonable	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
15	without adversely affecting the ability of automobile traffic to transit the area and eliminate potential conflict points between bicycles and cars by moving bikes off grade.	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
16	OK, but we liked the idea of continuing the planted median strip all the way around the corner. Making the section more residential looking might slow if not reduce the volume of this heavily used street. Still need more attention to the issue of southbound exiting traffic choosing to go straight thru light and into alleys off of the 24th Ave E dead-end.	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
17	The priority should be moving vehicles, bicycles, and people efficiently and safely, not improving or maintianing the home values for a small minority.	Oct 5, 2012 3:08 PM
18	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
19	Absolutely! Residents on E. Lk. WA Blvd. need this buffer!. The diagram I saw at a recent meeting showed a "local access only" road [a good idea] and a large planted buffer between the arterial and the homes on the south side. These homes *must* be protected.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
20	Sounds good. I think it's important to do this project the right way.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM
21	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

22	Important but second priority.	Oct 5, 2012 2:31 PM
23	good.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
24	Yes, I support increasing the plant buffer.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
25	I frequently ride my bike through the Arboretum and strongly support improved design of this area.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
26	good	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
27	Sounds great. However, don't stifle the use of Lake Wash Blvd for those of us who live near Madison on the other side.	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
28	yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:45 PM
29	If the neighbors want a buffer, they should be willing to pay for most of the cost, as they are the ones who benefit the most. Toll payers want safer bridges and more auto access.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
30	Great!	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
31	no	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
32	I prefer increasing traffic flow along this route instead of increasing planted buffer. Easing traffic congestion along this road would provide a better benefit than increasing the planted buffer.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
33	This could be helpful to local neighborhoods as long as the road is designed to handle the proper amount of traffic flow.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
34	OK Change grade level?	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
35	No preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
36	I'm not sure this is necessary.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
37	Noise prevention measures should also be included	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
38	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
39	Here is an opportunity to not only buffer the community but also pedestrian and bicycle traffic - create buffer areas between auto traffic and bikes and pedestrians. DO NOT PUT BIKES ON THE ROADWAY!!	Oct 5, 2012 12:01 PM
40	Probably most economical.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
41	Sounds nice	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
42	Again, make sure that bike flow is not impeded. Both figures of your design concept below show bikers walking their bikes in order to not collide with pedestrians. This doesn't seem well thought out.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

43	For the city, East Lake Washington Boulevard is a connector to the Arboretum. It's function in that way as a public space connector is important. The private interests of adjacent property owners should not be the driver for this public project. The preservation and improvement of public street space should be the focus of design and dollars.	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 AM
44	It is important that any changes to this area mitigate or improve the overall aesthetics of the area. This should be done by integrating green space, parks and multi-purpose fields and reserves.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
45	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 11:27 AM
46	Don't these folks already have a pretty sweet situation?	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
47	Not important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:13 AM
48	yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
49	Seems like its buffered well as is.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
50	Sure!	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM
51	I STRONGLY SUPPORT. This should not even be an option. The protection of the Montlake neighborhood should be at the forefront of every design option.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
52	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
53	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
54	You should do anything you can to improve the dumb decision to close the arboretum on and off ramp. If little towns in France and Germany can tunnel and build lids to protect their cities and neighborhoods why can't we.	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
55	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
56	Insure design is appropriate to an urban neighborhood--not a suburban freeway corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
57	Nice to have. But my preference is usability for pedestrian/bus/bike. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

58	The MPCC supports this Preference.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
59	This is a good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 AM
60	This might be fine, but not if the cost dooms the really important parts of the project.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
61	No preference.	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
62	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
63	Disagree. Maximize for overall transit access and flow. Housing to be secondary consideration in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
64	Sounds nice.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
65	It's nice to make the arboretum a quiet space. Would this help calm traffic in there? It's weird that an arboretum feels so much like an arterial street right now.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
66	Yes, as long as this does not take away space otherwise used for bike or pedestrian access.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
67	Not in favor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
68	Good.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
69	Look at the size of the intersection of 24th and Lake WA Blvd!!! Eliminate or greatly reduce on street parking here. Do not encroach on the width of the lid as that eliminates potential uses from being considered. Eliminate left turns from 24th onto LWB for traffic calming and to allow for narrower LWB.	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 AM
70	If done, must be done carefully so that the "buffer" does not provide an environment for transients. I doubt those against road noise would be pleased with a homeless encampment as the alternative.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
71	sounds kinda lame.	Oct 5, 2012 8:58 AM
72	I support all opportunities to shield the road from neighborhoods and reduce its appearance on the landscape. (minus the bridge portion, which should be showy)	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
73	Absolutely essential. The cover over the expanded bridge is a promised attribute and without it, the whole project has been grossly misrepresented.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
74	Ok, but not as high a priority as some of these other big impact issues.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
75	(Street name is Lake Washington Boulevard East)	Oct 5, 2012 8:45 AM
76	As long as cycling traffic has enough room, the more planted buffers, the better.	Oct 5, 2012 8:32 AM
77	No COmment	Oct 5, 2012 7:53 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

78	I love this idea.	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM
79	yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
80	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
81	This roadway provides a key by connection West of Capitol Hill. However, drivers treat it as a freeway. Removing the Arboretum off ramps is a positive move, but residents using it to travel to their homes will remain. Despite the 25 mph speed limit, traffic moves more frequently at 40 mph. There isn't enough space for bikes on this road, despite the fact that it runs straight through the park. Drivers are extremely hostile to cyclists who take the lane to prevent sideswipes. The entire corridor should be revisited with safety is the most important consideration.	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 AM
82	Ridiculous.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
83	good	Oct 5, 2012 6:45 AM
84	yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
85	High priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
86	Support.	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
87	No. 1st address on street bicycle facilities before a aesthetic buffer	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
88	So very important to all!	Oct 5, 2012 4:01 AM
89	Yes, planting is good to use for buffering noise and it looks nice too. Do that throughout this project since there is apparently lots of new strips of freeway being laid down throughout Montlake.	Oct 5, 2012 12:03 AM
90	Not as important. With the other lid elements, there shouldn't be much need for this.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 PM
91	yes	Oct 4, 2012 10:33 PM
92	Good idea.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
93	Toll LWB through the arboretum. This will accomplish many of the goals while bringing in revenue for the city.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
94	I support this peference.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
95	Support	Oct 4, 2012 9:41 PM
96	this is not a priority for me	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 PM
97	i like	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
98	Yes, as much as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side		
99	Hard to argue with moneyed folks about plantings, but do need to balance the need to make routes attractive enough to lure people into being more active.	Oct 4, 2012 9:14 PM
100	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM
101	Sounds good for the homes along this busy route.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
102	Great,	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
103	Yes, more trees, less noise.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
104	Yes!	Oct 4, 2012 8:32 PM
105	nope. the million dollar mansions are fine.	Oct 4, 2012 8:16 PM
106	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
107	Not in favour. Leave the distance between property line and road the same as it is now, instead giving more space to the public lid park, rather than to the useless grass in front of the home-owners.	Oct 4, 2012 7:45 PM
108	This seems an excellent solution to continuous problems for this lovely neighborhood of trees cut through by more and more traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 7:37 PM
109	This would be a nice addition.	Oct 4, 2012 7:20 PM
110	Lake Washington Boulevard needs to be repaired with a bike lane added.	Oct 4, 2012 6:56 PM
111	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
112	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 6:34 PM
113	taxpayer money and tolls should onyl be used for what was inteneded no additonal surranonding areas	Oct 4, 2012 6:02 PM
114	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
115	Vehicle roadways should be paved with sound absorbing asphalt - not concrete	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
116	They are already burden with traffic so it makes no difference. I think share-use paths are a good buffer and noise canceling areas along with some trees and bushes.	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
117	less important to me	Oct 4, 2012 4:57 PM
118	I still cannot believe that routing all the traffic off SR520 onto E. Lake Washington Blvd. will do anything but cause monumental back-ups no matter how it is designed.	Oct 4, 2012 4:36 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

119	Why not a bike lane? People ride here all the time.	Oct 4, 2012 4:05 PM
120	ok	Oct 4, 2012 4:00 PM
121	good	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
122	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 4, 2012 3:27 PM
123	Meh.	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
124	Buffers are good.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
125	As a homeowner on this stretch of E Lake Washington Blvd, this is of great importance to me and my family. I support this proposal and appreciate the recognition of a need to mitigate this street from those trying to use it as a bypass highway.	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
126	you live close to a freeway, you get to hear the traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
127	no	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
128	Preference 12: No comment.	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
129	Critical. We should not only be insulated from the traffic, but there MUST be curb parking/access for the homes along the roadway, especially to accommodate vehicles, delivery vehicles, visitors, etc, etc. WE LIVE THERE!	Oct 4, 2012 12:48 PM
130	We strongly support this. Design this roadway to be as unobtrussive as possible and do not expand the number of lanes if another design would work.	Oct 4, 2012 12:25 PM
131	I support this.	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
132	I am concerned about more traffic in the Arboretum.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
133	Increase planted buffer!	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
134	Reducing the impact on the Arboretum would be wonderful - but shouldn't take priority over allowing the project to meet the needs of active, non-automobile users.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
135	Good stuff.	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
136	Design must preserve access from BGT to Lake Washington Boulevard for non-motorized uses.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
137	Don't waste time and money on this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
138	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
139	A bicycle right of way would have been a better design to try an eliminate automobile traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

140	How about doing this same buffering for Lake Washington BLVD E and the homes on the west side?	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
141	don't care.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
142	not a priority	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
143	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:04 AM
144	neutral	Oct 4, 2012 10:59 AM
145	Yes, please buffer the neighbors from traffic, noise, and protect the Arboretum. Current speed bumps in arboretum are great...	Oct 4, 2012 10:35 AM
146	Fine.	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
147	Very important!	Oct 4, 2012 9:32 AM
148	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 AM
149	I have no preference on this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
150	No comment.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 AM
151	I love the sound and effect of more green in the neighborhood as well as sound mitigation	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 AM
152	"Additional buffering" seems like an expensive gift to existing property owners with little public benefit. However, this road would benefit from better bike access, either bike lanes on both sides or separated path (in addition to ped. only sidewalks) to facilitate through-traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 2:17 AM
153	Include the hiring of a parks design architect in your design-build proposal. The current diagrams are meaningless.	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
154	OK, but the buffer doesn't seem to extend all along E. Lake Washington Blvd, especially for those of us nearer the Arboretum who'll have all the Madison Park traffic diverted in front of our homes. (I live at [redacted]) Removal of the Arboretum Ramps will put the traffic on the street in front of my house for both eastbound and westbound 520 traffic going to and from Madison Park. It might be moving slow enough to not be too much of a noise increase, but I hope someone is watching for this.	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM
155	Terrific, however, where is the study to mitigate or improve traffic flows that currently use Lake Washington from Madison park and Madrona? How will the lake Washington and Madison as well as Madison and 23rd interchange change so we don't just end up with endless backups on interlaken blvd and Boyer as cut throughs?	Oct 3, 2012 8:34 PM
156	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 7:01 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side		
157	buffers are good (few lanes and less traffic better)	Oct 3, 2012 6:16 PM
158	Definitely support this.	Oct 3, 2012 4:02 PM
159	This seems like a reasonable approach.	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
160	Agree	Oct 3, 2012 3:41 PM
161	Access for traffic turning to go southbound on Lake Washington Blvd is going to be a bottleneck here. It is imperative that the cross-lid exit ramp be widened to accommodate a significant left-turn lane to allow for the many vehicles (and cyclists) who will be turning left to go to/through the Arboretum. Today that traffic is routed via the existing ramp to the east, farther away from the Montlake hub. Unless that traffic can flow smoothly during peak periods, congestion, emissions, and safety for vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, and recreational users of the open space will be compromised significantly during peak travel times.	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
162	Buffer the neighbors from SOUND please! Not just traffic.	Oct 3, 2012 2:46 PM
163	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 3, 2012 1:50 PM
164	Sounds good, but not sure why WSDOT wants to build ramps to the Arboretum anyway. It's a park! Commuters should be on the arterials, not on Olmstead boulevards.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
165	that would help	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM
166	no comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM
167	absolutely	Oct 3, 2012 12:04 PM
168	I love that road as it is, and would love to see it enhanced. Providing a buffer for the homes on the south side is very thoughtful.	Oct 3, 2012 10:49 AM
169	no strong opinion	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
170	Oh please. It would be better to spend dollars and put sidewalks in the north part of the city. People who purchased houses on LWB knew what they were getting. Unless they are paying for the planted buffer, use dollar elsewhere. This design approach is unfairly applied to here because of the $$ in this area. This would not be happening in Tacoma, South Seattle, or South King County just as an example.	Oct 3, 2012 9:52 AM
171	Prefer.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
172	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
173	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:41 AM
174	yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:33 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side		
175	Good idea.	Oct 3, 2012 8:28 AM
176	Keep the roadway right where it is today. This is a city street already.	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 AM
177	no commet	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM
178	Do not waste the money on "visual character". Allow those who want this to voulunteer their time and money to plant approved vegitation if they desire it. S/B non-maint. required vegitation as well.	Oct 3, 2012 7:11 AM
179	Close Lake Washington Blvd through the Arboretum to cars, like they did with Interlaken. It would be a good move to assert that parks are not places for roadways (Arboretum), freeways (Woodland Park), Sewage Pumping stations (Mathews Beach Park), Sewage Treatment Plans (Discovery Park). Sitting anywhere in the Arboretum, one primarily hears the rolling of motor vehices. Sometimes one smells several tens of vehicles idling to get to Madison.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 PM
180	This would be nice, but it's not a necessity.	Oct 2, 2012 8:58 PM
181	See comments Preference 9	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
182	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
183	Sounds like a good idea, as long as any improvements allow for bicycle/pedestrian access from LWB to east side of Lake Washington.	Oct 2, 2012 3:16 PM
184	No comment.	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM
185	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
186	As long as there is adequate space for cyclists, sounds good.	Oct 2, 2012 10:09 AM
187	OK	Oct 2, 2012 9:44 AM
188	Since the current design eliminates the Lake Washington Loop connection from 24th Ave E to the Shelby Hamlin loop by replacing it with a busy freeway interchange, a reroute eastward along East Roanoke St across East Lake Washington Blvd with a crossing light will be needed.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 AM
189	a fine idea, but not critical to do right away, no?	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
190	not sure what this is--seems as if the current 520 is already there. certainly don't make these conditions worse. However, making a cycling connection to Madison Park and E Lake Washington Blvd into Leschi is desireable, as the ride around Lake Washington is very popular for cyclists.	Oct 1, 2012 2:36 PM
191	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 1, 2012 2:24 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side		
192	Important	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
193	Yes. However, expansion of Lake Wahington Boulevard is not desirable. Rerouting traffic some other way would be more desirable for the neighborhood.	Sep 30, 2012 3:19 PM
194	no add'l comments	Sep 29, 2012 11:41 PM
195	4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM
196	Sure.	Sep 29, 2012 4:30 PM
197	I think this would look amazing and add to the character of this neighborhood.	Sep 29, 2012 1:41 PM
198	I would focus on transit, not how nice things look.	Sep 29, 2012 1:36 PM
199	Yes!	Sep 29, 2012 9:32 AM
200	Sure.	Sep 29, 2012 6:58 AM
201	Use a planted buffer.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
202	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
203	yes. the integration with the arboretum is essential	Sep 28, 2012 9:18 PM
204	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 PM
205	Reasonable mitigation should be provided.	Sep 28, 2012 5:56 PM
206	Agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM
207	Nice for the residents. Please watch the sight distances for the cyclists traveling on this busy stretch of road.	Sep 28, 2012 4:17 PM
208	Yes. Reduce noise.	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
209	don't really care	Sep 28, 2012 2:23 PM
210	cut & cover wherever possible.	Sep 28, 2012 12:51 PM
211	low priority, but a good idea	Sep 28, 2012 12:12 PM
212	In general I really like the way people spaces are buffered gracefully from noisy congested traffic spaces.	Sep 28, 2012 11:55 AM
213	Meh.	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
214	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East	Sep 28, 2012 10:19 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

	Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	
215	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM
216	Like	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
217	Yes but lower priority	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 AM
218	NO - THE COMMUNITY HAS NOT WORKED IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE GREATER GOOD!	Sep 28, 2012 7:05 AM
219	great	Sep 28, 2012 6:24 AM
220	Good idea. Opportunity to pull more bikes off of a tight section of the road.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
221	Include a cycle track in the buffer.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
222	If possible yes...	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM
223	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:04 PM
224	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 6:30 PM
225	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
226	That sounds nice.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
227	Buffer is nice, but I'd prefer pathways for peds and bikes, over tree buffer.	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
228	Use this opportunity to improve bicycle access through Washington Park Arboretum, especially southbound, with a separated bikeway or utilize the existing car-free road by improving cyclist access and both the north and south ends.	Sep 27, 2012 4:55 PM
229	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
230	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 4:29 PM
231	The Arboretum should be integrated and connected to the design for Montlake as much as possible.	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
232	Agree	Sep 27, 2012 3:58 PM
233	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
234	I'm less concerned with the appearance of the bridge and connections than I am with its functionality, but if this can be done with minimal impact to construction time and cost, that's nice.	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

235	Again, make sure cyclists can make North/South crossings at 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
236	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 1:57 PM
237	Great idea	Sep 27, 2012 1:48 PM
238	3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 1:08 PM
239	Support.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
240	nice!	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
241	Sounds good	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
242	4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
243	sounds nice	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
244	Highly desirable!	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
245	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
246	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
247	nice	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
248	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
249	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:35 AM
250	Isn't the roadway already sunken from sight and to some degree sound? Seems like a LOT of space and resources to accommodate a handful of residents, who seem like they're just trying to take advantage of the redesign. I think this space would be better used as part of the cap/transit/paths and other stuff that potentially benefits everyone.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
251	Yes, protect neighborhood and Arboretum from noise and disruption.	Sep 27, 2012 11:27 AM
252	This also could be put off till later, it doesn't seem like such a change from what there is now.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
253	4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

	SR 520.	
254	Good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
255	OK, but lower priority	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
256	Not important	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
257	Agreed.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
258	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 AM
259	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
260	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
261	4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
262	great idea, the more trees blocking noise the better.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
263	would be nice for residents.. certainly pouring tons of concrete on the medina side to make this accomodation. but seems expensive. Dont want to lose bike / ped improvements due to this.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
264	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
265	Could you stack the lanes added and not make them all side by side to save space and not impact nature as much.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
266	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
267	This sounds like a good option. This is a beautiful area and we shouldn't spoil it.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
268	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
269	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
270	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
271	All others on this page should consider the neighborhood's views and balance them with costs	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
272	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

	Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	
273	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
274	yes!	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
275	ok	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
276	Ok	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
277	Yep.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
278	Please include bicycle access and safety when finalizing your plans.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
279	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
280	Good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
281	I think the neighborhoods deserve this. Mitigate the impact of such a big road so nearby	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
282	Wider planting strips = excellent. But if the existing canopy of trees remains, then how will you plant anything but grass? perhaps evergreen shrubs in spaces...	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 AM
283	This sounds good but doesn't seem to benefit the greatest number of people.	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
284	OK, makes sense	Sep 26, 2012 11:18 AM
285	very good idea	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
286	Great.	Sep 25, 2012 9:51 AM
287	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:52 AM
288	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 AM
289	This is a great idea ... is there really room for it? If you move East Lake Washington Blvd north to provide the buffer, then it seems to me you are going to lose most of the park / paths / open space ... I'm sorry but the cute drawings in the design are not to scale and they have 50 yards in the drawing where there is about 2 feet of space in real life ...	Sep 24, 2012 11:15 PM
290	Sounds good.	Sep 24, 2012 9:19 PM
291	Fine idea.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
292	Integrating the arboretum with the lid would be a good thing for the park.	Sep 24, 2012 6:07 PM
293	This is a great idea.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side		
294	Increase max speed bumps on Lake Washington Blvd 10 mph.	Sep 24, 2012 12:06 PM
295	Provide for traffic control in order to enter Lake Washington Blvd. from Boyer Ave. E.	Sep 23, 2012 6:42 PM
296	yes	Sep 23, 2012 2:41 PM
297	This is critical. ELW Blvd is a treasure and the drive through the Arboretum is a delight. Please take care to buffer the neighbors and extend the park-like beauty. Improve the blue-green capacity of this area by getting rid of the bridges to nowhere and make it more pedestrian friendly.	Sep 23, 2012 8:21 AM
298	Design must take into account bicyclists heading north along Lake Washington Boulevard and their connections to the Montlake lid.	Sep 22, 2012 4:40 PM
299	Keeping 520 20 feet above the water has created an un-natural bank on the north side of East Lake Washington Blvd.	Sep 22, 2012 12:30 PM
300	less important. those homes have had 520 as it is for generations.	Sep 22, 2012 10:07 AM
301	Yes	Sep 22, 2012 2:42 AM
302	Agreed.	Sep 21, 2012 3:42 PM
303	The design preference option seems to make the most out of the existing space to accomplish the design goals.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
304	And in so doing will create a huge bottleneck where people attempt to drive through the alleys south of East Lake Wash Blvd.	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
305	Explore sound mitigation	Sep 20, 2012 10:36 AM
306	I definitely favor a buffer for the houses along the Boulevard. Without the buffer, I'm afraid the owners would gradually reduce their upkeep efforts on those houses.	Sep 19, 2012 9:26 PM
307	Need to prevent westbound off-ramp traffic from turning left at 24th and cutting through neighborhood, to bypass interchanges at Montlake Blvd -- but also need to maintain local access via 24th south of E Lk WA Blvd.	Sep 19, 2012 1:41 PM
308	Where is the plan for getting bicycles down to Lake Washington Blvd? This is the Lake Washington Loop after all. This needs to have separated facilities for bikes. Worry about buffers after you have that figured out.	Sep 19, 2012 12:30 PM
309	I am happy to see that the original vision for Lake Washington Blvd is being preserved, with additonal plantings.	Sep 18, 2012 4:13 PM
310	Essential to lower impact of increased Lk.Washington Blvd. traffic through the neighborhood.	Sep 18, 2012 12:20 PM
311	Very important.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side		
312	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM
313	To avoid disruption to East lake Washington Blvd., the existing retaining wall should remain to act as a temporary retaining wall while the new wall is built.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM
314	Support	Sep 17, 2012 6:14 AM
315	The neighbors who live on this Boulevard need to be protected and the proposed design is good, but it should be looked at by noise experts with the Community involved in any planning to reduce SR 520 noise and increased traffic on the Boulevard.	Sep 16, 2012 4:29 PM
316	Yes, maintain the look and feel of Olmstead design of Lake Washington Boulevard.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
317	yes	Sep 16, 2012 9:17 AM
318	good	Sep 16, 2012 7:25 AM
319	I support this.	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
320	seems to be the best idea	Sep 15, 2012 9:26 PM
321	Please prioritize bicycle and pedestrian access and preservation of green space in all these areas.	Sep 15, 2012 8:37 PM
322	For all of these areas, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle mobility and preservation of green space.	Sep 15, 2012 8:11 PM
323	Like.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
324	Need more lanes for traffic, particularly since the design is eliminating the on-ramp eastbound from the Arboretum	Sep 15, 2012 2:56 PM
325	Sure.	Sep 15, 2012 12:59 PM
326	Like it or not, the Arboretum is a MAJOR Arterial and IT SHOULD BE. Take what ever land you need to enhance the free flow of motor vehicles through the area and physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. Lots of BIG trees. Take this opportunity to start the eventual physical separation of bikes people and motor vehicles that needs to extend all the way south through the Arboretum along Lake Washington Blvd along its entire length - all the way south to the Mt. Baker neighborhood	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
327	All that traffic and acres of new concrete can't be mitigated by a few trees	Sep 15, 2012 11:26 AM
328	Buffer hardly necessary, working to slow the traffic with calming measures and direct integration at grade might be a better solution.	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
329	Most important	Sep 15, 2012 1:19 AM
330	We don't need a buffer as much as we need better access to roads for all types	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

	of transpiration.	
331	Waste of taxpayer money.	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
332	Your talking about a non issue here. The occupants of the dozen homes have already tuned out the traffic noise...they knew what they were buying...they love traffic noise it reminds them of the ocean. Stop listening to environmentalist that don't live there. you are alread building lid. Do I have to tell you the lid reduces noise. Improved visual character should be done without increasing annual maintenance, such as leaves falling and blocking catch basins.	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
333	Yes!	Sep 14, 2012 4:36 PM
334	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 3:45 PM
335	See comment on Preference No. 10. Lake Washington Boulevard is a historic boulevard and should keep its current configuration.	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM
336	sure	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
337	That sounds nice.	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
338	Need vastly higher East Lake Washington Boulevard PROPERTY TAXES to pay for all this non essential stuff.	Sep 14, 2012 1:49 PM
339	The buffer would be of importance as I understand with the removal of the SR520 ramps to the east, one could expect more traffic on LWB - this seems like a reasonable and neighborhood friendly approach	Sep 14, 2012 1:41 PM
340	this seems like a win for all involved	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM
341	Connecting the Arboretum is a really great idea. Currently it's somewhat hard to find.	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
342	generally yes, good idea, however it is a road in neighborhood that has a function.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
343	yes please	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
344	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
345	The road currently has many dead ends and random roads, will these also be removed and signage applied to decrease complexity while driving?	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
346	A pedestrian bicycle path is also a buffer	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
347	Yes absolutely if westbound off-ramp remains in the plan for lid, however if that off ramp doesn't exists perhaps it would not be necessary to have a buffer.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
348	The homes will already be buffered from most of traffic with the very expensive lid. If a person doesn't want to live by "any" traffic then move elsewhere. Plants do not provide any sound barrier only visual barrier. I feel that the ajacent	Sep 14, 2012 11:06 AM

Page 5, Q4. Preference 12: East Lake Washington Boulevard: Design the roadway to buffer neighbors from traffic, improve visual character and integrate with Washington Park Arboretum by increasing the planted buffer between the roadway and homes on the south side

neighbors are getting too greedy with their demands and keep asking for more and more and more until someone dares to say "enough, no more!" Do not increase the planted buffer any more.

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
1	This makes sense. This small historic neighborhood is inappropriate for through automobile traffic.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	And explore connecting westbound off-ramp (now labeled 24th Ave off-ramp) to Lake Washington Blvd further east to separate from bicycle and ped traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 PM
3	Yes! Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 PM
4	Another huge opportunity: Need a bike route solution at this major intersection. Sure, the bike route should not go through the neigborhood; but we need a bike lane and separation and maybe a bike signal. Otherwise, bikers will just use the neighborhood anyway.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 PM
5	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 PM
6	Not enough, supported a as a partial solution only	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 PM
7	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 PM
8	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
9	Strongly desire. Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 8:33 PM
10	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
11	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 PM
12	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. See http://www.economist.com/node/21528302 for need to keep bikes and car traffic separated	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
13	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 PM
14	Let's build more bicycle mobility into the model. Pedestrian and bicycle amenities should be fully grade separated from HOV .	Oct 5, 2012 5:15 PM
15	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 4:44 PM
16	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
17	Like this!	Oct 5, 2012 4:39 PM
18	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:08 PM
19	YES!	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
20	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 3:40 PM
21	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
22	Sure!	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
23	Seems like it would be important to ensure pedestrians and bicyclists don't have to cross ramps at crosswalks. Would be better for ensure pedestrian and bicyclist access is completely separated from motor vehicle traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
24	Do not eliminate automobile access to this area.	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
25	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
26	Cyclists shouldn't have their destinations limited, or they'll have to avoid the provided facilities to get where they want to go.	Oct 5, 2012 3:08 PM
27	This is good for people heading south. But there should be a straightforward way to get from the east side of the Montlake Bridge towards Roanoke/downtown without require a big detour.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
28	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
29	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution--ped and bicycle access whould be *entirely* separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
30	this is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
31	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 2:57 PM
32	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
33	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 2:45 PM
34	This seems like a step backwards. Previously north/south cyclists could avoid 520/montlake traffic by taking 24th; now 520 traffic uses both montlake and 24th. Pedestrians and cyclists needing to cross 520 on the lid should not have to wait for a light to stop 520 offramp traffic and cross at a crosswalk. The existing setup is superior, and the redesign does nothing to replace what is lost.	Oct 5, 2012 2:43 PM
35	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 2:35 PM
36	Desparately needed.	Oct 5, 2012 2:31 PM
37	We really need good bike access with this project.	Oct 5, 2012 2:21 PM
38	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
39	i don't understand this preference.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
40	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
41	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
42	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 1:48 PM
43	East Montlake Park should not be accessed via E. Hamlin. No parking stalls should be added to E. Park E. All park parking should be on the east side of the park under the freeway. The parking spaces shown in the models are too few to handle the number of people who will drive to this attractive park for Kayak and other water activities. The overflow parkers will park all along E. Hamlin and E.	Oct 5, 2012 1:45 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	Shelby, as UW Medicine workers and students do now.	
44	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 1:28 PM
45	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
46	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
47	more pedestrian and bike access is better.	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
48	OK	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
49	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 PM
50	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:52 PM
51	Dumb idea! Waste of money!	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
52	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
53	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
54	yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
55	This should be studied. If bike and pedestrian level of service/access can be maintained or improved through this corridor AND cars be allowed, then that is ok. This route should be considered for how much benefit it can provide to ease traffic congestion through the Montlake interchange corridor. However, bike/pedestrian level of service along this route should NOT be decreased.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
56	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
57	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
58	This area is currently a major bike/ped route and should be improved.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
59	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
60	This is not optimal as both directions should be accomodated, I do not see the benefit of only building one direction, essentially half a job.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
61	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
62	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
63	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
64	A lid should be in this area to reconnect the neighborhood and separate peds and bikes from traffic and not via crosswalks	Oct 5, 2012 12:10 PM
65	Safe routes for bikes and pedestrians with sturdy paths are a good idea	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
66	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
67	Develop west side pedestrian ad] and cyclist access along the Montlake Blvd. and Montlake bridge as described above. Single access points tend to be funnels that forces people to use alternate undesignated avenues to get where they want to go. These undesignates avenues are most often unsafe and very dangerous!	Oct 5, 2012 12:01 PM
68	Dreamy! There's so many of them and they should not need to compete with vehicles.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
69	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
70	Yes. I strongly support.	Oct 5, 2012 11:48 AM
71	Again, make sure that bike flow is not impeded. Both figures of your design concept below show bikers walking their bikes in order to not collide with pedestrians. This doesn't seem well thought out.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM
72	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:41 AM
73	Good	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 AM
74	strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 11:32 AM
75	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:31 AM
76	I have no preference.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
77	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and	Oct 5, 2012 11:27 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
78	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
79	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 AM
80	Huh? The park should be accessed from Montlake Blvd, Lk Wash Blvd, 24th Ave E and the shared use trail	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
81	Not important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:13 AM
82	This would be a great asset.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
83	yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
84	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
85	Bicycle access should be different/separated from car traffic	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
86	This is good but bike and pedestrian paths need to be separated from vehicle traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM
87	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. THE CURRENT PROPOSALS ARE NOT SATISFACTORY. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
88	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region.	Oct 5, 2012 10:38 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities .	
89	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:35 AM
90	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
91	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
92	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
93	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
94	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution; pederstrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
95	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
96	If this question is asking if motor vehicles be prohibited from access to East Montlake Park--yes. If it is asking if the 24th avenue crossing will only link peds and bikes to the park (and no other destinations), no.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
97	Oddly worded. Sounds like you are asking if i would limit other types of access.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
	But then it is not clear what access. Key for me is that pedestrian/bike is first priority. Cars second. Let's make it easy to walk. Not requiring people to wait and wade through crazy traffic. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	
98	The MPCC support this Preference so long as pedestrian and bicycle is entirely seperated from vehicles including HOV use.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
99	I strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 AM
100	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 AM
101	Nice!	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
102	This sounds good	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
103	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
104	Not a high priority for me	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
105	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
106	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
107	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
108	What are cars going to do in there anyway?	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
109	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
110	I am not in favor of this, providing parking allows access to all of Seattles residents, not just those in the neighborhood with parking zone stickers and cyclists.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
111	Okay.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
112	Yes. And since there is no longer a need for the connection through 24th, consider moving the 24th on the lid to the east or west to reduce the amount of pavement on the lid and to reduce the impact of the roads in chopping up the lid.	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 AM
113	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
114	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 8:58 AM
115	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
116	Efficiency and safety result from keeping pedestrian, bicycle, and car traffic separated as much as possible. Crosswalks that are shared by all decrease efficiency, safety and usability by all ... creative thinking here would be great.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
117	I don't like the ramps. I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks.	Oct 5, 2012 8:32 AM
118	yes	Oct 5, 2012 8:16 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
119	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
120	Preference 13: I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 7:53 AM
121	I would support this, but prefer a separate facility for bicycles and pedestrians.	Oct 5, 2012 7:43 AM
122	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM
123	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 AM
124	not sure	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
125	OK.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
126	good	Oct 5, 2012 6:45 AM
127	only for pedestrians. bicycles access needs to be separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 AM
128	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 6:06 AM
129	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses,	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
130	yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
131	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
132	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
133	Duh? Of course there should be non-car access.	Oct 5, 2012 5:17 AM
134	Ok	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
135	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 4:56 AM
136	But what about park visitors who can neither walk nor bike? Preserve access to those who need it!	Oct 5, 2012 4:01 AM
137	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 AM
138	This is important given the pedestrians and bicyclists who travel through this area regularly.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 AM
139	OK, sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 12:03 AM
140	Confused here.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 PM
141	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 PM
142	Yes. Cars don't need this corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 PM
143	Pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM

	traffic. I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution.	
144	no. where do people park. not everyone is using transit.	Oct 4, 2012 10:33 PM
145	24th ave. should be only peds and bicycles, no cars. Again cars and buses should not be on a lid.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
146	Support	Oct 4, 2012 10:21 PM
147	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
148	I support this, but do a study to design it well.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
149	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 PM
150	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
151	Support. See #11	Oct 4, 2012 9:41 PM
152	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
153	why not use this a way to cross 520 on bike or foot rather than on 24th Ave E?	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 PM
154	i like.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
155	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
156	It would be better if bicycles had routes that avoided being shunted onto crosswalks with pedestrians. It would seem that additional crossing facilities are needed.	Oct 4, 2012 9:14 PM
157	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: Pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM
158	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution; pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goals should be smooth through passage for these users and reconnecting the neighborhood split by the original bridge construction. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
159	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
160	Yes, bicycles and pedestrians all the way. Whatever happened to light rail	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	compatibility? There is that new station RIGHT there.	
161	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
162	This is good, its a well used connection	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
163	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
164	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks.	Oct 4, 2012 8:05 PM
165	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
166	Good idea. Want to discourage through vehicle traffic on 24th, like it is discouraged today.	Oct 4, 2012 7:45 PM
167	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 7:21 PM
168	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 6:56 PM
169	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
170	Plan must improve safe access for bikes and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 6:11 PM
171	if this is not presently provided the no taxpayer money the cysclists and pedestrians already have a path they can use	Oct 4, 2012 6:02 PM
172	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
173	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
174	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 5:33 PM
175	Bicycle access would be helpful.	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
176	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM

	crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
177	NO bike access	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
178	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
179	I don't like it when it's "only"!!!! Make it all work a bike/pedestrian path only take little bit of space to make it happen.	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
180	yes	Oct 4, 2012 4:57 PM
181	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 4:44 PM
182	It is extremely important that this area is designed for safety. Pedestrians and bicycles should be separated from traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 4:36 PM
183	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 4:27 PM
184	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
185	good	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
186	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 3:27 PM
187	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
188	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
189	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
190	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
191	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
192	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
193	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
194	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
195	Please ensure bikes and pedestrians can cross freeway off ramps and large intersections safely- overpasses perhaps?	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
196	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 2:01 PM
197	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 1:55 PM
198	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes	Oct 4, 2012 1:41 PM

	of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
199	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
200	I can't tell what the plan is here.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
201	YES@	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
202	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
203	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
204	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
205	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 1:03 PM
206	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
207	Preference 13: I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city,	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM

	and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
208	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:40 PM
209	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
210	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
211	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
212	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
213	I only support preference 13 for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be ENTIRELY separated from car and HOV traffic. cycle track, cycle track!	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
214	Support, but this is only a partial solution: Pedestrains and cyclists should be entirely seperated from auto traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
215	good idea, but pedestrian and bike access should be seperate from vehicle traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
216	The primary bike route should be along Montlake Boulevard, not through Shelby and Hamlin. However, I can't see preventing the bikes from making that connection.	Oct 4, 2012 12:06 PM
217	Support.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
218	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
219	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution:	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood with the city, and this is made more difficult if you're shunting pedestrians and cyclists through crosswalks. The crosswalks on the western end of the I-90 Trail are a good example: They make the trail less convenient for both cars and pedestrians/cyclists, and increases danger of an accident for drivers who are not paying attention or pedestrians/cyclists who get impatient.	
220	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM
221	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
222	bicycle and pedestrian access should be everywhere, not just a specific route.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
223	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
224	Great, I will use this improvement.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
225	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
226	Only supported for pedestrians. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be separated from car/HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
227	sure. How wide are the bike paths going to be that run from the Arboretum to Montlake Bridge? They need to be quite wide to accommodate various bike speeds in each direction. Otherwise much of the traffic will continue to use Lake Wash BLVD E (and E LWB).	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
228	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
229	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 AM
230	As long as it is separated from cars. Otherwise, it's not all that helpful.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
231	i would endorse a more robust version including separate facilities for bikes and pedestrians.	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
232	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
233	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution:	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM

	pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
234	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
235	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
236	This is terrible. Bikes will continue to use the sidewalks for direct access to the University from the Montlake neighborhood.	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
237	Pedestrian and bicycle access should be separate from HOV traffic	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 AM
238	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
239	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses,	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 AM

	schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
240	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 7:07 AM
241	I oppose spending money on bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
242	An important option for walk bike commuters and neighbors.	Oct 4, 2012 6:48 AM
243	not sure	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 AM
244	Yes, agree. New mixed-use connection over 520 bridge will cause a big shift in current (mostly bicycle) commuting patterns, causing a big increase in bike traffic that then needs to be efficiently shunted north, south or west through this area.	Oct 4, 2012 2:17 AM
245	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 9:45 PM
246	If there is a park on the lid, then there should be some nominal automobile parking just as there is now through the Arboretum.	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
247	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 3, 2012 9:06 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
248	So, how will people access the Park from cars. Park in front of my house and walk? There's already a bit of this (again near [redacted]), but designs that promote additional parking in the neighborhood should be reexamined.	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM
249	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 4:02 PM
250	I like this idea, but it won't change the pedestrians and bicyclists that are on Montlake Blvd. trying to cross over all the on and off ramps. Serious consideration needs to be given to reconnecting the north side of 520 with the south side of 520 in a way that doesn't put pedestrians and bicyclists at risk.	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
251	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 3:49 PM
252	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over	Oct 3, 2012 3:06 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
	Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	
253	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 1:58 PM
254	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 3, 2012 1:50 PM
255	As opposed to what? This is a very incomplete question.	Oct 3, 2012 1:46 PM
256	Sounds good.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
257	as we have it now, I would hope/expect it to continue or improve	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM
258	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM
259	connect as loop trail from 24th Ave. East to West Montlake Park to Montlake Playfield to Montlake Waterfront Park to East Everett street to Boyer to Delmar to Interlaken and Roanoke Parks to East lake...	Oct 3, 2012 12:04 PM
260	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 3, 2012 11:56 AM
261	Yes, I think that's the best way. Past design concepts showed vehicle traffic accessing the park from the lid, and that creates serious safety hazards for bikes and pedestrians at that intersection with the ramps. Having parking on the south side of the bridge so folks can bring boats to the launch in the park is a great idea! I think that park will be 100 times nicer than it is now - what a fabulous	Oct 3, 2012 10:49 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	addition to the neighborhood!	
262	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
263	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 3, 2012 10:30 AM
264	No strong opinion	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
265	No to "only"	Oct 3, 2012 9:52 AM
266	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
267	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
	Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities. (Central Greenways)	
268	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East	Oct 3, 2012 9:36 AM
269	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:41 AM
270	I support this option.	Oct 3, 2012 8:28 AM
271	I don't understand this one.	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 AM
272	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 8:15 AM
273	I only support this preference for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access should be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalks. The goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood, city, and region. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. This creates the perception that bikes are not equal to other modes of transportation and not convenient for everyday travel. The risk of crashes with cars and potential pedestrian conflicts is also increased by routing cyclists through crosswalks. This area is in the heart of a busy regional junction that connects to downtown, the University of Washington, hospitals, businesses, schools, the eastside, the Burke Gilman Trail, and many other important destinations. Perhaps, 25th Ave E. bike traffic could be routed at Miller E. over Lake Washington Blvd so that it merges with Arboretum trail, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps using separated facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM
274	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 3, 2012 7:40 AM
275	Bicycle and pedestrian access S/B every place that other traffic is allowed.	Oct 3, 2012 7:11 AM
276	That would be great also. Cars shouldn't have access to everything. Destroy the existing parking area there.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
277	Great! We need more bike access in this area.	Oct 2, 2012 8:58 PM
278	See comments Preference 9	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
279	yes	Oct 2, 2012 8:26 PM
280	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 2, 2012 6:16 PM
281	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 2, 2012 4:23 PM
282	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
283	Strongly agree.	Oct 2, 2012 3:16 PM
284	Include separated bicycle facilities along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 2, 2012 11:48 AM
285	I only support for pedestrians and only as a partial solution: pedestrian and bicycle access must have be entirely separated from car and HOV traffic. The lid should allow them to cross SR 520 without having to wait at a crosswalk. Your goal has been to reconnect the neighborhood. It will not be met as long as pedestrians and cyclists have to cross ramps at crosswalks. The risk of accidents is too high. This area is in the heart of a busy neighborhood, at a critical crossing in the middle of a busy city, and is the only connection between a residential area and places of employments, as well as a rail station and a football stadium. The Montlake lid is not in a suburban area like Mercer Island. You must offer foot bridges over all the ramps. - Route 25th Ave E. bike traffic at Miller E. so that it merges with Arboretum trail traffic, crosses the lid, and crosses the ramps on bridges. Cyclists and pedestrians must be completely isolated from highway bound or incoming traffic.	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM
286	access from everywhere	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
287	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 2, 2012 10:09 AM
288	I support this.	Oct 2, 2012 10:04 AM
289	And how will older and disabled people get to the park if there's no vehicle access at all?	Oct 2, 2012 9:44 AM
290	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 2, 2012 9:04 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
291	Residents in the Shelby/Hamlin loop prefer bike/pedestrian only access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. They do not want it connected to the intersection at the off ramp.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 AM
292	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 1, 2012 9:25 PM
293	good idea, but the picture isn't nearly as useful as might be a rotating 3D view (obviously!)	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
294	Yes!! Separate facilities for bikes/peds are safest.	Oct 1, 2012 4:08 PM
295	don't understand but support bicycle use	Oct 1, 2012 2:36 PM
296	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Oct 1, 2012 2:24 PM
297	Very important. This corridor gets used all the time as provides access to Foster island and Arboretum.	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
298	Yes, design good connections along 24th Ave across 520 and between the 520 trail, a trail on the Portage Bay bridge, and the University area.	Oct 1, 2012 12:44 PM
299	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Oct 1, 2012 10:21 AM
300	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 30, 2012 7:48 PM
301	In favor	Sep 30, 2012 4:57 PM
302	No	Sep 30, 2012 3:19 PM
303	Intersection at 24th Ave E and SR520 must be bicycle and pedestrian friendly, and must allow access to the Montlake Bridge and points north of the canal. Bicyclists currently funnel through the Montlake neighborhood onto 24th Ave E to reach the Montlake Bridge. Unless a safe, efficient alternative is provided for bicyclists from the Montlake neighborhood and the Arboretum to reach the Montlake Bridge, passage must be provided from E Montake Park to the Montlake Bridge. Well, now that I re-read the question, I sense that feedback is requested regarding whether CARS should have access to the park. Being 24th Ave E at SR520 will be a major transportation hub, it seems there should not be car access to the park, for many good reasons.	Sep 30, 2012 10:31 AM
304	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 30, 2012 7:26 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
305	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 30, 2012 3:42 AM
306	no add'l comments	Sep 29, 2012 11:41 PM
307	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM
308	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 29, 2012 7:37 PM
309	I'm afraid I just don't understand this.	Sep 29, 2012 4:30 PM
310	This is a great idea and will bring plenty of people into the park/Arboretum	Sep 29, 2012 1:41 PM
311	This is a necessity.	Sep 29, 2012 1:36 PM
312	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 29, 2012 1:19 PM
313	If you are suggesting removing car access to the park, I think you are in for a battle. It would be great from my view. Limit pkg in the neighborhood to zone passes an still a few spaces for park access.	Sep 29, 2012 6:58 AM
314	Eliminate vehicle traffic to enhance bike & pedestrian safety.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
315	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
316	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520	Sep 28, 2012 9:49 PM
317	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 PM
318	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 8:15 PM
319	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 7:26 PM
320	agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:52 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
321	YES!	Sep 28, 2012 5:11 PM
322	Yes. Do this.	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
323	strongly prefer!!	Sep 28, 2012 2:23 PM
324	Yes, but make sure that bicycle access is bidirectional	Sep 28, 2012 2:14 PM
325	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 12:27 PM
326	yes	Sep 28, 2012 12:12 PM
327	I support this. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 11:43 AM
328	Uh, why?	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
329	That would be great.	Sep 28, 2012 10:50 AM
330	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 10:19 AM
331	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 9:55 AM
332	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM
333	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
334	Yes, some way of connecting bike paths (and pedestrian) onto the bridge from all directions and hopefully keeping them well separated from vehicular traffic so as to not slow down either.	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 AM
335	Great. this will speed flow of traffic in area. Intergrating this with changes to bike access to the Montlake Bridge would also help	Sep 28, 2012 6:24 AM
336	Yes, please	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 PM
337	As with current access only to MOHAI, keeps car out of Hamlin/Shelby neighborhood.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
338	Great idea.	Sep 27, 2012 10:20 PM
339	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
340	yes	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 PM
341	min 14 feet wide	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 PM
342	Limiting access doesn't seem wise in the long run.	Sep 27, 2012 9:22 PM
343	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:05 PM
344	Need to understand better, think this sounds good.	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM
345	I love this idea.	Sep 27, 2012 7:40 PM
346	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:04 PM
347	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
348	Sweet!	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
349	Excellent idea.	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
350	3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. 5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 4:58 PM
351	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 4:55 PM
352	YES and ideally include separated bi-directional bicycle facilities along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 4:52 PM
353	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
354	No, still need a much better way to cross the busy street. Currently nothing and a lot of cycling traffic crosses here.	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
355	Yes, this will be necessary for the high level of bike and pedestrian traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
356	Agree. Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the	Sep 27, 2012 3:58 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
	Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	
357	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
358	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 3:41 PM
359	There must be bicycle and pedestrian access.	Sep 27, 2012 2:57 PM
360	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 2:49 PM
361	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
362	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:22 PM
363	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM
364	Yes, provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520	Sep 27, 2012 2:15 PM
365	It is important for cyclists and pedestrians to be able to go North/South on 24th Ave E.	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
366	No, open it up as much as possible.	Sep 27, 2012 1:57 PM
367	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 1:48 PM
368	My preference....commute from Redmond to Volunteer Park area .... this is the best alternative for me.	Sep 27, 2012 1:46 PM
369	Yes please!	Sep 27, 2012 1:28 PM
370	excellent	Sep 27, 2012 1:23 PM
371	Moderate priority.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
372	4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 1:08 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
373	This is not only a requirement for safety and efficiency of bikes and peds, but will also help cut down on potential auto backups.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
374	Why wouldn't this be done?	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
375	Would it be possible to create a dedicated bike trail separate from ped traffic? There seems to be a lot of space here, and if a buffer is going to be created on the other side of the street for the exclusive benefit of the owners of the large homes, it seems like we could get a bike path next to the sidewalk.	Sep 27, 2012 12:43 PM
376	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
377	if this describes the alternative i suggested in Pref 11, then i think this will be better.	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
378	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 PM
379	yes	Sep 27, 2012 12:20 PM
380	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
381	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
382	I support this	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
383	Yes - this should be high priority	Sep 27, 2012 12:01 PM
384	YES	Sep 27, 2012 11:51 AM
385	?	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
386	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
387	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
388	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:35 AM
389	"only"? That would be the only route? Or...that would be the only ped-designated route? That area is easily reached by bike and foot now--not sure why a special path would be needed(?).	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
390	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
391	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:27 AM
392	Sounds good.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
393	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:18 AM
394	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
395	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:17 AM
396	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM
397	Yes! I am a frequent bike commuter and also ride recreationally. I think that the lack of a bike path across 520 is pretty limiting. I live in Bothell and it would be VERY nice to have a lake crossing via bike that is closer than I-90! I feel strongly that adding bicycle and pedestrian lanes is a CRITICAL aspect of any new road work as it will provide better transportation and health opportunities for years to come.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
398	Not sure if restricting vehicle access is necessary, but if this will improve traffic flow then this is a good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
399	yes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
400	need not be bike/ped only in my opinion.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
401	Not important	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
402	This would be fine	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
403	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
404	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
405	Agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
406	Bike access must be contonuous in both directions!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
407	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	
408	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
409	I support the proposal.	Sep 27, 2012 10:39 AM
410	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 10:38 AM
411	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
412	please	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
413	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
414	not sure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
415	Priority!	Sep 27, 2012 10:26 AM
416	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 10:25 AM
417	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
418	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
419	Sounds like a good idea. This connection will help walkers and cyclists connect to interlakken	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
420	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
421	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
422	All others on this page should consider the neighborhood's views and balance them with costs	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
423	4th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
424	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East

	access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	
425	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
426	and bicycle access	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
427	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
428	Ok	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
429	Yep.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
430	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
431	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
432	YES!	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
433	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
434	Please include a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail as part of the Portage Bay Bridge design. It's only a half-mile connection, and if built would connect the Eastside of Lake Washington to North Capitol Hill in Seattle by a completely separated trail that is safe, convenient, and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities to ride and walk on.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
435	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
436	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
437	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
438	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
439	yes,	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
440	Yes please	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
441	YES, a MUST DO in my mind	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
442	Yes yes yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
443	Cyclists will avoid streets with traffic lights, or run them when they see the inefficiency of the car centered system. It must be made so that you would bring your 5 year old daughter on her bike. If not, then it is obstructionist and anti neighborhood. Keep the bike path far away from roads: Cyclists are tired of listening to and fearing cars.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 AM
444	As long as pedestrian and bicycle access is provided I don't feel like we need to prevent access for others.	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
445	OK	Sep 26, 2012 11:18 AM
446	good idea	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
447	Does that mean close the access to cars? I think that would be great. The cars can park on the road. The neighbors should like that since it creates their own private little park. Limit parking. Bikers will love this option.	Sep 25, 2012 9:51 AM
448	I'm in favor of Preference 13	Sep 25, 2012 9:25 AM
449	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:52 AM
450	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 AM
451	This is silly, lets build a nice park and block it off from the neighborhood right next to it ... I can tell somebody is living in the Hamlin neighborhood and mad about the bike rolling through there ... and a.) the bikes are not that big a problem and b.) building a park and blocking it off from the neighborhood next to it is not a win for the people who live in the neighborhood. As I understand this item it is a bad idea.	Sep 24, 2012 11:15 PM
452	Don't know.	Sep 24, 2012 9:19 PM
453	Unfortunately I cannot comment on this, as there is no way to reference the impact on 24th Ave E from the materials provided.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
454	Not sure what this implies.	Sep 24, 2012 6:07 PM
455	I support this.	Sep 24, 2012 5:52 PM
456	24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520	Sep 24, 2012 1:11 PM
457	Yes please.	Sep 24, 2012 12:57 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
458	My inclination would be to be careful on this one - doing this would mean that the only way out of that little neighborhood by car would involve crossing Montlake, which can be a mess.	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
459	This option would choke off a very important bicycle connection through the city for almost no reason at all. I strongly oppose it.	Sep 24, 2012 12:44 PM
460	Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 24, 2012 12:18 PM
461	As a cyclist, I would like to be able to access the park from the east-west shared multi-use trail.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM
462	yes	Sep 23, 2012 2:41 PM
463	Yes.	Sep 22, 2012 4:40 PM
464	Access to East Montlake Park should come from Hamlin. and not 24th. The transit lanes at the lid create a conflict between bikers and walkers.	Sep 22, 2012 12:30 PM
465	there should be access from hamlin and the north	Sep 22, 2012 10:07 AM
466	No	Sep 22, 2012 2:42 AM
467	There should be some parking access to the lidded park area overall. Pedestrian and bicycle access to internal areas of the park should be sufficient.	Sep 21, 2012 3:42 PM
468	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
469	Fine, if people can get there from Capitol Hill, like by the Portage Bay bridge.	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
470	Absolutely	Sep 20, 2012 10:36 AM
471	Do you mean disallow car access from 24th? That's probably good. However, the only public parking facility I see anywhere in the vicinity is the one by the maintenance facility. The design of the lid seems focused on pass-through of motorized vehicles. Will parking be an issue with the mobility hub concept?	Sep 19, 2012 9:26 PM
472	Desireable.	Sep 18, 2012 12:20 PM
473	Makes sense. It is certainly needed.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM
474	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM
475	Agreed. The pedestrian trail under 520 that connects to the Arboretum should be expanded to include a connection to 26th Ave East at East Miller. This would allow pedestrians and bikers who travel North and South to avoid the intersection at 24th and East Lake Washington Blvd. This would take pedestrians and bikers out of the conflict with those who exit 520 at 24th and the buses that enter/exit 520 at 24th.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
476	Seems reasonable but need more info	Sep 17, 2012 6:14 AM
477	No problem with this preference and urge it not be changed to allow autos.	Sep 16, 2012 4:29 PM
478	Bikes and pedestrians need access from SR520 too.	Sep 16, 2012 1:19 PM
479	Approve	Sep 16, 2012 10:02 AM
480	Yes. Cars and Parking will be a huge issue for this park. This seems like a big park with no parking. But definately no car access to the park from 24th.	Sep 16, 2012 9:17 AM
481	This design turns 24th into a freeway access ramp. The existing Lake Washington bike route is severly harmed by this influx of traffic and no solution has been proposed by WSDOT.. More attention is needed for neighborhood bike and pedestrian connectivity!	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
482	Please prioritize bicycle and pedestrian access and preservation of green space in all these areas.	Sep 15, 2012 8:37 PM
483	For all of these areas, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle mobility and preservation of green space.	Sep 15, 2012 8:11 PM
484	Like.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
485	Yes, this is a smal lcorridor that could benefit from being limited to only bikes and peds.	Sep 15, 2012 12:59 PM
486	I'm confused here. When ever you say 'only to <somewhere>' THEN where do they go? You dump cyclists into an area and then they are right back in with the motor vehicle traffic? BAD idea. Take what ever land you need to enhance the free flow of motor vehicles through the area and physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. Lots of BIG trees.	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
487	This does need to happen.	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
488	no opinion	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
489	No. There should be maximum access for bikes. They ARE the cleaner alternative. We should encourage them and discourage auto traffic.	Sep 14, 2012 4:36 PM
490	Good idea	Sep 14, 2012 3:45 PM
491	This is doable only if a roadway is supplied for those with handicapped stickers. All parks need to be open to the elderly and others who have difficulty walking. A new park or recreation area with parking space and access by vehicle puts those people in the position of Aesop's fable about the fox having to drink from a tall decked jog!.	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM
492	?	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
493	I don't quite understand what's happening here, or what the alternative is.	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
494	Do NOT need	Sep 14, 2012 1:49 PM

Page 5, Q5. Preference 13: 24th Avenue East: Provide bicycle and pedestrian access only to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East		
495	there should be bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the lid, not exclusively to the east	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM
496	I support	Sep 14, 2012 1:21 PM
497	Disagree entirely! The park needs to be accessible to cars. This area is frequently used as a boat launch area for kayaks and canoes!	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
498	Not sure on this, no real prefference.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
499	yes please	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
500	Do not know	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
501	nice homeowner bonus for a couple of dozen people	Sep 14, 2012 12:00 PM
502	Possibly.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
503	no opinion here	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
504	YES!	Sep 14, 2012 11:58 AM
505	This is appropriate.	Sep 14, 2012 11:06 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area		
1	This is a new idea to me. I like it! I guess the stormwater will be mostly clean (road oil filtered out?).	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 PM
2	Yes, I think this is a good idea. Would this be used with stormwater from the highway or nearby roads? I think it would be a great way to help clean the water before it enters the Lake.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 PM
3	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
4	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 PM
5	That sounds like a good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 PM
6	could be scaled back with scaled back construction	Oct 5, 2012 4:08 PM
7	Yes!	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
8	If this would help with drainage, yes, seems reasonable.	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
9	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
10	nice	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
11	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
12	Seems OK, but if there is a big pond, there needs to be protection from a child falling in. And, odors must NOT be a problem for residents.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
13	this is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
14	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
15	Good plan.	Oct 5, 2012 2:31 PM
16	ok.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
17	Yes, I support a wetland facility.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
18	I row on Lake Union and Lake Washington. I strongly support a stormwater facility and improved water quality of lake water.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
19	OK	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
20	OK	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
21	There is enough wetland in the area now; why add more at who-knows-what-cost? It does nothing to enhance the safety and access for bridge users in autos.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
22	No comment.	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
23	yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

24	Only as necessary/beneficial for permitting.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
25	This is key to local wildlife. Providing shelter is to our benefit	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
26	Absolutely	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
27	No, this is not the highest use per person for cost. This is a high traffic area with many high end properties, making a proper transition that benefits students, home owners, and commuters serves more widespread interests. This is too narrow a scope.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
28	No preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
29	Sure	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
30	I would like to see what is being proposed in detail. Anything in East Montlake Park and shoreline should honor the wetland and enhance the natural area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:10 PM
31	Positive for environment - what will impact be during construction?	Oct 5, 2012 12:09 PM
32	Any stormwater facility design should be vetted and approved by the community - make a proposal for review and comment!	Oct 5, 2012 12:01 PM
33	Yay!	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
34	The wetland is pretty and ads character. Preserving and exposing it is a good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
35	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM
36	Necessary for water quality	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 AM
37	As long as this does not effect the overall aesthetics of the area, I have no preference.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
38	This should be a natural area that local residents can access for bird watching, etc. - not a fenced-off collection pond, if possible.	Oct 5, 2012 11:27 AM
39	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
40	Not important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:13 AM
41	sure	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
42	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
43	no opinion on this	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM
44	I support a below ground facility.	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM
45	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
46	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

	either. good job in that)	
47	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
48	Make the wetland facility look like a natural feature, and consistent with the landscape architecture of the Washington Park Arboretum	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
49	Neutral.	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM
50	The MPCC strongly supports this Preference	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
51	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 AM
52	I support adding more wetland areas.	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 AM
53	Sure.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
54	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
55	Agree.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
56	Does there have to be a facility here?	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
57	That sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
58	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
59	Cool	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
60	Good.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
61	yes	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 AM
62	So long as a treatment process can be maintained so the area isn't polluted further.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
63	sounds reasonable	Oct 5, 2012 8:58 AM
64	Would be great to have wildlife and viewing opportunities in the wetland facility also.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
65	Low priority	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
66	Makes sense.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
67	If this passes the EIS, I support it.	Oct 5, 2012 8:32 AM
68	NO comment	Oct 5, 2012 7:53 AM
69	I would support this.	Oct 5, 2012 7:43 AM
70	A great idea!	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

71	yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
72	No. Too expensive.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
73	good	Oct 5, 2012 6:45 AM
74	yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
75	Low priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
76	Ok	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
77	We need to plan how to handle the increase of pollution from vehicles.	Oct 5, 2012 4:01 AM
78	Yes. Bring people to the water.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 PM
79	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
80	I support this preference, as replacing lost wetland area to the construction will be critical for the wildlife and human life in the area.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
81	I support this idea.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
82	Yes. This is critical environment for eagles, salmon, and many other nesting birds that are a unique draw to all Seattle residents and visitors. How many large cities can claim having resident eagles in their urban parks. It's a very special privilege for us, and we need to keep this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:41 PM
83	beyond my knowledge to comment on	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 PM
84	always good.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
85	Hopefully it will be a true wetland with clean water that is not contaminated by poisonous run off. We enjoy the herons and do not want them to die from drinking polluted run off.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
86	An attractive idea, I've not had the time to look at the costs of this. It seems this can be done at a later time considering that other wetland facilities are being built elsewhere locally.	Oct 4, 2012 9:14 PM
87	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM
88	Seems good.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
89	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
90	Goodbye MOHAI, hello wetland.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
91	What a great idea!	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
92	sounds like a boondoggle.	Oct 4, 2012 8:16 PM
93	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

	acceptable.	
94	This facility is one approach to treating the water sluicing off the highway passing through the area. I surely hope it is effective and that the adjoining wetland does not suffer.	Oct 4, 2012 7:37 PM
95	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
96	Yes, mitigation should be in the surrounding area not in other parts of the city/county.	Oct 4, 2012 6:34 PM
97	if this is not a requirment- no taxpayer money -only the requiremd wetland	Oct 4, 2012 6:02 PM
98	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
99	N/a	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
100	No comment.	Oct 4, 2012 4:36 PM
101	Sounds great	Oct 4, 2012 4:00 PM
102	omit if costly	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
103	Seems good.	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
104	What about parking for access to the arboretum via paddled boat? Presently the MOHAI parking lot is an excellent and popular location for matching launching canoes and kayaks.	Oct 4, 2012 2:49 PM
105	Absolutely support this. Constructed wetlands should be an integral part of any water management system.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
106	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
107	no	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
108	Preference 14: No comment.	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
109	Route the ventilation shafts away from the homes to the stormwater area. Shafts would likely result in concentrated, dangerous pollutants. Were these on the original EIS?	Oct 4, 2012 12:48 PM
110	We support this.	Oct 4, 2012 12:25 PM
111	I strongly support this.	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
112	Concur!	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
113	If necessary, yes.	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
114	Generally support.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
115	This is a good idea.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

116	Don't waste time and money on this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
117	Sounds good.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
118	nice, sure.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
119	not a priority	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
120	Yes.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 AM
121	Very important and will be a draw for people and birds, animals, who now inhabit the MOHAI-Foster Island corridor, the last biggest wetland in Seattle (the MOHAI sign entrance to the floating path says so!).	Oct 4, 2012 10:35 AM
122	Great!	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
123	No comment	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 AM
124	I have no preference on this.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
125	No comment.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 AM
126	needed and strongly supported - everyone and everything is going to be affected and we have such phenomenal biodiversity in this area it would be sad to not have this available	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 AM
127	Strongly in favor, seems like this should be part of any baseline proposal.	Oct 4, 2012 2:17 AM
128	Include this option.	Oct 3, 2012 9:29 PM
129	This should be a non-discretionary given in the design-build proposal.	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
130	OK, but basically no opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM
131	Great	Oct 3, 2012 8:34 PM
132	If it's done right, and doesn't turn into an eyesore or neglected area.	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
133	Agree	Oct 3, 2012 3:41 PM
134	A climbing tower (e.g. similar to the one at Marymoor Park in Redmond) on the edge of this wetland space looking out on the bay would offer stunning views and allow additional recreational activities while consuming a very modest footprint.	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
135	As long as it does not remove net human-accessible land from the park area. Also, please do NOT lessen existing parking space count -- that just reduces accessibility, especially for families.	Oct 3, 2012 1:46 PM
136	Sounds good.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
137	yes!!	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

138	no comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM
139	which blends/enhanceso existing habitat	Oct 3, 2012 12:04 PM
140	Oh, I think that would be fascinating! Just no chain-link fences - they are so ugly and unwelcoming.	Oct 3, 2012 10:49 AM
141	No strong opinion	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
142	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
143	The 40 foot wall is a horrible idea.	Oct 3, 2012 9:05 AM
144	Yes.	Oct 3, 2012 8:41 AM
145	There are no other options, as I understand it. Every effort should be made to minimize the impact of this facility on the park. A half baked pit surrounded by cyclone fences would be a disaster	Oct 3, 2012 8:28 AM
146	Sounds good to me.	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 AM
147	Yes, a wetland facility to accommodate the water fowl's whose habitat will be impacted.	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM
148	No, don't waste the resourses when the stormwater will run it's natural course to the water.	Oct 3, 2012 7:11 AM
149	No, keep industrial and municipal utility infrastructure off parks. If you care about the wetlands, keep the as parks. Put those facilities in already-developed areas of the city. There certainly is no major run-off drainage that goes through East Montlake Park. Storm water will have to be moved there by a pipeline or something like that. Take it somewhere else, expropriate property if you have to. Respect the city's green spaces.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 PM
150	this is currently a very nice area. the stormwater facility should not degrade the current peaceful and natural feeling of the park	Oct 2, 2012 10:50 PM
151	I defer to experienced civil engineers and planners. Would probably be good to have.	Oct 2, 2012 8:58 PM
152	See comments Preference 9	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
153	No opinion.	Oct 2, 2012 3:16 PM
154	No comment.	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM
155	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
156	Sounds good.	Oct 2, 2012 10:09 AM
157	OK	Oct 2, 2012 9:44 AM
158	no comment.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

159	agree	Oct 1, 2012 8:02 PM
160	Is that going to breed a trillion disease carrying mosquitoes?	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
161	sounds good	Oct 1, 2012 2:24 PM
162	Important.	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
163	As long as it is not visually obtrusive.	Sep 30, 2012 3:19 PM
164	needed.	Sep 29, 2012 11:41 PM
165	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM
166	If environmental engineers recommend this	Sep 29, 2012 9:16 PM
167	Sure.	Sep 29, 2012 4:30 PM
168	This is more important than any image improvement.	Sep 29, 2012 1:36 PM
169	This is a design question. It should blend with nature as best as possible.	Sep 29, 2012 6:58 AM
170	Maintain a net positive wetland footprint.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
171	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
172	Sounds like a good idea.	Sep 28, 2012 4:17 PM
173	Yes. More wetlands.	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
174	If it's simlar to the one in Madison Valley, that would be really nice.	Sep 28, 2012 2:27 PM
175	uh, OK sounds good	Sep 28, 2012 2:23 PM
176	Sure	Sep 28, 2012 2:02 PM
177	yes - like! Keep our lake cleaner & marshland habitat for crittters	Sep 28, 2012 12:12 PM
178	If it's cheap. Extending public shoreline is good.	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
179	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
180	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM
181	Neutral	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
182	This would be a good amenity and maintain/ replace some of the impacts from new/old construction.	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 AM
183	Yes, we need more wetlands	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 PM
184	Needed facility. Landscape and site well to integrate with park, but put on side to maximize continuous greenspace on lid.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

185	Sure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
186	Low on my priority list but if the money is there this could be a good thing to maintain the natural wetlands that are there now	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM
187	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
188	Makes sense	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
189	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 4:55 PM
190	yers	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
191	Not important.	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
192	Yes -- priority should be water quality and habitat.	Sep 27, 2012 3:58 PM
193	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
194	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM
195	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 1:57 PM
196	I imagine this could result in a higher mosquito population. This should be considered before any such stagnant water facility is produced	Sep 27, 2012 1:48 PM
197	No opinion.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
198	Cool	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
199	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
200	this is an important part of this project	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
201	I support this	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
202	important	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
203	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
204	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:35 AM
205	instead of what? this will filter freeway run-off? seems good.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
206	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:27 AM
207	Sounds and looks great.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
208	Good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
209	no opinion.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
210	Important to maintain environmental balance	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

211	Agree.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
212	We can never have enough wetlands.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 AM
213	I prefer the money to be spent on accessibility of pathways for bicycles and pedestrians for functionality over a wetland facility construction.	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
214	ok	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
215	Most likely need stormwater treatment. Can't have typical city run off going into lake.. looks like a good place for it.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
216	Sounds great!	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
217	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
218	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
219	All others on this page should consider the neighborhood's views and balance them with costs	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
220	ok	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
221	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
222	Yep.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
223	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
224	not sure what this would mean or impact. I agree we need to deal with stormwater run off in a better way. If this helps...that is good.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
225	UW landscape Architecture students already masterminded this one, But I suppose that I'll add that As much as we want to have more evergreen trees in Seattle, We also want lots of relaxing open space. I suggest lots of "wet feet" type evergreens by the freeway and pond, then open wild flower/low shrub to the north. A bog would be ideal but runoff from the road is to alkaline to even attempt it. perhaps if the paths are on burms, then the shrub, swamp part will be low enough to provide vista.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 AM
226	Again, is not doing this even an option? It's a wetland and there will be run-off!	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
227	OK	Sep 26, 2012 11:18 AM
228	not excited about this idea; without this today, not clear on need	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
229	Very technical and seems like a state design decision. Make it look good, be functional, easy to maintain, and inexpensive. A balance job for engineers.	Sep 25, 2012 9:51 AM
230	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:52 AM
231	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area		
232	This sounds like creating a giant mess. The area is either wet land or it is not ... trying to construct something that is going to be wet land during half the year and dead land the other half the year sounds like you are creating an un-covered septic tank. In that area dry land should be well drained and natural wet land should be preserved as well as possible for the beavers and ducks and eagles (who eat the ducklings which makes them kind of hard to like) and other creatures who live there.	Sep 24, 2012 11:15 PM
233	Yes, I think this is important.	Sep 24, 2012 9:19 PM
234	Excellent.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
235	Constructed wetlands are generally good things...not sure anyone cares about this.	Sep 24, 2012 6:07 PM
236	ok	Sep 24, 2012 1:11 PM
237	Great idea.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM
238	Very much in favor of this.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
239	This sounds like a good idea. I kayaked around Foster Island today, and it was striking how many of the bridges around there just dump their water into the lake. We can do so much better, *and* make it something attractive that people will enjoy walking around.	Sep 23, 2012 6:48 PM
240	yes	Sep 23, 2012 2:41 PM
241	How can we retain, not lose, park land in the area?	Sep 22, 2012 1:51 PM
242	It should be a tank and not an open pond with all the use that will occur at this location.	Sep 22, 2012 12:30 PM
243	less important. good wetlands nearby	Sep 22, 2012 10:07 AM
244	Yes	Sep 22, 2012 2:42 AM
245	If this is deemed to be a necessity for the surrounding area by the stormwater engineers, or a preferred alternative to other potential solutions, then it should be pursued.	Sep 21, 2012 3:42 PM
246	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
247	Fine.	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
248	Excellent	Sep 20, 2012 10:36 AM
249	Handling stormwater will be a necessity.	Sep 19, 2012 9:26 PM
250	Desireable	Sep 18, 2012 12:20 PM
251	Seems reasonable. I do not understand the pros and cons and cannot comment.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

252	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM
253	The Park design needs to be coordinated with the CSO project. A pond should be avoided at all costs.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM
254	Support	Sep 17, 2012 6:14 AM
255	Any WSDOT Stormwater ponds should be helped to look as natural as possible with native, appropriate northwest water plants, and public access.	Sep 16, 2012 4:29 PM
256	The structure should be very minimal with plantings around it so little to no visual impact on landscape.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
257	Approve	Sep 16, 2012 10:02 AM
258	Preserve the natural landscape and ecosystem to the best of your ablitily.	Sep 16, 2012 9:17 AM
259	I support this, but bring lid completely across to storm water park to improve connectivity and eliminate 30-foot tall blank wall overshadowing it.	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
260	most definately	Sep 15, 2012 9:26 PM
261	Please prioritize bicycle and pedestrian access and preservation of green space in all these areas.	Sep 15, 2012 8:37 PM
262	For all of these areas, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle mobility and preservation of green space.	Sep 15, 2012 8:11 PM
263	Like.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
264	Why not, is there even a way to get away from doing it?	Sep 15, 2012 12:59 PM
265	Build a dock adjacent to this park in the waterway to the north of SR 520 but south of the Marsh Island trail and the bridges. A small, low profile float that is accessible to car-top, hand carried boats will protect the shoreline from random access which destroys habitat. Make it light transmitting, etc. but put it in and you will save more fish and more habitat in that area. People paddle over from the UW WAC now in canoes and destroy the shoreline getting out for picnics, etc. Give them places to go to.	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
266	Mitigation of stagnation would be nice to hear about.	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
267	Wetland is important to preserve.	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
268	No opinion	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
269	Will this integrated wetland have a chain link fence around it? If yes then no.	Sep 14, 2012 5:37 PM
270	Of course, yes, obviously!	Sep 14, 2012 4:36 PM
271	Yes, because typical detention ponds are usually really ugly.	Sep 14, 2012 3:45 PM
272	The pond needs to look natural much as that at High Point of the Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM

Page 5, Q6. Preference 14: Stormwater facility: Integrate a constructed wetland facility into the existing East Montlake Park and shoreline area

	Housing Authority project. It should have features to attract wildlife, which would indirectly discourage swimming. The ponds at Magnuson Park have bat boxes. An amateur naturalist suggested that a tree or similar structure in the midst of a pond makes a good home for an apiary. Consult with some beekeepers about it. Wild hives don't need tending and do wonders for flowering trees and plants in the park.	
273	interesting	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
274	Wetlands are a very cost-effective way to treat water, and they look nice. I'm in favor.	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
275	Not a big deal to me, but I guess do it if it's good for the environment.	Sep 14, 2012 1:54 PM
276	OK	Sep 14, 2012 1:49 PM
277	agreed	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM
278	There needs to remain some sort of parking at this park, but a stormwater facility is also a good idea.	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
279	yes.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
280	yes please	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
281	Yes, I hope you can make it function.	Sep 14, 2012 12:42 PM
282	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
283	What is wrong with leaving it looking natural, just improving the current facilities and structures such as walking paths?	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
284	sounds good	Sep 14, 2012 12:00 PM
285	If possible, yes.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
286	no opinion here	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
287	This sounds like a great idea!	Sep 14, 2012 11:58 AM
288	Yes.	Sep 14, 2012 11:06 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

1	Hiding the transit ramps by lowering them would make the space a more inviting green space. I support option B.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 PM
3	I support promoting bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 PM
4	Its best if there isn't an inaccessible island park where bad things will rule.	Oct 5, 2012 11:04 PM
5	I would think the lower the better for visual and noise-radiation reasons; I can't recall the downside of option B (and PDF won't load :( ). Now unless the noise is mitigated, I don't think you'll see all these people hanging out in the park as per the rendering! But the walking and bike connectivity is important. And the relationship to the Arboretum helps honor and expand the Olmstead vision. Please consider whether we want bike commuters and fast riders to use this path, or use the street, and design accordingly.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 PM
6	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 PM
7	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 PM
8	I would like to see the lower transit/HOV ramps (Option B) explored further in order to provide more contiguous open space and better pedestrian and bicycle connectivity across the lid in the north-south direction.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 PM
9	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
10	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 5, 2012 8:33 PM
11	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation,	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	
12	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 PM
13	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 PM
14	I prefer whatever will have the least amount of noise for residents. Since noise generally travels up, I would factor that into the decision over what it looks like aestetically.	Oct 5, 2012 6:23 PM
15	I strongly support continuous trail unbroken by intersection with motor vehicle traffic. Interactions with traffic here are ambiguous and unsafe. This is a major bike corridor as part of the Lake Washington Loop.	Oct 5, 2012 6:23 PM
16	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 6:08 PM
17	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 PM
18	I strongly support working w the City of Seattle to enhance bicycle mobility.	Oct 5, 2012 5:15 PM
19	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 4:44 PM
20	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
21	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea. Once again the buses get everything and the cars nothing yet the cars pay for the work with gas taxes, license fees and tolls. This is highway robbery.	Oct 5, 2012 4:08 PM
22	Yes, thank you for doing as much as you can to mitigate the local/neighborhood impact of this project.	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
23	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 3:40 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

24	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM
25	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
26	Consider providing a trail over all lanes of traffic. Underpasses tend to be viewed as unsafe and less desireable.	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
27	Come up with increased funding to support such a request.	Oct 5, 2012 3:21 PM
28	Yes, but with the focus still on noise mitigation for neighborhood. Prefer Option B.	Oct 5, 2012 3:17 PM
29	The priority should be moving vehicles, bicycles, and people efficiently and safely, not improving or maintianing the home values for a small minority.	Oct 5, 2012 3:08 PM
30	Please focus on connectivity first.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
31	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
32	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
33	this is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
34	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 2:57 PM
35	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
36	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 2:45 PM
37	We need more than to "study options" for north/south connectivity. This area is a bottleneck for north/south travel, and this redesign is taking a functional and heavily used bicycle connection and making it worse. I would expect a project of	Oct 5, 2012 2:43 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	this scope to *improve* connectivity, not plan to study options to avoid degrading it if possible.	
38	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 2:35 PM
39	More bicycle access is needed.	Oct 5, 2012 2:31 PM
40	i support the lowered ramps	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM
41	We really need good bike and transit access with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:21 PM
42	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians bicycles and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
43	good.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
44	I support continuing to work with the City of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
45	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 1:55 PM
46	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 1:48 PM
47	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 1:28 PM
48	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
49	continue to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

50	yes, more pedestrian and bike access is better.	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
51	Why are we only concerned about connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users? Love the idea of adding all of this, but must ensure that "NOTHING IS REDUCED" from it's current state for cars. The whole purpose of rebuilding the 520 is 1) cars, 2) transit, 3) bicycles. I feel like this survey is 3, 2, 1 priority.	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
52	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 PM
53	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 12:52 PM
54	if not too expensive	Oct 5, 2012 12:45 PM
55	Don't waste money on access and extra amenities for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. This is a bridge project for auto use and that's where the money should be spent.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
56	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
57	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
58	yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
59	Yes, continue to study potential improvements to keep all users moving through this area N-S-E-W. Preference is to provide 1) least congestion for car traffic while 2) providing some improvement to bikes and transit users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
60	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are unsatisfactory and need some improvement.	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
61	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 PM
62	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
63	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	
64	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
65	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
66	Please continue working with the City of Seattle to determine a better level of connectivity for peds and cyclists. Continue the trail over all lanes of traffic, trail underpass not pleasant - separate trails from roadways to allow for more walking and biking.	Oct 5, 2012 12:10 PM
67	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
68	Absolutely, see above comments regarding pedestrian and bicycle led access west of Montlake Blvd. and the Montlake Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:01 PM
69	Good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
70	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals need improvement in this regard.	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
71	Again, make sure that bike flow is not impeded. Both figures of your design concept below show bikers walking their bikes in order to not collide with pedestrians. This doesn't seem well thought out.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM
72	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 11:41 AM
73	Absolutely. The "Option A" lid is an oversized, out of scale impostion on the shoreline.	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 AM
74	strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 11:32 AM
75	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory	Oct 5, 2012 11:31 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

76	It is important that any changes to this area mitigate or improve the overall aesthetics of the area. This should be done by integrating green space, parks and multi-purpose fields and reserves.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
77	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 11:27 AM
78	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
79	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 AM
80	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
81	Moderate value.	Oct 5, 2012 11:13 AM
82	This would be very helpful.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
83	yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
84	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
85	yes: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E.	Oct 5, 2012 10:54 AM
86	Current proposals fall short	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
87	I support this.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM
88	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to	Oct 5, 2012 10:39 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	choose choose walking and cycling.	
89	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 10:38 AM
90	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 10:35 AM
91	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
92	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
93	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
94	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
95	This is all nice that you are doing fjor the East side of Montlake blvd but you should fix the West side from this project too.	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
96	I support continuing to wori with the City of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclings and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
97	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
98	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
99	Not ready for an either/or choice. More design refinement is necessary here generally.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
100	Absolutely. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don’t know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each “preference”. I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the	Oct 5, 2012 10:09 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	
101	The MPCC strongly supports this Preference.	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 AM
102	I strongly oppose this waste of money.	Oct 5, 2012 9:49 AM
103	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 AM
104	DO NOT JUST STUDY! MAKE IT WORK for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. We pay taxes too!	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
105	This needs more work to effectively enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
106	Agree, prefer Option B	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
107	Yes. Maximize for transit, then integrate green space.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
108	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
109	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
110	I couldn't load the pdf for some reason- if the high transit ramps have some good way for wheelchair users and people with bicycles to get up there, I'm fine with them.	Oct 5, 2012 9:28 AM
111	I don't like any of the proposals, and I fear that we're being asked to accept a mediocre option from a list of mediocre options. Back to the drawing board.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
112	Sure.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
113	Whatever is best for cyclists and pedestrians.	Oct 5, 2012 9:19 AM
114	Consider lower, only if it is going to increase the total amount of non-pavement surface on the lid.	Oct 5, 2012 9:14 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

115	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
116	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 8:58 AM
117	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
118	The promised lid is essential. See Mercer Island lid over I-90 - similar lid essential for the expanded 520.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
119	Yes, continue to study this problem to arrive at the best solution. Is it possible to to direct the pedestrians, commuters and cyclists over the car and HOV traffic ... an underpass may discourage use.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
120	Whatever makes the transit faster.	Oct 5, 2012 8:45 AM
121	Transit connections must be lower, at the same elevation as the mainline roads. Raising the transit ramps slows down transit and slows down north-south transportation. These impacts are huge. I ride transit across Mercer Island (with raised transit) and across SR-520 (with lower transit). The SR-520 lower ramp configuration is much preferred, is more efficient, and has much less impact on the neighborhood community. The lower ramps also result in a much more visually appealing configuration when viewed from the surrounding areas.	Oct 5, 2012 8:42 AM
122	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 8:32 AM
123	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
124	Preference 15: I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to	Oct 5, 2012 7:53 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	
125	I would support this.	Oct 5, 2012 7:43 AM
126	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM
127	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 AM
128	best	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
129	If this makes transit more efficient, then that's probably best, but if the high transit option makes waiting for a bus more pleasant, it should be seriously considered.	Oct 5, 2012 7:29 AM
130	Are you seriously considering removing the Montlake flyer stop? This is a huge access point for bus riders from Capitol Hill.	Oct 5, 2012 7:20 AM
131	No.	Oct 5, 2012 7:10 AM
132	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 6:50 AM
133	good	Oct 5, 2012 6:45 AM
134	Continue to work with the city of Seattle to enhance connectivity for pedestrians, bicycles and transit users. Current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 AM
135	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. Pedestrian and bicycle use and access needs to be an equal if not even higher priority objective than motor vehicles.	Oct 5, 2012 6:06 AM
136	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
137	Option B looks better	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
138	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	
139	High priority	Oct 5, 2012 5:22 AM
140	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
141	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 5, 2012 4:56 AM
142	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:53 AM
143	I strongly support strengthening the current proposals for enhancing north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 AM
144	Yes, please come up with something that works and makes the lid actually useful.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 PM
145	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 PM
146	Yes. The more options to cross by other than car the better. I like the connections to and through the arboretum.	Oct 4, 2012 10:56 PM
147	The current proposals are not satisfactory. I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
148	I like the idea of lowered transit ramps, because a lid with traffic is not really a lid. Would rather keep transit on 520 and not bring it up to grade, except for the transit traveling to the north or south. No need for all transit to come up to Montlake Blvd. if continuing to I-5 north or south. Keep east and west bound transit traffic separated from North/South transit traffic. But allow the riders to freely move from under the lid to the top (and this time put in an elevator, so disabled folks have access as well). Why have separate transit exit to Mont. Blvd. at all (in plan B it bisects the lid, making the lid not a lid at all). Keep the transit off ramp coupled with the car traffic to ensure that the lid actually remains a lid.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
149	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
150	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	
151	Please continue to work with the city for a more optimal solution	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 PM
152	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities. Lowered transit ramps would limit visual disruption of trees and other flora of the lid based park.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
153	Prefer option B strongly to keep sightlines/views. The more enjoyable (less noise, less visual garbage, less concrete to work around) will make this a more utilized and valuable space.	Oct 4, 2012 9:41 PM
154	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
155	support	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 PM
156	works for me.	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
157	Lower seems to be less of a visual distraction	Oct 4, 2012 9:24 PM
158	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
159	From the drawings I support Option B. I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 9:16 PM
160	Given the choices, it would be more unpleasant to have to go through underneath, dark, dank, narrow tunnels are not fun. Wide, clear, open, higher views are much more attractive, even though I would have to go up on one side, I get to go down the other. It's not like there aren't any hills in Seattle!	Oct 4, 2012 9:14 PM
161	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable,	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	
162	I would lower if the cost is not too high.	Oct 4, 2012 8:57 PM
163	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well-lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose walking and cycling, and it will keep them safer.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
164	Great - keep views whenever you can.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
165	Option B seems like it would provide the most north south connectivity for the lot and it looks better. Continue with option B.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
166	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
167	I prefer the lower option as it presrves a ped/bike connection without intersections	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
168	Please work to make this a more livable city. We need ways for people to get around Seattle on foot and on bikes. We desperately need safe connecting routes between neighborhoods.	Oct 4, 2012 8:32 PM
169	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
170	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 4, 2012 8:05 PM
171	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
172	transit!	Oct 4, 2012 7:48 PM
173	Lower ramps would give better amenity, and connect the two halves of the lid split by the HOV ramps. They would also give a better lookout eastwards. Finally, the HOV ramps wouldn't need to swerve to the north, they could be straight, which should be better for standing passengers on the ST express	Oct 4, 2012 7:45 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	buses who won't be jolted sidewards.	
174	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 7:21 PM
175	I support the idea of continuing to work with the city to study options which would improve the connectivity and access for all users.	Oct 4, 2012 7:20 PM
176	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 6:56 PM
177	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
178	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 6:34 PM
179	Maximize green space on the lid to make it feel like part of the arboretum and to make it feel connected to the Montlake playfield/communicty center. Make it friendly for the hundreds of bike commuters who will cut across the lid and then through the neighborhood to 25th, i.e., make the Lake Wash Blvd crossing bike-friendly.	Oct 4, 2012 6:23 PM
180	no taxpayer money this is fluff for Seattle- Saettle shoul pay via bonds or their taxes	Oct 4, 2012 6:02 PM
181	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
182	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
183	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 5:33 PM
184	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
185	Support	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
186	bike traffic is incompatible with pedestrian	Oct 4, 2012 5:15 PM
187	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 5:09 PM
188	Yeah it could work. But then would the cable bridge not be chosen?!	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
189	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not	Oct 4, 2012 4:44 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	satisfactory.	
190	The trail underpass is unlikely to be safe.	Oct 4, 2012 4:36 PM
191	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 4, 2012 4:27 PM
192	Option B.	Oct 4, 2012 4:00 PM
193	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
194	avoid if park-like space is costly	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
195	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 4, 2012 3:27 PM
196	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
197	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
198	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
199	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
200	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 3:03 PM
201	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
202	I like.	Oct 4, 2012 2:42 PM
203	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

204	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
205	Strongly support option B. Having to go under freeway ramps is uncomfortable and can be scary. This provides a way to go over them. Not happy about having them go through the park/lid at all, but I'm not sure that there is a better alternative.	Oct 4, 2012 2:21 PM
206	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 1:55 PM
207	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 1:41 PM
208	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. Access and safety need to be paramount, which means simple, wide connections and separated ped and cycle facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
209	Does lowering the ramps mean they'd go under the lid? I can't tell from the drawings what's going on. I don't think I have a strong opinion on this.	Oct 4, 2012 1:33 PM
210	no	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
211	Continue to study options, yes. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
212	A north/south path under the bridge is fine	Oct 4, 2012 1:12 PM
213	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
214	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 1:07 PM
215	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not	Oct 4, 2012 1:03 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	satisfactory.	
216	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
217	Preference 15: I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
218	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:40 PM
219	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
220	We support this if it does not require raising the elevation of the lid. We woud like the emphasis to be on noise reduction and a lid as large as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 12:25 PM
221	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
222	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
223	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
224	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are NOT satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
225	Please, please keep working in good faith with the City of Seattle to provide GREAT (not just 'good') access and connectivity options for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals fall short of this, and need to be improved.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
226	Yes, continue to study and work on it -but also do it! This is an important area for north-south travel as well as east-west -it shoudl be user-friendly to navigate through here on bicycle or foot, and to transfer to bus routes.	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
227	Keep the ramps on the lid. The lowered ramps concept creates lid space that is	Oct 4, 2012 12:06 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	unusable anyway and will just attract on desirable behavior.	
228	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
229	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
230	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
231	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM
232	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
233	Yes, but again, this should be the default design, not an option to study.	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
234	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
235	This a good idea and will make the area very pleasant for me on my bicycle.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
236	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
237	I do not support the current proposals. WSDOT should continue to work with Seattle to enhance connectivity, but the current proposals are inadequate.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
238	I like the lowered ramps. North/South access that does not require crossing on/off ramps should be prioritized. Ramps are almost as much a barrier to park use as the freeway lanes. The renderings below don't show the difference where it will matter most, crossing (or not) the ramps on foot/bike.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
239	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
240	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 AM
241	Current proposals are not really satisfactory to address needs of peds, bikes,	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	and transit. I don't understand why the emphasis in the pics (option a/b) seems to be on aesthetics.	
242	i endorse any improvement along this section	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
243	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
244	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
245	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
246	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
247	Just study options, or study and include in the final plan? It's a good idea, but I worry that a commitment just to study doesn't mean anything.	Oct 4, 2012 11:18 AM
248	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 4, 2012 11:04 AM
249	lower profile in general. This new lake-crossing bridge is a monster, high, and should be lowered everywhere when possible. Noise will be lowered in the process. Connectivity to Montlake school and West Montlake areas is very important - and is part of the Safe Routes to Schools ordinance mandate now that a larger radius of kids will walk to school (a good thing, if safe!)	Oct 4, 2012 10:35 AM
250	See my comments for #9	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
251	Yes, need to enhance connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists	Oct 4, 2012 9:31 AM
252	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

253	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 AM
254	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 4, 2012 7:07 AM
255	You people seem to think that money grows on trees, don't you?	Oct 4, 2012 7:06 AM
256	Most important!	Oct 4, 2012 6:48 AM
257	I like the raised version slightly better although maybe lower would have better sound/ visual effect	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 AM
258	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 3, 2012 9:45 PM
259	This looks good.	Oct 3, 2012 9:29 PM
260	There is no significant difference between Option A and Option B. Require the involvement of a competent parks design architect in the design-build proposal. See 10 above.	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
261	Support: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Oct 3, 2012 9:06 PM
262	Given where I live, I'm in favor of things that extend the lid as much as possible to the east. And I'm opposed to anything that pulls the lid entrance to the west. Lowering the transit/HOV ramps looks good to me, but if it limits the lid in front of my house, I'd be in favor of keeping them up high. My major concern for the entire project is that noise does not increase at my house. I bought the house understanding the current noise levels. Lowering them is good and I like that. The lid should do some of that, but we'll still get a bit of noise from the freeway traffic just east of the lid. The thing that could increase noise for us is the added	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	traffic on the Boulevard. Quiet pavement and slow traffic due to gridlock should work to our advantage on this.	
263	Dont really want a flyover pass neighborhood feel. How about creat and do not just study.	Oct 3, 2012 8:34 PM
264	Definitely.	Oct 3, 2012 8:18 PM
265	yes lower	Oct 3, 2012 6:16 PM
266	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling	Oct 3, 2012 4:02 PM
267	Please consider extending the lid further west where the bulk of the pedestrian traffic now exists to travel north/south. The noise is so loud on the corner of Montlake Blvd and E. Lake Washington Blvd., you can't carry-on a conversation. The noise extends all the way north across 520 to Hamlin St. Why isn't there talk of putting a lid to quell that noise and make it a comfortable place for pedestrians? Conversations shouldn't have to cease in a residential neighborhood because of traffic noise, isn't this one of the goals of the project?	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
268	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 3, 2012 3:49 PM
269	Agree	Oct 3, 2012 3:41 PM
270	Playfield siting here is a must to support youth soccer, lacrosse, ultimate frisbee, etc. as well as Montlake Elementary School. It can server as a "front porch" to the Arboretum, localizing sporting pursuits on the edge of the more natural, hiking/biking friendly trails into the deeper arbored areas.	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
271	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation.	Oct 3, 2012 3:06 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

272	YES! Lower the transit HOV ramps and find ways to include bike paths and provide sound barriers to the neighborhood! RAMPS are UGLY and NOISY!	Oct 3, 2012 2:46 PM
273	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 3, 2012 1:58 PM
274	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 3, 2012 1:50 PM
275	Since existing transit/HOV ramps are often ugly giant solid block eyesores, this is a very good idea.	Oct 3, 2012 1:46 PM
276	Yes, study all possibilities to make better connectivity for bikes and pedestrians.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
277	please do favor peds/bikers/transit!!	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM
278	no comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM
279	absolutely	Oct 3, 2012 12:04 PM
280	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 3, 2012 11:38 AM
281	I think this is a cool idea. The illustration above shows a lane coming up from SR 520 westbound and connecting at the intersection with 24th. Depending on how bike and ped crossings at that point for those traveling between the UW area and the Arboretum area, would either make or brake this concept. If that is a high-volume ramp (I don't think it is) then the idea is dead on arrival. If it is a low-volume ramp, then there are some opportunities to develop it into a vital corridor for non-motorized users.	Oct 3, 2012 10:49 AM
282	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

283	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 3, 2012 10:30 AM
284	Unclear why the higher version is being considered, but lower appears to be better option if possible.	Oct 3, 2012 10:06 AM
285	Sounds like a good idea.	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
286	Lowered. More space.	Oct 3, 2012 9:52 AM
287	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
288	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal forms of transportation. (Central Greenways)	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
289	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 3, 2012 9:36 AM
290	Option B: lower the ramps.	Oct 3, 2012 8:41 AM
291	yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:33 AM
292	Of course, this side of the lid is the most sensitive from my perspective. It has a high potential for ugly maintenance facilities and dark, dank pedestrian and bicycle routes. This requires the most thought and care. I think I prefer multilevel ramps, but it is hard to know the impact of these on noise in the surrounding community.	Oct 3, 2012 8:28 AM
293	The main bridges should be just high enough that a bike ped path can cross under the west ends of them.	Oct 3, 2012 8:23 AM
294	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the a trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail will help to encourage vulnerable users to choose multi-modal	Oct 3, 2012 8:15 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	forms of transportation.	
295	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM
296	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-ofthe- art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 3, 2012 7:40 AM
297	This sounds OK except that any "green space" must be of the no maint. type natural growth so minimal future funds will need to be expended for upkeep.	Oct 3, 2012 7:11 AM
298	I like the lowered option. It seems to provide better grade separation between the transit ramps and the open space, as well as making the ramps less visually obtrusive. North/south connectivity for transit users is also very important.	Oct 2, 2012 11:49 PM
299	Don't have HOV lanes in 520. Have exclusive, separate lanes for transit that will be immune to traffic congestion, be it light rail, or bus rapid transit. That would entice drivers to take transit. Make public transit cheaper. The city is wasting its money by trying to keep car culture on life support, by such methods as HOV lanes, tolls, more lanes. Provide real alternatives to cars, and that entails not allowing car drivers to take over every public space.	Oct 2, 2012 11:36 PM
300	north south pedestrian connectivity over the lid is really important. a lid higher than the surrounding area would not help much-it should be at the same level as the area to the North	Oct 2, 2012 10:50 PM
301	Great! Accessibility is a very high priority.	Oct 2, 2012 8:58 PM
302	See comments Preference 9	Oct 2, 2012 8:48 PM
303	yes	Oct 2, 2012 8:26 PM
304	Make sure the connection to the 520 bike lane is well thought out.	Oct 2, 2012 6:58 PM
305	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 2, 2012 6:16 PM
306	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Oct 2, 2012 4:23 PM
307	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:19 PM
308	Strongly agree to enhance connectivity for non-motorized tranport both north-south and east-west.	Oct 2, 2012 3:16 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

309	yes--make sure there are bike and ped connections.	Oct 2, 2012 12:31 PM
310	Keep working on bicycle options.	Oct 2, 2012 12:22 PM
311	This improves the visual aspects of the new park area and it would most likely reduce road noise. Also, easier N/S connectivity is always a plus. I've found it rather treacherous to commute south from the Wallingford area.	Oct 2, 2012 12:05 PM
312	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 2, 2012 11:48 AM
313	I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory.	Oct 2, 2012 11:16 AM
314	hide everything dealing with cars	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
315	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 2, 2012 10:09 AM
316	I prefer Option A for better continuity in the park. Yes, the view is more cluttered from the park, however having roadways cutting through the park as much as they do in Option A will inhibit use of the park.	Oct 2, 2012 9:44 AM
317	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 2, 2012 9:04 AM
318	This corridor has been deemed very important at the regional, citywide and local levels. Improving the design to provide comfortable and safe north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 AM
319	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 1, 2012 9:25 PM
320	sounds good	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
321	don't understand but support bicycle use	Oct 1, 2012 2:36 PM
322	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Oct 1, 2012 2:24 PM
323	No study but make it happen for bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths!	Oct 1, 2012 1:22 PM
324	I like the idea of lower transit/HOV ramps	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
325	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Oct 1, 2012 10:21 AM
326	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 30, 2012 7:48 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

327	Yes. High transit ramps visually unattractive and noisy. Low transit ramps highly preferable.	Sep 30, 2012 3:19 PM
328	Absolutely enhance all aspects of pedestrian and bicyclist north-south connectivity on the lid. Keep as much car traffic below the lid as possible. Develop clear, wide and safe mixed-use pathways between the UW campus/medical/stadium and the Arboretum/Montlake neighborhood.	Sep 30, 2012 10:31 AM
329	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 30, 2012 7:26 AM
330	Lower transit/HOV ramps (option B): out of sight and with that the noise should be reduced.	Sep 30, 2012 3:42 AM
331	Ensure that alternatives to lowered ramps get as much visibility in case preference is not possible.	Sep 29, 2012 11:41 PM
332	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM
333	This is not clear to me	Sep 29, 2012 9:16 PM
334	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 29, 2012 7:37 PM
335	I think it's very important to have bus stops for traffic coming off I-5 and heading over the 520 bridge. I heard earlier that these were going to be deleted - which just seems crazy given their importance in the region.	Sep 29, 2012 4:30 PM
336	How will buses get to the new lightrail station at Husky Stadium? Will it be easy for people coming from the Eastside to transfer to Link?	Sep 29, 2012 1:41 PM
337	This is a good thing.	Sep 29, 2012 1:36 PM
338	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 29, 2012 1:19 PM
339	Yes!!!	Sep 29, 2012 9:32 AM
340	The difference in designs is not substantial. Buses travel on roads all around and there are a lot of cars surrounding the area. This should be a cost and construction timeline decision. Build it fast, cost efficient, and provide function.	Sep 29, 2012 6:58 AM
341	Provide substantial green space.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
342	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:24 PM
343	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails	Sep 28, 2012 9:49 PM
344	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 PM
345	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-	Sep 28, 2012 7:26 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	
346	Sounds expensive for the projected mobility/capacity gains.	Sep 28, 2012 5:56 PM
347	I can't tell from this map how things are supposed to work, but I would hope that the bike trail across 520 connects easily and safely to both the Burke-Gilman Trail and to the Lake Washington Loop route to the south and to the Arboretum.	Sep 28, 2012 3:49 PM
348	Another great idea. Really want to enhance mobility.	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
349	I have a hard time understanding the different impacts. How much bigger will the usable green space feel in option A? How much quieter will the traffic noise be in option B? They are both imperfect, and it's very hard to weigh the trade-offs.	Sep 28, 2012 2:27 PM
350	Your project will finally provide the necessary infrastructure to allow bicyclists to commute/access east/west corridor similar to I-90 for the first time. Please understand that there will be several types of cyclists using this critical new infrastructure and so planning ahead for fast versus slow, commute versus recreational would be ideal.	Sep 28, 2012 2:23 PM
351	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 2:14 PM
352	This is important. I don't have anything useful to say about it, except tht it's critical.	Sep 28, 2012 1:24 PM
353	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 12:27 PM
354	This isn't terribly clear to me what is proposed / what happens if the proposal doesn't happen. The two pictures look identical from a biker / ped perspective. What I care about is bikes! bikes! bikes! (followed by neighborhood connectivity and public shorelines and then parkes.)	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
355	This would be ideal.	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
356	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 10:19 AM
357	Higher transit/ramps seem to make a better environment for commuters, it's always better when you don't have to go down stairs or a long path to access a bus stop.	Sep 28, 2012 10:01 AM
358	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 28, 2012 9:55 AM
359	Yes, promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM
360	Like	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
361	HOV will only be more important in future. We should build for it while we have	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

	the chance. This could eventually become an extension of light rail.	
362	This lower transit would be a good way to keep the lid more parklike (the noise from transit would be dampened, and of course the buses and ramps would be less visible)	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 PM
363	Indifferent as long as access is provided above or under ramps	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 PM
364	What about connections to the west for bicyclists, the Portage Bay Bridge trail?	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 PM
365	Yes, lower ramps.	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
366	yes	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 PM
367	Please provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East	Sep 27, 2012 9:36 PM
368	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:05 PM
369	Yes and this will be the access point to crossing on bike law path I assume.	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM
370	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 7:40 PM
371	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 6:30 PM
372	Lowered	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
373	Yes, yes, yes.	Sep 27, 2012 6:07 PM
374	YES, and by the way -- SDOT needs to put a cycle track through the Arboretum!	Sep 27, 2012 6:06 PM
375	I bike. Let me bike.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
376	I care more about pedestrian and cyclist connectivity than the particular look and height of the ramps. I would rather money go towards improvements in pedestrian/cyclist infrastructure, rather than lower or raise a ramp without need.	Sep 27, 2012 5:44 PM
377	Yes, to make bicycle commuting easier across the new lids	Sep 27, 2012 5:10 PM
378	It's key that this connect smoothly and safely to the 520 bike trail.	Sep 27, 2012 4:55 PM
379	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Sep 27, 2012 4:52 PM
380	Lowered is prefered.	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
381	Option B. I like the reduced eye sore and the connection between the north and south parts of the lid. There isn't a great solution possible here, but I do think Option B is better than A.	Sep 27, 2012 4:29 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

382	Yes, lower transit and HOV ramps and improve connectivity for pedestrians and bikes.	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
383	Covered bicycle parking, connectivity to the arboretum for pedestrians and cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 4:01 PM
384	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
385	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 3:41 PM
386	Lower is visually better, but if we have to trade aesthetics for more bike and pedestrian access, I'd rather had that. Its all about tradeoffs.	Sep 27, 2012 3:03 PM
387	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:49 PM
388	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM
389	yes	Sep 27, 2012 2:35 PM
390	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:22 PM
391	I'm less concerned with the appearance of the bridge and connections than I am with its functionality, but if this can be done with minimal impact to construction time and cost, that's nice.	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM
392	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:15 PM
393	North/South connectivity is important.	Sep 27, 2012 2:05 PM
394	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 1:57 PM
395	I'm not sure if lower HOV ramps are all that necessary. I would agree with the continued exploration of bicycle/ped connectedness and arboretum esque design, but the lower ramps don't seem all that necessary	Sep 27, 2012 1:48 PM
396	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 1:37 PM
397	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities	Sep 27, 2012 1:08 PM
398	Support.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
399	if the lid can be enhanced and extended to enclose the ramps, that would be best.	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
400	Option B is better	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

401	The lower transit ramp is preferable. It creates more usable green space.	Sep 27, 2012 12:43 PM
402	Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections: We've articulated our main recommendations above, but if you're filling out the survey, we'd suggest reiterating the importance of (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:35 PM
403	Great idea!	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
404	Provided it does not impeed pedestiran of cyclist access I prefer the higher HOV lanes and ramps, again to minimize the foot print of the road way.	Sep 27, 2012 12:34 PM
405	sure, explore lower transit/hov ramps, but if it makes the project more difficult to build/more expensive, and if this is a visual issue, the addition of the lid improves the area so much that this seems to be a reasonable "compromise". DEFINITELY work to enhance the N/S connectivity for peds/bikes/transit. This is such a highly used corridor - we must be forward thinking on this and plan for even more non-car uses in this area.	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
406	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 PM
407	yes	Sep 27, 2012 12:20 PM
408	No preference.	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
409	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
410	I support north/south connectivity for non motorized users.	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
411	ensure that safe thru-routes for cyclists exist who commute or are passing thru the area. offer options for those who ride faster and for recreational riding/family.	Sep 27, 2012 11:56 AM
412	all about quality of life.	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
413	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
414	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
415	No	Sep 27, 2012 11:35 AM
416	Yes. I drive, but I probably bike more. I would like to see: --520 become bike-commutable. --better 520 transit options --freeway traffic routed out of/around the arboretum.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
417	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities. Focus on efficient and safe bicycle connections.	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

418	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 11:27 AM
419	Sounds good.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
420	promote bicycling across the lid	Sep 27, 2012 11:18 AM
421	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM
422	Yes! I am a frequent bike commuter and also ride recreationally. I think that the lack of a bike path across 520 is pretty limiting. I live in Bothell and it would be VERY nice to have a lake crossing via bike that is closer than I-90! I feel strongly that adding bicycle and pedestrian lanes is a CRITICAL aspect of any new road work as it will provide better transportation and health opportunities for years to come.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 AM
423	Good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
424	yes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
425	High priority and looks very good.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
426	Not important	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
427	I would prefer the lower transit/HOV ramps	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
428	Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East, promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
429	Option b looks great.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
430	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 AM
431	Option B looks better but perhaps not a huge difference.	Sep 27, 2012 10:54 AM
432	Any change must incorporate full connections for peds and bikes between the Arboretum, points norts, and (most importantly) the 520 bridge!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
433	yes, please. I prefer the lower ramps, option B	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
434	I highly recommend designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM
435	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
436	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:38 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

437	5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
438	please	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
439	Higher HOV ramps and train options would be better option A	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
440	would be a beutiful, useful additon to that area. Would certainly see increased use as it would be a destination area for the city.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
441	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 10:26 AM
442	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:25 AM
443	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
444	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
445	Connectivity is key: this is what opens up the transit options for people and can allow longer trips without hazardous sections	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
446	Lowered Transit/HOV ramps	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
447	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
448	Option B looks more fluid and clean.	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
449	Ok.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
450	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
451	All others on this page should consider the neighborhood's views and balance them with costs	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
452	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
453	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
454	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
455	lower is always better for appeal	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
456	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
457	Like Option B better.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

458	Yep.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
459	East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East.	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
460	quite studying options and start providing a bike path - separate pedestrians and bicyles - look at Europe and other places thta raise the pedestrian path above the bike path by 3"	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
461	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
462	Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
463	I think that there should be a commercial lot which can be rented here for restaraunts and the money leased can be used for upkeep.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
464	promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
465	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
466	I prefer option B	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
467	yes!!!!!	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
468	options A and B look identical. Not sure what you need here. I like what I see in the renderings.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
469	Keep working for pedestrians and cyclists. Safety is paramount.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
470	Why go to the lid? As I heard one architect say: this is a spot for a coffee stand. TO activate this space, we need food! There are plenty of empty landscapes with paths. People want: Vista, sports, vantage points, peace, and may settle for food. Remember: sketching in "people" will not make them appear in the built park.	Sep 27, 2012 12:31 AM
471	Again, don't just work with but actually provide enhanced connectivity for all users (people who walk, people who bike, people who ride the bus) to and around the Arboretum. The lower ramps are nicer.	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
472	like this idea very much	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
473	This would be good if you could cross over the other ramp. The way it is shown it seems like it would provide a false sense of connection. It still forces people back to the same crossing. If the connection can't be made, maybe shorten the lid.	Sep 25, 2012 9:51 AM
474	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:52 AM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

475	How about a nice bridge for pedestrians and bikes to go up over the 520 / Montelake interchange and back down ... I think a lot of people need to move through there north to south and a lot of the design seems to focus on making a nice park / destination / pleasant place to walk through when you get off the bus.	Sep 24, 2012 11:15 PM
476	I am not sure what you are asking here, even with the picture.I liek the options you discuss. What are we losing by lowering the lid? What problems would the lid solve? I want to support HOV and tranist very much but I also like green space, the Arboretum and pedestrians.	Sep 24, 2012 9:19 PM
477	Please do not allow non-transit HOV's onto the lid. If one purpose of the lid is to add safe and useful interface between transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists, allowing private commuter vehicles access to this space defeats its purpose. (Did anybody notice that the renderings of this particular view of Option A and Option B are near-identical enough to be useless? Why not have renderings that actually show the difference from the middle of the lid?)	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
478	N/S connectivity is really key at montlake. Currently its terrible for everyone:cars, bikes and peds. The 2nd bridge will be harsh on the neighborhood, but should help with cars. Bicycles and pedestrians have different goals. On a bike, you typically want to just get somewhere, so excess curves, pedestrians and other obstacles are annoying. Its nice if its quiet, but views aren't that big a deal for most bicycles..you've moving a bit too fast. There is also much pedestrian traffic to/from bus stops, and the will probalby multiply with light rail. Pedestrians don't like bike, so ideally any route made for connectivty (ie not just strolling), would have both a bike and walking section. Finally, there will be people trying to use the lid as a park. I suggest the be routed far away from any connectivity paths, otherwise you will create endless user conflicts. I don't see much difference in either drawing..they both look like user conflicts waiting to happen. There is often a bike every 1-2 minutes across the montlake bridge. Who cares what it looks like if bicyclists and pedestrians are yelling at each other all day long?	Sep 24, 2012 6:07 PM
479	Promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 24, 2012 5:52 PM
480	Yes please.	Sep 24, 2012 12:57 PM
481	This is a huge improvement over the original option - the lowered HOV ramps give the park a much better shape.	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
482	we need a high speed bicycle route, bike lanes	Sep 24, 2012 12:23 PM
483	This is key for promoting safe, convenient bicycling commuting and recreation.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM
484	Very much in favor of this.	Sep 24, 2012 12:02 PM
485	A bike/pedestrian connection from the arboretum to the Montlake Bridge that avoids busy 23rd Ave (perhaps using East Montlake Park and Shelby St instead?) would be a significant enhancement.	Sep 23, 2012 6:48 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

486	yes	Sep 23, 2012 2:41 PM
487	Critical. This is a major hub and needs to reflect the beauty of the area and still be functional. Existing homes should not be negatively impacted so noise reduction and beauty of the area are extremely important. The higher transit/HOV ramps are noisy and unsightly. Please keep the park-like atmosphere that is natural to this area and let pedestrians and bicyclists enjoy it. Option B has a much cleaner look to it and it should also be determined if it will create less noise. That should be known up front.	Sep 23, 2012 8:21 AM
488	Like the idea of lower transit/HOV ramps, assuming this does not have a negative impact on connectivity for pedestrian and bicyclists on the Montlake lid.	Sep 22, 2012 4:40 PM
489	We need to be sure that traffic in Montlake is not increased, and that the new 520 does not increase noise.	Sep 22, 2012 1:51 PM
490	Option B is preferred. The area under the ramps on the east side of the lid should be filled with light, 24 hours per day to create a safe place to travel.	Sep 22, 2012 12:30 PM
491	focus more on ped and bike access instead of creating park on the lid	Sep 22, 2012 10:07 AM
492	Yes	Sep 22, 2012 2:42 AM
493	The lowered transit/HOV ramps would be preferred, as they provide more greenspace on the lid, and don't break up the space as much as the raised ramps.	Sep 21, 2012 3:42 PM
494	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:25 PM
495	Fine. It should connect from there on a bike/pedestrian trail to Madison Park.	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
496	Lower transit/HOV ramps preferred. Sorry to be a pain in the ass, but as a Montlaker this is an important quality of life issue. Thank you for all your hard work in devising a sustainable solution.	Sep 20, 2012 10:36 AM
497	Don't defer decisions on providing bicycle and ped access. This needs to be decide up front and treat these vulnerable users as first class citizens above cars. The question of option A vs. B is insignificant if you build it while "continue to work with ... to enhance connectivity for peds, bicyclists". Worry about getting the vulnerable users safely through here to the common destinations safely first. Then worry about the height of the transit/HOV ramps. The priorities here seem backwards.	Sep 19, 2012 12:30 PM
498	I like to see the formal walkways and bicycle paths through this section of the lid, so that Arboretum visitors can safely and easily access it.	Sep 18, 2012 4:13 PM
499	Go for it!	Sep 18, 2012 12:20 PM
500	Yes, please do this.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM
501	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

502	Option B is preferred. However, Option B fails to properly address the sense of connection between the Shelby/Hamlin neighborhood and the Montlake neighborhoods.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM
503	This is my preference to keep the natural appearance of the area as much as possible	Sep 17, 2012 4:38 PM
504	Who would pay for additional costs associated with the lowered ramps and expanded lid, including ongoing maintenance of green space on lid?	Sep 17, 2012 3:24 PM
505	Seems ok. Need more info than renderings though	Sep 17, 2012 6:14 AM
506	Allow no left turn at the light on 24th for Sr 520 returning traffic to travel into the Arboretum. Olmsted didn't design to be used as a Freeway exit road to E.Madison St. Lower the Transit Exit ramps to reduce the noise and provide a better enfvironment for futue users of the lid open aspace.	Sep 16, 2012 4:29 PM
507	Yes, prefer burying the transit/HOV ramps and enhance connectivity for pedestrians, bikes and transit users. Usable green space and relating to the Arboretum is definitely preferable. And minimal above ground bridge structures/off ramp structures is desirable.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
508	Prefer option B.	Sep 16, 2012 10:02 AM
509	These drawings are a joke. It distorts the reality of both options and it is not helpful. I want to see what it is like to be next to the ramp. I don't like how the lowered on divides the park. I don't like what the looming ramp will do to the spaces next to it. It will be unpleasant. Is this really the best you can do? why can't the lowered scheme move north to where the overhead ramp is?	Sep 16, 2012 9:17 AM
510	Prefer Lower!	Sep 16, 2012 7:25 AM
511	Underbridge area is not safe for pedestrians. Area will encourage illegal activity. Route bike route on top of lid.	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
512	will look to massive	Sep 15, 2012 9:26 PM
513	Please prioritize bicycle and pedestrian access and preservation of green space in all these areas.	Sep 15, 2012 8:37 PM
514	For all of these areas, prioritize pedestrian and bicycle mobility and preservation of green space.	Sep 15, 2012 8:11 PM
515	Like option B with lower profile.	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
516	Eliminating the access to 520 to/from the arboretum is the dumbest thing I have ever heard of. Montlake Blvd is already overloaded, imagine what is going to happen by shoving all of these cars up to Montlake to get on and off 520. Absolutely assinine idea. Did you take a stupid pill when you decided this? I heard it was because somebody wants to return the arboretum to it's more natural state - what a pile of crap idea that is.	Sep 15, 2012 2:56 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

517	No, keep ramps functional, even if they are higher. Save the green areas below.	Sep 15, 2012 12:59 PM
518	NO. Go with the high option. Take what ever land you need to enhance the free flow of motor vehicles through the area and physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. Lots of BIG trees. IF you add light rail, DO NOT take any of these lanes, design the thing so that it can accommodate the addition of light rail without reducing ANY pedestrian, bike, or motor vehicle, or transit/HOV lanes.	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
519	Option B is by far the better option.	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
520	Yes.	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
521	Waste of money.	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
522	Yes.	Sep 14, 2012 5:20 PM
523	Yes, yes, yes! There should really be a Montlake rail stop here or nearby, too. Higher transit ramps are fine. HOV, maybe not.	Sep 14, 2012 4:36 PM
524	I prefer this option as it seems like it provides more open space for park uses.	Sep 14, 2012 4:26 PM
525	Generally like option B better	Sep 14, 2012 3:45 PM
526	The vision is too limited,. The designers need to involve the University of Washington, the Friends of Olmsted Parks, and Open Space advocates. Horticulture clubs should also be invited. The plan needs to return the WSDOT Peninsula to Arboretum usage. SR 520 will take much of East Montlake Park, a dedicated public park, and sections of the Arboretum (including the Canal Reserve) that are dedicated for park purposes. The takings leaves Montlake and the Arboretum berift of much park acreage. Only the WSDOT Peninsula provides a satisfactory substitute. Unfortunately, Seattle's leadership has yet to take up the cause of restoring the WSDOT Peninsula the Arboretum. However, as SR 520 construction goes forward, the public and Arboretum advocates will catch on; and then City officials will belately wake up, and like politicians do, blame WSDOT and demand correction. It will be costly then. WSDOT has to offer an alternative with the WSDOT Peninsula restored to Arboretum use and one showing the upland surplussed. That will get the attention of the public to the indifference of City officials and force the issue..	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM
527	well, lower is less visual impact, of course	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
528	I use this connection as a pedestrian regularly, and would use it with a bike when 520 becomes open to bicycles. I think the connection here is very important. Currently the path from the W.B. bus stop to Montlake is very narrow and cannot simultaneously serve peds and bikers. I think option B looks nicer, since there isn't an extra road in the sky. I also mildly prefer the trail layout in option B.	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
529	I prefer option B	Sep 14, 2012 1:54 PM
530	The raised ramps appear intrusive therefore, the lowered ramps are more desireable.	Sep 14, 2012 1:54 PM

Page 5, Q7. Preference 15: East half of Montlake lid: Explore lower transit/HOV ramps (see option B) and continue to work with the city of Seattle to study options to enhance north/south connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, provide usable green space in an urban environment, and relate...

531	Overdone for transit/HOV pedestrians, bicyclists, green space etc...	Sep 14, 2012 1:49 PM
532	this seems like a win for a possible light rail integration (although this seems like a non-starter because where does it go west of there...lowered ramps are just less visually intrusive and always more pleasing, I mean the lid and new interchange is supposed to get rid of the ugliness of the existing dead interchanges by the simple nature of eliminating dual interchanges and a non-existant freeway	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM
533	I support	Sep 14, 2012 1:21 PM
534	Sounds reasonable. Do that, explore!	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
535	I think the transit sould be on top rather than below in the underground - this is better for the user and access (and reduce noise) on the surface.	Sep 14, 2012 1:09 PM
536	no preference	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
537	optimize transit operations, select most cost efficient option and move on, please.	Sep 14, 2012 12:42 PM
538	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
539	The lower looks better from these two angles, however is it safer to load the buses on the highway or above the highway?	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
540	Yes please!!! Please make it easy for people who walk and bike to use this bridge and please connect multiple communities to the bridge. The 520 bridge serves the region and many people will use it on foot and on bicycle!	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
541	prefer option b lowered transit/HOV ramps - ideally no off ramp to vehicular traffic and underground transit stops or highway transit stops similar to how they are today but with more protective rider waiting areas. I do use the 545 to/from Redmond daily and don't mind the freeway level stops.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
542	Option A seems to provide slightly more of a large green open space. Go with which option is least expensive with or tax dollars. In Option A why is there a lid over the westbound Montlake Blvd off-ramp lanes? Don't need the unnecessary waste until the westbound 24th Avenue off-ramp crosses over it.	Sep 14, 2012 11:06 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
1	I absolutely support the regional shared-use path on this bridge.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:37 PM
3	Viewing areas a great idea. Family can ride out aways to viewing area, pull aside so as to not block path. But: the bike path and the viewing areas need to have sound mitigation; I assume that means lower than the bridge and would block the cyclists view; so is there another way to give cyclists views to south and yet block the road noise?	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 PM
4	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 PM
5	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:59 PM
6	I think having some belvedere viewing areas off of the shared-use path (I'm assuming that means wider areas where one could pause, out of the main path of travel?) is an excellent idea, it is a very scenic area and it would make it a lot safer for all users if there were a way to pause off to the side of the main path. I imagine that this may be a popular spot for wildlife viewing as well, so it makes all the more sense to provide that type of facility along the path.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 PM
7	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
8	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Oct 5, 2012 8:34 PM
9	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 PM
10	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 PM
11	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 PM
12	I support a shared use path on the bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 6:23 PM
13	With quiet pavement, please. And high sides so sound and pollution tend skyward rather than into the neighborhood and arboretum.	Oct 5, 2012 6:22 PM
14	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge - Yes, please, please do have a bike path capability across 520 - today it is totally off limits - hard to imagine that this project would do all this work and not address a bike path for East and West bike traffic over 520.	Oct 5, 2012 6:09 PM
15	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. To build a new bridge without a way to move anything other than vehicles in 2012 is beyond ridiculous.	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 PM
16	I strongly emphatically support a shared use path along Sr520 especially for bicycle mobility. Don't you dare build a new bridge without it! It might just sink!	Oct 5, 2012 5:16 PM
17	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 4:44 PM
18	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 4:43 PM
19	The shared use path for the whole bridge is a must	Oct 5, 2012 4:39 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
20	Once again the buses get everything and the cars nothing yet the cars pay for the work with gas taxes, license fees and tolls. This is highway robbery.	Oct 5, 2012 4:09 PM
21	As much as can be done to narrow the bridge, the better. For example, are things like waivers on shoulder width requirements possible?	Oct 5, 2012 4:06 PM
22	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 3:40 PM
23	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 3:35 PM
24	Sounds great!	Oct 5, 2012 3:29 PM
25	Yes, we need a share-use path across the bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 3:28 PM
26	Yes, but also choose road surfacing to minimize noise.	Oct 5, 2012 3:18 PM
27	I'm glad there will finally be a bike path here. I bike commuted over 520 for several years and as I sat waiting to pay my over on a bus I wished there had been even a narrow crappy path like on the old I-90 bridge that sunk.	Oct 5, 2012 3:12 PM
28	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
29	Strongly support shared-use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
30	Fine. Just please make it architecturally beautiful.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM
31	this is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
32	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:58 PM
33	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:56 PM
34	I strongly support a shared-use path along the north side of the bridge. Bicycles are the most efficient mode of personal transport from an energy standpoint.	Oct 5, 2012 2:46 PM
35	support having a shared-use path here	Oct 5, 2012 2:44 PM
36	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:35 PM
37	Shared use bath is critical for low carbon commuting.	Oct 5, 2012 2:32 PM
38	As long as one can ride one's bike across the bridge spanning Lake Washington, I am happy.	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM
39	I like the path a lot.	Oct 5, 2012 2:21 PM
40	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR 520 bridge	Oct 5, 2012 2:14 PM
41	I strongly support a shared-use path along the SR-520 Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:14 PM
42	Great. The viewing areas would be cool.	Oct 5, 2012 2:13 PM
43	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 1:56 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
44	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 1:49 PM
45	I strongly support a shared use path on the bridge!	Oct 5, 2012 1:10 PM
46	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 1:09 PM
47	more pedestrian and bike access is better. Learn what you can from the existing I-90 shared use path.	Oct 5, 2012 1:07 PM
48	OK	Oct 5, 2012 12:55 PM
49	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. I would commute by bicycle across this route approximately 200 days per year.	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 PM
50	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:52 PM
51	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:42 PM
52	This is OK but forget the extra expense of a shared-use path as it costs too much for too few users.	Oct 5, 2012 12:42 PM
53	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
54	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
55	keep it simple	Oct 5, 2012 12:33 PM
56	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. This is likely the most important change to the bridge we can make.	Oct 5, 2012 12:29 PM
57	Yes strong support	Oct 5, 2012 12:29 PM
58	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:24 PM
59	I prefer to keep this area as is, it is already a large highway and working to add a viewing area seems odd. It is loud and crowded.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
60	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
61	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
62	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:17 PM
63	Viewing areas and shared use paths are a positive development	Oct 5, 2012 12:10 PM
64	Any such design should be within the footprint of the existing 520 corridor. Any additional expansion or regional shared use should be incorporated into the appropriate community or existing park or trail authority.	Oct 5, 2012 12:04 PM
65	Yes - strongly support	Oct 5, 2012 12:02 PM
66	This must include a shared use path (bike/ped) across 520.	Oct 5, 2012 11:53 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
67	Yay!	Oct 5, 2012 11:52 AM
68	Sounds good.	Oct 5, 2012 11:42 AM
69	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:41 AM
70	"Simple" and "clean" are good objectives for an approach bridge. The structural system should be designed for 100 years. The systems will change and program may change in that time frame. Get the structure right.	Oct 5, 2012 11:39 AM
71	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:31 AM
72	I strongly support shared-use facilities for this project.	Oct 5, 2012 11:29 AM
73	I strongly support a shared-use path along the 520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:28 AM
74	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:22 AM
75	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:21 AM
76	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 AM
77	Not important.	Oct 5, 2012 11:14 AM
78	yes if at all possible. Most important features of the new bridge should be designing all bicycle connections to accomodate future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 5, 2012 11:05 AM
79	yes	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
80	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:00 AM
81	We need a bicycle and pedestrian path	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
82	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:44 AM
83	I strongly support a shared use path.	Oct 5, 2012 10:40 AM
84	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:38 AM
85	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:35 AM
86	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
87	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
88	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
89	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. Goals The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

	Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
90	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
91	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. I use the I-90 path every day and would use a 520 path if it existed.	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
92	I strongly support this	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
93	These issues are critical to the neighborhoods served by the MPCC. The simpler and cleaner the structural design will be the less negative impact this imposting structure will have on our neighborhoods south of the new Bridge. A shared-use path on the north side of the Bridge is a necessity for all of the reasons previously stated.	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
94	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM
95	Minimize width of structure to the greatest possible degree.	Oct 5, 2012 10:11 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
96	Sure. Besides bus access from Montlake to the eastside, bike access on 520 is critical. This would make a huge difference in my life. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don't know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each "preference". I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can't afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
97	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. I would frequently use this path.	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
98	cool.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
99	A regional shared-use path, with a focus on transportation bicycling, should be a major focus of the project.	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
100	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
101	The shared use path would have higher security/visibility to neighbors if located on the south side of the bridge structure	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
102	I am glad that a shared-use path is included with this bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:36 AM
103	Agree	Oct 5, 2012 9:35 AM
104	No.	Oct 5, 2012 9:33 AM
105	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
106	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:29 AM
107	Viewing areas! Cool. Also, SHARED USE PATH. I ride my bike to Kirkland for work once a week from downtown Seattle right now, so this is SO EXCITING.	Oct 5, 2012 9:29 AM
108	I support a shared-use path. It would be completely and utterly unacceptable to build a new bridge without a safe and wide path for pedestrian and bike access.	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
109	Yes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
110	Just do what is cost effective.	Oct 5, 2012 9:22 AM
111	While a path is vital, belvedere viewing areas are not.	Oct 5, 2012 9:21 AM
112	reduce the width of the bridge that is dedicated to motor-vehicles.	Oct 5, 2012 9:16 AM
113	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:04 AM
114	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
115	Must keep any additional height to a minimum.	Oct 5, 2012 8:57 AM
116	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. To do without this portion would be a mistake felt for generations.	Oct 5, 2012 8:55 AM
117	sure.	Oct 5, 2012 8:47 AM
118	Viewpoints are good.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
119	We need a separate bike path on SR-520, just like we have on I-90	Oct 5, 2012 8:33 AM
120	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 8:06 AM
121	Preference 15: I support continuing to work with the city of Seattle to enhance the connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. The current proposals are not satisfactory. One potential improvement would be to continue the trail over all lanes of traffic. While it is generally advisable not to unnecessarily gain elevation, the trail underpass will likely not be a facility that many feel comfortable. Giving people the option to continue over the ramps on a well lit, direct, comfortable, and paved trail separated from the roadways will help to encourage users to choose choose walking and cycling.	Oct 5, 2012 7:54 AM
122	I support the shared-use path--ideally it would be wider than the one on I-90, which can be uncomfortably tight for passing on a bicycle.	Oct 5, 2012 7:45 AM
123	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:42 AM
124	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:41 AM
125	yes	Oct 5, 2012 7:32 AM
126	Viewing areas would be nice - but not critical. Bike traffic on I90 seems to handle slow/stopped peds w/o any trouble.	Oct 5, 2012 7:31 AM
127	This section is one of the worst impositions of the bridge on the Arboretum. The visual impact is the least of the problems. Noise is by far the worst, as rush-hour traffic already spreads gloom across the entire surrounding park and bay.	Oct 5, 2012 7:21 AM
128	OK. But keep it that way.	Oct 5, 2012 7:11 AM
129	Yes, yes, YES - I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 6:51 AM
130	the ideal sounds great... the viewing areas i question	Oct 5, 2012 6:48 AM
131	Viewing areas would be great, but the highest priority is ped/bike connecivity -- across the full length of the project, as well as to neighborhoods and to other pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and routes at either end.	Oct 5, 2012 6:07 AM
132	Agreed. simple with shared use.	Oct 5, 2012 5:39 AM
133	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 5:36 AM
134	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 5:23 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
135	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:23 AM
136	Yes	Oct 5, 2012 5:10 AM
137	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 4:58 AM
138	No viewing areas are necessary; this should be strictly for moving vehicles in and out and past the neighborhood as quickly and cleanly as possible.	Oct 5, 2012 4:02 AM
139	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 AM
140	Please	Oct 5, 2012 12:39 AM
141	I strongly support extending the bike and pedestrian path across the new SR-520 bridge to Montlake, North Capitol Hill, and downtown Seattle. It would be a shame not to complete this route given the investment in the new SR-520 bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 AM
142	Clean and simple bridge design. This should be the case for the bridge structure between I-5 and Montlake Blvd too.	Oct 5, 2012 12:04 AM
143	jViewing areas sound good. I'd rather have the shared-use path on the south side of the bridge though.	Oct 4, 2012 11:20 PM
144	Yes, a belvedere area would be great. A truly bold design would have a pedestrian/bike access the the neigbhorhood to the south - but then you'd have to add a bus stop!	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 PM
145	I strongly support a bike path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 PM
146	Yes. Let's concentrate the design on usability and the view and not over flourish it.	Oct 4, 2012 10:57 PM
147	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:46 PM
148	viewing areas aren't worth the cost	Oct 4, 2012 10:34 PM
149	The bridge is too high and needs sound walls.	Oct 4, 2012 10:25 PM
150	support	Oct 4, 2012 10:22 PM
151	The bike trail should have been under the bridge deck to shelter it from the noise and road spray and rocks and other debris that gets thrown up by the cars and trucks. At least put those green fins up that are used to screen headlights from blinding oncoming traffic. These would help avoid being blinded by the cars' headlights and reduce the chance of getting hit by flying debris from the traffic. While you're at it, these should be added to the I-90 bridge too. It really sucks to have to cross the bridge in the rain. Not because of the rain falling, but because of the road spray thrown up by the cars. It's nasty and full of grit and oil and gets all over your clothes and face.	Oct 4, 2012 10:19 PM
152	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:17 PM
153	yes - I like this	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
154	I am a user of the I-90 shared use path and strongly support adding this functionality to 520. Thanks!	Oct 4, 2012 10:05 PM
155	The bridge section between the east Montlake lid and the east end of Foster Island should be enclosed, or trenched. Existing bridge is beyond obnoxious to the surrounding arboretum and marsh. If trenching is beyond any hope (additional federal funds?) then build it so that high sound absorbing walls can be added later, such as includinig the supporting foundation along the outer edges of the medians during the new bridge construction.	Oct 4, 2012 10:00 PM
156	provide a 14 foot shared use trail with bicycle/pedestrian connections design to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
157	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:44 PM
158	Very strongly support the shared use path. It does not have to be 14 feet wide, nor fancy. Similar to I-90 is more than sufficient. That gets much use and this would get as much or more, as it will be going to the Arboretum, a wonderful asset the city has. This again needs to be easy to access, good lighting and surfaces for optimal use. The current pedestrian access under 520 are very unsafe due to tight corners, low/no visibility around corners and even with brakes on downhill, you're going to fast to safely navigate on a bike.	Oct 4, 2012 9:43 PM
159	A bike/pedestrian path along 520 is very desirable. The width of the path on the I-90 floating bridge is sufficient for such purposes. The addition of a reasonably spaced wider sections such as used on the Golden Gate Bridge would be beneficial but not necessary.	Oct 4, 2012 9:33 PM
160	the bike path on the bridge is super important. my #1 priority hands down.	Oct 4, 2012 9:28 PM
161	Pausing to look at the arboretum, on bike, would be great!	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 PM
162	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 9:24 PM
163	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. This will be a nice connection to the East side for my husband to take to work and for me to access Bellevue.	Oct 4, 2012 9:18 PM
164	The current bridge is damm ugly! Viewing areas are good.	Oct 4, 2012 9:15 PM
165	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
166	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:56 PM
167	Ensure that belvedere viewing areas don't obstruct east west flow: people pausing for the view should not be pausing for the path.	Oct 4, 2012 8:53 PM
168	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:49 PM
169	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:39 PM
170	I strongly support a shared use along 520!	Oct 4, 2012 8:32 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
171	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:19 PM
172	ok.	Oct 4, 2012 8:16 PM
173	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:06 PM
174	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
175	Not sure how useful the viewing ares will be. Final design should ensure that the underpass at Fraser Island is maintained. Noise barriers should be built through the wetlands, to reduce the impact of the highway on the natural preserve.	Oct 4, 2012 7:47 PM
176	Minimizing the visual effect of this huge roadway cutting across the Arboretum and Foster Island would be a primary goal for me. Its width and height in this area creates a visual wall of concrete. Belvederes and other design elements that are not vital to the work of this roadway should be eliminated.	Oct 4, 2012 7:43 PM
177	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 7:22 PM
178	I very strongly support a shared path along the bridge. It will be so nice to be able to access the east side without relying on an automobile!	Oct 4, 2012 7:21 PM
179	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. The I-90 trail is great; let's do that for 520 too.	Oct 4, 2012 6:56 PM
180	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
181	Shared-use bike and pedestrian path is vital. The path must be safe, wide and maintain clear lines of sight.	Oct 4, 2012 6:12 PM
182	use tax payer money only for what is required -we do not need additonal taxes or tolls on this bridge	Oct 4, 2012 6:03 PM
183	This would be great! I commute by bike to downtown Bellevue from the CD everyday, and a shared use path along 520 would be a huge timesaver	Oct 4, 2012 5:35 PM
184	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
185	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:34 PM
186	A bike path would be great!	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
187	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:20 PM
188	Support	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
189	NO share ped only	Oct 4, 2012 5:16 PM
190	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 5:10 PM
191	Sometimes simple and clean its not the best way to go. The cable bridge would be ideal for various reasons. Attraction, which means toll money and visitors	Oct 4, 2012 5:01 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

	money.	
192	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. Not including a shared use path now would be a huge missed opportunity to expand excellent commuting (not to mention recreational) options.	Oct 4, 2012 4:47 PM
193	I very much support a pedestrian and bicycle path along the SR 520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 4:37 PM
194	Fine. Minimal design with a bike lane. Dig it.	Oct 4, 2012 4:05 PM
195	ok, like the idea of the pedestrian path, would be nice to be able to exit that path into the islands in the arboretum	Oct 4, 2012 4:01 PM
196	sidewalks are welcome!	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
197	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:38 PM
198	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:19 PM
199	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:16 PM
200	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
201	Yes. does the shared use path connect to either Foster or Marsh Island pathways?	Oct 4, 2012 3:05 PM
202	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. This is hugely important for connecting bicyclists between Seattle and Bellevue / the Eastside. People WILL put it to use.	Oct 4, 2012 3:04 PM
203	If the path were on the south side it could allow east access to Madison Park and the Lake Washington shore to the south	Oct 4, 2012 2:53 PM
204	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
205	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 2:47 PM
206	Multi-mode transportation options are critical, particularly when designing transportation elements that will be with us for many years to come.	Oct 4, 2012 2:44 PM
207	Excellent	Oct 4, 2012 2:43 PM
208	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 2:39 PM
209	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
210	I support the dedicated bike/pedestrian path on the N side of 520.	Oct 4, 2012 2:22 PM
211	make sure there is a bicycle access	Oct 4, 2012 2:02 PM
212	I am very much in favor of this.	Oct 4, 2012 2:01 PM
213	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 1:59 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
214	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:56 PM
215	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:41 PM
216	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge. I strongly support a WIDE shared use path along the SR520 bridge to enhance non-motorized user safety and usability. If this causes less vehicle capacity, I still support a wide, usable path.	Oct 4, 2012 1:35 PM
217	I strongly support the shared use path on the new 520 Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:25 PM
218	Strongly support the path, and some belvederes so that users of different intents can stay out of each other's way	Oct 4, 2012 1:14 PM
219	yes	Oct 4, 2012 1:08 PM
220	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:08 PM
221	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:03 PM
222	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 1:02 PM
223	Preference 16: I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
224	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:40 PM
225	I support a bicycle path across 520.	Oct 4, 2012 12:36 PM
226	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:33 PM
227	We strongly suggest eliminating the belevedere viewing areas but do support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridege. The footprint of the bridge should be as small as possible, unobtrussive and of simple design. Funds would be better spent on the noise reduction. substantial lids and shared use paths to connect neighborhoods with safe, simple paths and walkways.	Oct 4, 2012 12:29 PM
228	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
229	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
230	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
231	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge!!	Oct 4, 2012 12:11 PM
232	A shared use path on 520 is a must: 520 needs to work for moving people, not just cars. Please, please make it more friendly to non-auto users than the I-90 'path', which is horrible to use thanks to noise and crowding.	Oct 4, 2012 12:11 PM
233	I strongly support the shared-use path on the bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:10 PM
234	The architecture should be integrated with the floating bridge now under construction.	Oct 4, 2012 12:08 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
235	Hard to argue with any of that wording. Clearly delineate pathways of travel to avoid the Brooklyn Bridge problem -- extreme conflicts between use as viewing area vs. travel path for pedestrians and cyclists.	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
236	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
237	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM
238	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:00 PM
239	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:59 AM
240	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:56 AM
241	Yes	Oct 4, 2012 11:52 AM
242	I would prefer a separated path for bicycles and pedestrians but I will take what I can get. It sure beats having to ride down to I-90 every time I want to cross the lake.	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
243	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
244	the bike path needs to be wider than the one on I-90. Will there be access to the path from Foster Island?	Oct 4, 2012 11:47 AM
245	I strongly strongly strongly support a regional shared-use path along the SR 520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:46 AM
246	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:39 AM
247	I would like to see a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:37 AM
248	Yes for a regional shared-use path on the bridge, totally support! It would be great.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
249	YES! please include a shared use path on one side of the bridge. Cyclists would LOVE this.	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
250	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
251	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
252	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
253	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:23 AM
254	I strongly support a shared-use path along the 520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:12 AM
255	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 11:04 AM
256	I own our home a half mile from the west landing of the bridge and support the path to provide me with commuting options.	Oct 4, 2012 11:01 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
257	Definitely favor a clean, LOW, structure for the west approach - no sentinels, keep lighting down-facing to aid safety to peds/bikes, but not provide glare, nor disruptions to birds. A "widowed" eagle, and sometimes more bid birds love that area - restore the wetlands, Foster Island, and make them comfortable to use (for both people and wildlife).	Oct 4, 2012 10:38 AM
258	Fine	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
259	Viewing areas, yes.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 AM
260	Strongly support the concept of a shared use path	Oct 4, 2012 9:32 AM
261	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:21 AM
262	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 9:13 AM
263	shared use might be nice and I am all for simplicity in this area	Oct 4, 2012 3:12 AM
264	Simple and clean structure is great; "belvedere" areas are OK, but please don't allow them to compromise the efficiency of the path for utility cyclists. Do many cars crossing 520 want to pull off and stop to enjoy the view from the bridge? Us bike commuters are the same, we mostly want the path to allow us to get quickly and efficiently from one side of the lake to the other.	Oct 4, 2012 2:20 AM
265	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 9:45 PM
266	Looks good.	Oct 3, 2012 9:30 PM
267	This is where the bypass bridge should connect to take all northbound 520 traffic off of Montlake Boulevard. A nice long-span suspension draw-bridge would be a thing of engineering beauty and would save a considerable amount of political skin in the long run because not nearly so many folks will end up stuck in the 'Montlake Mess' that will ensue upon completion of the current design.	Oct 3, 2012 9:15 PM
268	I don't know if the fancy structures on the bridge are part of this portion of the project, but I'd support removal of them from the plan. The grandiose, lighted entrance to the city seems completely out of line with the wetlands and natural area where the freeway comes ashore.	Oct 3, 2012 8:50 PM
269	Yes	Oct 3, 2012 8:35 PM
270	Shared use path needs to be a part of the design.	Oct 3, 2012 8:19 PM
271	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 4:02 PM
272	I agree that a clean, simple design should be used, but the Montlake interchange needs to be seriously reconsidered. It seems a shame to put this much money into a project that essentially fails drivers once they get across the water. Serious study of Montlake Blvd. should be a part of the 520 process.	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
273	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 3:50 PM
274	Agree	Oct 3, 2012 3:42 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
275	I strongly support a multi-use path along the 520 bridge. During my time working in Kirkland but commuting from Capital Hill, I always considered it an inconvenience that I had to take a bus across the lake. The result of this was a frequent decision to drive.	Oct 3, 2012 3:08 PM
276	Bikes! Bikes! Bikes!	Oct 3, 2012 2:47 PM
277	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 1:58 PM
278	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 3, 2012 1:50 PM
279	Seems good.	Oct 3, 2012 1:48 PM
280	Shared use path is essential.	Oct 3, 2012 1:19 PM
281	ok	Oct 3, 2012 1:15 PM
282	no comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:09 PM
283	as long as does not distract traffic flow on bridge	Oct 3, 2012 12:05 PM
284	The new 520 bridge must be built with pedestrian and bicycle access. A new bridge without bike/ped access is an insult.	Oct 3, 2012 11:40 AM
285	Put a bike path on 520. Please.	Oct 3, 2012 11:01 AM
286	I would love to see belvederes on this portion of the structure - maybe one at or near Foster Island? Make sure that they are at a spacing that would allow folks who just want to walk out from the Montlake Lid and back can have a nice stroll and turn around once they arrive at one of the belvederes. One over the Arboretum waterways could be so gorgeous too!	Oct 3, 2012 10:51 AM
287	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 10:48 AM
288	agree	Oct 3, 2012 10:31 AM
289	no strong opinion	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
290	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 AM
291	Good idea, especially if there is some separation from the vehicle traffic and noise to make it a comfortable place to stop.	Oct 3, 2012 9:41 AM
292	I can see using 520 as a bicyclist, and having exits for ped and bikes for the parks veiwing areas would be nice and well used.	Oct 3, 2012 9:37 AM
293	Minimal bridge, make it disappear into the landscape.	Oct 3, 2012 9:06 AM
294	Yes but use some design elements to make it look less like every freeway in the country	Oct 3, 2012 8:34 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
295	I fear that simple and clean are architecture speak for low cost box girder monstrosity. The belvedere viewing areas are unnecessary if they are just used to justify the higher elevation to the bridge. Sound walls are a mistake because they block the view of the water from the shore and from the bridge for minimal benefit.	Oct 3, 2012 8:34 AM
296	Sounds good to me.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 AM
297	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 8:15 AM
298	I strongly support a shared use path along the SR-520 bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 8:00 AM
299	Simple is good depending on the seperation between the noise and polution from the car/truck/bus traffic and the clean users on bikes/feet/small E/Vs.	Oct 3, 2012 7:14 AM
300	I like the idea of the belvedere viewing areas. The pedestrian access under the bridge on Foster Island should also be improved compared to the current tunnel.	Oct 2, 2012 11:54 PM
301	Just beware that a viewing area will congregate a lot of pedestrians in groups, which will not go well with commuting cyclists/ It will be unsaf for all. Make sure there is no blokage of the pedestrain right of way by groups of pedestrians. Better still segregate foot trafdfic from cycling traffic.	Oct 2, 2012 11:38 PM
302	the key point should be to minimize the disruption to the foster island and surrounding areas, which are highlights of the arboretum	Oct 2, 2012 10:50 PM
303	Good	Oct 2, 2012 8:59 PM
304	I assume the orange line is a bicycle path. It appears to be direct and that is good. I use my bicycle for transportation and I want large safe (not pretty turns) bicycle paths.	Oct 2, 2012 8:52 PM
305	good idea.	Oct 2, 2012 8:31 PM
306	yes	Oct 2, 2012 8:27 PM
307	Yes!	Oct 2, 2012 5:49 PM
308	I really don't care what it looks like as long there is ped and bike facility.	Oct 2, 2012 5:35 PM
309	Provide a shared-use trail and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:20 PM
310	Viewing areas are a good idea as long as path is wide enough that all users can be accommodated on the path.	Oct 2, 2012 3:18 PM
311	As long as the shared use path remains in the design, go for it!	Oct 2, 2012 12:06 PM
312	No comment	Oct 2, 2012 11:17 AM
313	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:07 AM
314	OK	Oct 2, 2012 9:45 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
315	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 9:04 AM
316	Belvedere viewing areas will be useful for giving pedestrians and people on bikes comfortable places to stop in case they want to enjoy the views, catch their breath or repair a flat tire. Consider a small number of seats to accommodate the needs of the elderly.	Oct 2, 2012 9:02 AM
317	there needs to be a shared use path for bikers and pedestrians to cross the 520. I bike commute to kirkland and would be much more convenient to cross the 520 rather than go around the burke gilman	Oct 1, 2012 8:03 PM
318	good idea	Oct 1, 2012 7:22 PM
319	wide enough passage for bicycling across 520 is critically important	Oct 1, 2012 2:37 PM
320	seems OK; not sure what this will look like though	Oct 1, 2012 2:25 PM
321	This is great assuming this means bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path? Where is the design to include light rail? Why is this not included? Don't give me hogwash that its not possible. If you do, then your either incompetent, corrupt because you want to support the oil, gas, and auto industry, or think the public is too stupid to know any better! If Washington just doesn't want to provide these types of access then just say so and stop saying we are such a great state to visit! This is nothing more than enriching a few at the expense of many and limits a vision to leading a future!	Oct 1, 2012 1:26 PM
322	make sure there is room for rail based mass transit like light rail or mono rail. Ensure there is a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 1:20 PM
323	Very important especially for the wetlands area. Bike/ped access is a must.	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
324	Access on and off to Foster Island and environs would be innovative.	Sep 30, 2012 9:24 PM
325	Do not need viewing areas. Use funds for lid and noise reduction.	Sep 30, 2012 3:20 PM
326	I support these design elements. Incorporate north-south wildlife travel into bridge design. Belvedere(s) over the wetlands are a good idea, as important as belvederes over the lake at mid-span.	Sep 30, 2012 10:34 AM
327	Provide a restroom	Sep 30, 2012 7:27 AM
328	Bike and pedestrian way??	Sep 30, 2012 7:12 AM
329	if viewing areas are viewable from the roadway, it is imperative that screening is provided so that activities in the viewing areas (similar to distractions caused by college students climbing on fountains) can not disturb traffic flow and distract drivers.	Sep 29, 2012 11:43 PM
330	Yes	Sep 29, 2012 10:12 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

331	Simple clean but elegant and safe too please!!!!	Sep 29, 2012 9:17 PM
332	Yes.	Sep 29, 2012 7:38 PM
333	access to foster island from shared use path	Sep 29, 2012 6:24 PM
334	Please make it wide enough that people can ride quickly/safely.	Sep 29, 2012 4:49 PM
335	Sounds good.	Sep 29, 2012 4:31 PM
336	The viewing areas will be good for resting.	Sep 29, 2012 1:36 PM
337	Build a solid wall between the pedestrian/bike lane and the road. The isolation from traffic should be more robust than on the I-90 bridge, where pedestrians and cyclists deal with noise, exhaust, wind and the risk of collision with cars.	Sep 29, 2012 1:20 PM
338	Make the bridge big and strong enough to support rail transit. The bus is not working all that well.	Sep 29, 2012 10:09 AM
339	The bridge needs to be an 8 lane bridge, or at least be able to re-stripe it in the future like I-90. We need more capacity.	Sep 29, 2012 7:53 AM
340	Provide belvedere viewing areas for path.	Sep 28, 2012 10:55 PM
341	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:25 PM
342	I really like the thought of having a shared-use path to cross Lake Washington. The only other thing that needs to be added is light rail. I would love to see light rail either down the center of the vehicle lanes or better yet between the shared-use path and the vehicle lanes with access to the shared-use path.	Sep 28, 2012 9:19 PM
343	the shared use path is very important	Sep 28, 2012 9:18 PM
344	If WSDOT is going to build a 14 foot wide bike/ped lane on SR 520, costs should be helped paid for by the users.	Sep 28, 2012 5:58 PM
345	agree	Sep 28, 2012 5:53 PM
346	YES! This bridge must have a shared-use (bicycle & pedestrian) path.	Sep 28, 2012 5:11 PM
347	Shared use for bicycle commuting is very important to me and something that I would use on a daily basis.	Sep 28, 2012 5:01 PM
348	A place to pause, is nice. Sometimes there is a tire going flat or a child that needs attention on a longer crossing such as this.	Sep 28, 2012 4:19 PM
349	Sure, why not?	Sep 28, 2012 2:37 PM
350	Belvederes are a great idea. Thoughtful details can give character to a plain, fuctional design.	Sep 28, 2012 2:29 PM
351	So long as the view areas are bumped out or otherwise off the main track for cyclists who will be plentiful and probably traveling two abreast and possibly in	Sep 28, 2012 2:25 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
	excess of 15 mph.	
352	Utilitarian and ugly. Less of a bridge and more of a freeway across the water.	Sep 28, 2012 2:02 PM
353	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 2:02 PM
354	Please keep this area visually clean. The wetlands and wildlife in the area area represent the best part of my commute.	Sep 28, 2012 1:41 PM
355	I love the belvedere viewing concepts, especially because it moves gawkers/sightseers out of the line of bike and ped traffic. I don't know if this is the right place to mention it, but please don't have open areas at the bottom of the rails along the shared-use path. It's unnerving to ride and imagine your bike tires getting caught underneath somehow (as on the I-90 bridge).	Sep 28, 2012 1:26 PM
356	sounds good - make sure that trail is at least 14 ft wide!!!!!	Sep 28, 2012 12:12 PM
357	Viewing areas are good. But I wouldn't stop there.	Sep 28, 2012 11:15 AM
358	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 11:10 AM
359	Yes that would be VERY nice!	Sep 28, 2012 10:51 AM
360	Definitely include a shared-use path!!	Sep 28, 2012 9:56 AM
361	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 9:02 AM
362	Yes. Important	Sep 28, 2012 8:36 AM
363	Defiantly highest priority to have bike path. After only good vehicle connection and HOV.	Sep 28, 2012 7:34 AM
364	PRESERVE VIEWS.	Sep 28, 2012 7:06 AM
365	The shared use path is extremely important. This really needs to be a part of the bridge design.	Sep 28, 2012 6:25 AM
366	Nothing fancy needed. I-90 trail is nice, simple and very usable.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 PM
367	Viewing areas are great, just be sure that they do not impede commuter bicycle traffic by ensuring sufficient width and length for each viewing area.	Sep 27, 2012 10:56 PM
368	Yes, and clearly essential to continue the regional shared-use path all the way to I-5.	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 PM
369	provide bicycle access to east side	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 PM
370	Yay for shared use path	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 PM
371	Yes, be sure to put a path on the bridge!	Sep 27, 2012 8:17 PM
372	Yes simple, yes clean, yes simple and clean look	Sep 27, 2012 7:58 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

373	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM
374	Very very important to have shared use path.	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
375	Yes	Sep 27, 2012 6:15 PM
376	A more open feel and viewing area along the waterside of the bridge for peds and bikes would be nice. While the 90 path is great, it feel claustrophobic at times and I wish it were more offset or buffered in some way from the interstate traffic. Perhaps a higher dividing wall is all that would be needed.	Sep 27, 2012 5:48 PM
377	Do you want me to say anything negative? Simple and clean is hard to argue with.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
378	Orange is bike path? Bike path is very important. East west bike travele is very difficult at this time. More bikes = less cars.	Sep 27, 2012 5:33 PM
379	This is good	Sep 27, 2012 4:58 PM
380	Definitely have a full 14-foot shared use path as part of the design.	Sep 27, 2012 4:56 PM
381	YES	Sep 27, 2012 4:52 PM
382	Viewing area of the wetlands and surrounding areas are preferred	Sep 27, 2012 4:47 PM
383	yes, a broad cycling and pedestrian path	Sep 27, 2012 4:40 PM
384	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 4:29 PM
385	Yes, keep it simple and affordable. Match belvedere viewing areas on both ends of the bridge for coheasive design.	Sep 27, 2012 4:10 PM
386	Yes -- agree. Don't pay it lip service -- do it right. This is your legacy. Keep in mind: You must build a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
387	What in gods name is a belvedere viewing area? This is a transit project to move as many cars/bikes/peds through as quickly as possible. No viewing areas.	Sep 27, 2012 3:56 PM
388	I strongly support belvedere viewing areas - preferably as large as is feasible.	Sep 27, 2012 3:54 PM
389	ALL I care about is bicycle access. Without a car, this would be the single easiest way to get to the east side without an hour detour north or south, which prevents just about every trip!	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
390	Excellent!	Sep 27, 2012 3:47 PM
391	Yes. Included a shared use path across the bridge. Don't leave that out.	Sep 27, 2012 3:03 PM
392	Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 2:47 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

393	sounds good	Sep 27, 2012 2:43 PM
394	yes	Sep 27, 2012 2:36 PM
395	Yes!	Sep 27, 2012 2:22 PM
396	I'm less concerned with the appearance of the bridge and connections than I am with its functionality, but if this can be done with minimal impact to construction time and cost, that's nice.	Sep 27, 2012 2:17 PM
397	Viewing areas are good as long as they are designed so cyclists and pedestrians don't have conflict with thru traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 2:06 PM
398	yes	Sep 27, 2012 1:57 PM
399	I thought this was already in the design, if not, then there must be this. Otherwise. The bridge is useless to me and many others in Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
400	Do what is needed but don't delay too much. The east side is working seriously on construction and Bellevue's efficiency is putting Seattle to shame!!! Include bike path	Sep 27, 2012 1:39 PM
401	If the goal of viewing area is to not congest shared use path, well done but if just for viewing then costly for a minimal effect looking at what...the eastside???	Sep 27, 2012 1:29 PM
402	Viewing areas are less important than providing adequate width to accomodate two way pedestrian and bike traffic. The I-90 bridge between Mercer Island and Bellevue is very dangerous because it is too narrow to handle the traffic. Don't make the same mistake twice.	Sep 27, 2012 1:11 PM
403	Support. Ensure safety measures to keep peds and bikes apart at the viewing areas.	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
404	simple clean design at this point would be best.	Sep 27, 2012 12:56 PM
405	very nice, love the shared use path!	Sep 27, 2012 12:46 PM
406	Got that right	Sep 27, 2012 12:46 PM
407	yes. so glad to see the regional shared-use path! i hope this will be planned for increased future use so it doesn't become obsolete shortly after opening.	Sep 27, 2012 12:35 PM
408	Make sure viewing areas are wide enough to allow people on bikes to use viewpoint without blocking the trail. Ensure clear sight lines on downhill side of viewpoint.	Sep 27, 2012 12:16 PM
409	Nice feature.	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
410	I support this	Sep 27, 2012 12:08 PM
411	I definitely want bicycle access on the bridge. Keep going!	Sep 27, 2012 11:59 AM
412	Be sure that pedestrian/viewing areas don't create choke points for cyclists and	Sep 27, 2012 11:57 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

	runners.	
413	In favor...	Sep 27, 2012 11:43 AM
414	again only 2 dimensional view hard to tell vision.	Sep 27, 2012 11:43 AM
415	YES! Shared use path!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:42 AM
416	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:41 AM
417	yes	Sep 27, 2012 11:36 AM
418	sure.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
419	Please provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along 520.	Sep 27, 2012 11:28 AM
420	Simple and clean design sounds great. I like the pictures in the report.	Sep 27, 2012 11:26 AM
421	Yes! I am a frequent bike commuter and also ride recreationally. I think that the lack of a bike path across 520 is pretty limiting. I live in Bothell and it would be VERY nice to have a lake crossing via bike that is closer than I-90! I feel strongly that adding bicycle and pedestrian lanes is a CRITICAL aspect of any new road work as it will provide better transportation and health opportunities for years to come.	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM
422	Good idea.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
423	yes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
424	no opinion	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
425	Path needs to be wider than the I-90 path, where bikes can just barely pass safely.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
426	Please, include 14-foot bike lanes to the new design.	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM
427	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
428	This is great! Can't wait to have a bike/pedestrian path on the bridge	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
429	Shared use and/or dedicated bike lane is MANDATORY! Lack of 520 bike access has been a major problem for travel in this area, increasing car use and limiting work options for non-car-owners. If a shared-use path is created, bike lanes should be CLEARLY separated from pedestrian lanes to allow for high-speed bike travel over this long span. As bikes on a flat can exceed 30mph, a partial barrier between bike and pedestrian sections should be considered.	Sep 27, 2012 10:53 AM
430	Absolutely need shared use path of adequate width for safe 2-way biking.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
431	My highest preference is providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Sep 27, 2012 10:42 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
432	1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
433	keep it simple, keep maintenance costs in mind.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
434	Just need safe efficient bike / ped path.. pull outs for resting or repairs would be helpful and make for nice scenic viewing.	Sep 27, 2012 10:31 AM
435	Y	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
436	We should have a shared use path for pedestrians and bicycles, this will improve my daily commute to the east side from downtown seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 10:30 AM
437	Signage on the shared use path should assist in directing usage for cyclist of varying age and abilities as well as pedestrians to insure a safe environment: if there are rest/view points, they must have adequated space to not impact the need for a 14 foot multidirectional moving usage.	Sep 27, 2012 10:29 AM
438	It is critical that we have a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:26 AM
439	seems like a good idea as long as cost constraits can be met.	Sep 27, 2012 10:19 AM
440	providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
441	Looks good!	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
442	Again, stacking the lanes like in san francisco would impact less land space.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
443	Sounds good.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
444	Please do! I love the I-90 bridge, but 520 would be much more direct, better bicycle access	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
445	agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
446	Simple and clean are important but don't forget beauty. In the past Seattle has too often elevated function over beauty. We are a wealthy city; why not build monument we can be proud of for generations?	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 AM
447	Yes.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
448	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 AM
449	Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge

	Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	
450	Essential design element is the ability to safely and conveniently travel the bridge on foot and bicycle.	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
451	Again, we need at least a 14-foot wide trail. Needs to be easy to get on and off.	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
452	Great	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
453	Yeah.	Sep 27, 2012 9:53 AM
454	include a bicycle path so you can pass pedestrians prohibit dogs on the path	Sep 27, 2012 9:51 AM
455	Please make sure to design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
456	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
457	REgional shared-use path is a must.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
458	If there's any way to connect the bridge bicycle path with a safer Arboretum bicycle path (nothing currently except the extremely tight Arboretum road) that would be amazing.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
459	Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
460	SHARED USE PATH PLEASE!!!	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
461	Great	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
462	This works well. Need the shared use path.	Sep 27, 2012 9:39 AM
463	Over the past 10 years I have suggested moving the path to the south side for a myriad of reasons and no one has been able to justify the north side preference. 1. Wind: (there is also wind from the north, especially in the summer when beginners ride their bikes.) However, wind could be lifted off the bridge with a spoiler shaped handrail. 2. Rain: South winds bring heavy car mist from the road onto cyclists on I-90. I hate this. 3. Noise. A south side path could be lower than the roadway so that it is quiet, yet sunny. If it were on the north side, a lowered path would be dark, mossy, or frosty and damp. 4. Safety of path with view from road: There are zillions of paths with no view to the traffic. They are safe. We don't even want zooming cars to be looking over at cyclists since they may loose attention to the road.	Sep 27, 2012 12:32 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
464	I can't tell anything about the project from this image. What exactly is the "design preference" here? What's a belvedere viewing area?	Sep 26, 2012 11:20 AM
465	Clean design = boring and depressing...make a statement	Sep 26, 2012 11:19 AM
466	no opinion	Sep 25, 2012 8:18 PM
467	Get rid of the sentinels. Those things are against the clean simple design that has been discussed for years. Not needed and likely adds cost. If there is money to throw away, spend it on something with a measurable return.	Sep 25, 2012 9:53 AM
468	YES	Sep 25, 2012 8:53 AM
469	good	Sep 25, 2012 8:21 AM
470	Viewing areas on the bridge are great, people can take pictures and bikes can stop and get out of the way for a rest or to fix mechanical issues ... This is a long stretch and I would say keep is clean and straight and fast. Maybe add steps down to the water for people who want to jump off the bridge and then swim to the steps and do it over again. Maybe mark no jumping areas and safe to jump areas (where boats won't come under the bridge ... avoiding boats coming under the bridge seems to be the big problem for bridge jumpers, that and it's hard to get back to the bridge to jump again) so provide steps for bridge jumpers to get back up out of the water, and mark no jumping areas and "go ahead and jump" areas.	Sep 24, 2012 11:20 PM
471	Since "belvedere viewing area" is not even generally described (or defined) either in this document or Chapter 5 of the report, comment is impossible.	Sep 24, 2012 6:29 PM
472	A bike route across the 520 bridge will make many destinations possible that are now impractical. Like the I-90 bridge bike path, it will be so loud you can't hear yourself think, but the ability to get to Bellveue without having to go thru Kenmore will be worth it. I don't get the viewing areas...	Sep 24, 2012 6:10 PM
473	As with the Portage Bay section, I think that options more visually striking than the current concrete causeway should be considered.	Sep 24, 2012 12:52 PM
474	Wonderful idea.	Sep 24, 2012 12:16 PM
475	Great Idea.	Sep 24, 2012 12:06 PM
476	It is very important to include a shared use path, so the connection from the Eastside to Seattle is complete.	Sep 24, 2012 12:03 PM
477	yes for shared use path	Sep 23, 2012 2:42 PM
478	Yes, the bridge should blend into the environment as there is so much to be viewed in this area - the renderings look good from the Laurelhurst and Madison park viewpoints - an improvement over the current structure, even though the bridge will be higher.	Sep 23, 2012 8:21 AM
479	yes, viewing areas would be great for views, but also for providing rest areas on what will be a long stretch of pathway	Sep 22, 2012 12:37 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
480	Shared path is required and should be smooth as possible. The shared path on I-90 is too rough. The shared path on the East Channel bridge is unacceptable.	Sep 22, 2012 12:32 PM
481	agree. simple design, minimize visual distraction. bikes and peds will stop to view on path so belvedere viewing areas will both encourage use and increase safety. it's an issue on the 90 dual-use trail.	Sep 22, 2012 10:09 AM
482	This would be an outstanding way to create attractions without slowing traffic down.	Sep 22, 2012 2:43 AM
483	Yes, a simple and clean structural design should be used for this bridge.	Sep 21, 2012 3:44 PM
484	Please consider traffic noise mitigation.	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
485	Great.	Sep 20, 2012 3:17 PM
486	Yes, mitigate traffic impact on these important wetlands	Sep 20, 2012 10:37 AM
487	Sounds good guys. Keep up the good work!	Sep 19, 2012 3:23 PM
488	Sounds good.	Sep 18, 2012 12:21 PM
489	seems reasonable.	Sep 18, 2012 11:51 AM
490	OK	Sep 17, 2012 9:30 PM
491	Yes, definitely	Sep 17, 2012 5:18 PM
492	Belvedere viewing areas are not required.	Sep 17, 2012 4:48 PM
493	I like this idea	Sep 17, 2012 4:39 PM
494	Don't make it look like I90. that is so huge...no pedestrians want to be on it or near it. you can't even have a conversation next to people. strive for as little noise as possible. I90 is a mess!! Except for the top parks like the soccer field on top - that is great design.	Sep 17, 2012 10:01 AM
495	Support	Sep 17, 2012 6:15 AM
496	Some Laurelhurst residents opoose the lighted Beledere, but it is a new welcoming of departing signal for users of the 520. Perhaps the light could be turned off after 11pm as a respose to their opposition? The need is to have a lower profile design the bridge from north and south neighborhoods appears in the report on Page 40 to be sleeker than the existing bridge.	Sep 16, 2012 4:37 PM
497	Yes, simple and clean structural design with no big bulky structures. Belvedere viewing areas are fine, should be very simple and not over designed or bulky structures as well.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
498	as little impact as possible on the natural landscape. No need for grandous design move.	Sep 16, 2012 9:18 AM
499	bridge should be beautifully engineered - emphasize lightness in appearance	Sep 16, 2012 7:26 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
	over heaviness	
500	Good.	Sep 16, 2012 2:28 AM
501	Problem with this section of the bridge is that it is way too high off the water. Such a large section does not need to be elevated for such a long stretch. It will destroy the look and feel from the shoreline with this large massive structure running 30 feet or so off the water line. Bring the bridge back down to the water line like it is now so it won't look so out of proportion.	Sep 15, 2012 9:30 PM
502	Places to stop, rest and enjoy the view are essential to a user-friendly pedestrian and bike facility that can be used by people of all ages and abilities. Children and people with limited mobility will use this facility if they can take it in chunks! Also consider mitigating the noise and pollution created by bridge traffic.	Sep 15, 2012 8:38 PM
503	Places to stop, rest and enjoy the view are critical to a functional shared-use path. Please also consider separation of pedestrians and bicycles, and minimizing impact of traffic noise and exhaust.	Sep 15, 2012 8:13 PM
504	Like, but is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520?	Sep 15, 2012 7:51 PM
505	It'd be nice if we could bury the roadway entirely, but I suppose we're long past that point in the design process by now	Sep 15, 2012 6:13 PM
506	I like the easy grade of 0.7%. This compares very favorably to the I-90 bridge!	Sep 15, 2012 1:38 PM
507	See previous comments. Bike/ped path needs to be wide, and have islands/peninsulas every XXX feet so people can stop, enjoy the view, and be out of the way. Why does the bridge here need to look very different from what we have today? Just make it wider! And TALL enough so at least smaller vessels can pass underneath.	Sep 15, 2012 1:01 PM
508	Take what ever land you need to enhance the free flow of motor vehicles through the area and physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. Lots of BIG trees. Do what is required to get a good design built for a reasonable amount of money, but WHATEVER YOU DO, make sure it is wide enough to accommodate 2 full lanes of traffic, AND in addition, a HOV/Transit late, AND on and off ramps. IF you add light rail, DO NOT take any of these lanes, design the thing so that it can accommodate the addition of light rail without reducing ANY pedestrian, bike, or motor vehicle, or transit/HOV lanes. This may require more width than some people want - but WHY would you build something that would no accommodate the volume of traffic that is already there?	Sep 15, 2012 12:33 PM
509	PKEASE DINT STICK BLUE LIGHTED SENTINELS OUT IN MIDDLE LAKE ON WESTSIDE. WE HAVE BEAUTIFUL MOUNTAINS TO SEE - uninterrupted PLEASE.	Sep 15, 2012 11:28 AM
510	Seattle has needed this pedestrian link for some time.	Sep 15, 2012 10:58 AM
511	Pedestrian/bicycle features very important	Sep 15, 2012 1:21 AM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
512	Many residents of Madison Park area depend on the Lake Washington boulevard ramp to 520 for daily commute to Bellevue. The elimination of this exit ramp would be devastating to the area and increase congestion through Montlake, which will always be congested no matter what improvements are made. The traffic through montlake includes University district, Laurelhurst, Windermere and the UW. Redirecting all of the traffic to Madison Park area through Montlake would be a disaster. Please do not overlook this important consideration (traffic and congestion) which outweighs all other considerations.	Sep 15, 2012 12:20 AM
513	Please do NOT change the Lake Washington Boulevard exit. This ramp is key to preventing further congestion in montlake area (which is already terrible at all times of day). Madison Park residents use the Lake Washington Boulevard exit preferentially and losing this ramp would only increase congestion in Montlake, despite plans to widen roads.	Sep 15, 2012 12:10 AM
514	Approve.	Sep 14, 2012 5:55 PM
515	This is ideal.	Sep 14, 2012 5:54 PM
516	Use Classicism designers to help you understand timeless design. Quit screwing around with engineers.	Sep 14, 2012 5:39 PM
517	Sounds great. Build it so that people who are biking and walking can co-exist happily.	Sep 14, 2012 5:21 PM
518	yes. Smaller footprint is usually better.	Sep 14, 2012 4:37 PM
519	I like the more prominent architectural features of the design concepts shown at some of the earlier open houses. The belvedere viewing areas would provide a good chance for a tired bicyclist or one with a flat tire or other mechanical problem to take refuge away from the faster flowing bikes	Sep 14, 2012 3:50 PM
520	The design has dropped the "sentinels." Good. Construction on Foster Island should take extra care to preserve the trees and provide replacements for those removed or damages. Foster Island is very important for our bird colonoies.	Sep 14, 2012 3:25 PM
521	Sounds fine. I like the idea of viewing areas. They could be used to rest after riding/walking as well as providing interim destinations for walkers/bikers using the bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 2:05 PM
522	OK	Sep 14, 2012 2:04 PM
523	A shared use path would be great but at what cost?	Sep 14, 2012 1:57 PM
524	I don't totally understand the difference. Not sure what belvedere viewing is.	Sep 14, 2012 1:55 PM
525	OK	Sep 14, 2012 1:50 PM
526	sounds perfect, keep it clean and provide those viewing platforms	Sep 14, 2012 1:32 PM
527	Okay.	Sep 14, 2012 1:19 PM
528	No need for viewing areas from the bridge as the entire trip across the bridge will	Sep 14, 2012 1:11 PM

Page 6, Q1. Preference 16: Bridge design: Work toward a simple and clean structural design; include belvedere viewing areas for the regional shared-use path on the north side of the bridge		
	be a great veiw.	
529	yes please	Sep 14, 2012 12:43 PM
530	Top priority. This would be great!	Sep 14, 2012 12:25 PM
531	Yes	Sep 14, 2012 12:16 PM
532	Just make traffic flow. Focus on the traffic more and less about the looks and viewing areas.	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
533	no design will please Madison Park	Sep 14, 2012 12:01 PM
534	Yes.	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
535	Yes, sounds good. ... when can we put in lightrail though??	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
536	yes agree and love the idea of belvedere viewing areas	Sep 14, 2012 11:59 AM
537	Yes. Why do you use terms like "belvedere"? Speak to your audience and leave engineer-speak out of it - this only shows your lack of connection and understanding of the real public.	Sep 14, 2012 11:10 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

1	These are great goals that I absolutely support. I unfortunately do not see them applied to the design of the Montlake lid, Montlake Blvd East corridor, or the Portage Bay Bridge continuation of the 520 regional use trail. I urge WSDOT to apply these goals to every aspect of the project, and especially those I have pointed out.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	These are the right goals	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 PM
3	Biking is important - over the distances concerned biking is the most efficient option - especially with e-bikes on the horizon as a major mode - preserves much of the health benefits while extending range	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 PM
4	Good goals, but I'm seeing a beautiful rendering that doesn't address "utility" -- and that should be a goal as well. While there are lots of ways to make it nice for peds, as you've shown in the rendering, I want to keep harping on this theme that this is a major bike connection from Bellevue to Seattle and from UW, Mad Park, Montlake etc over the Portage Bay bridge bike path to downtown, South Lke Union, Cascade, Eastlake, etc; as such it needs to have a separated bike lane that supports volume and provides safety for bikes, doesn't impact auto traffic, and meets safety goals by being separated from ped traffic. Separate bike lanes supports 5 of the 6 stated goal and adds important 'utility'.	Oct 5, 2012 11:05 PM
5	Keep in mind that bicycle numbers will likely continue to rise into the future, even if it is Seattle. A good design will anticipate this sort of thing.	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 PM
6	The goals are good. Here in Montlake, we had some ideas for you to achieve these goals. Please listen to us know as we strive particularly for strengthening not weakening our neighborhood, particularly in access, mobility, beauty, quality of life for current residents. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
7	Economic justice (access for users of all incomes, improved affordable mobility for all. Not too much green space,needs to be balanced with economic activity.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 PM
8	Those goals sound fine, I might add equity, because it's important to make sure you are providing facilities for users with all types of mobility, with a similar level of convenience.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 PM
9	Great goals. Let's see results.	Oct 5, 2012 8:35 PM
10	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on	Oct 5, 2012 7:47 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
11	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 7:22 PM
12	Sounds good at a high level. I think designing the non-motorized connections for easier surface quality maintenance is a good thing - we have seen Multi-Use Trails suffer from degradation due to poor selection of trees and paved surfaces. By the way, paved surfaces are far, far superior to gravel surfaces. The design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect	Oct 5, 2012 6:15 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	adherence to the stated goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without an adequate understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 which should not be its primary purpose. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want	
13	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 5:43 PM
14	How about making the goal about moving people not cars!	Oct 5, 2012 5:18 PM
15	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 4:45 PM
16	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 4:45 PM
17	sometimes ADA rules at the expense of bikes. There is no need to make sharp	Oct 5, 2012 4:21 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	turns on the path, keep minimum radius at 25 feet.	
18	I think they are very important goals and should remain primary, especially for such a project that will have a large and long-term impact on the area.	Oct 5, 2012 4:16 PM
19	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:10 PM
20	The goals are good, and the design is a good start, though it needs significantly more work. In particular, a trail needs to be included on the Portage Bay Bridge. That way, the trail coming across 520 from Redmond continues from Montlake to Capitol Hill and beyond rather than dead-ending in Montlake. Also, the lid design needs work. A lid is so much more than a screen (and dead space) - it's also a space for creating pedestrian-bicycle connections among neighborhoods and providing other recreational activities. This lid should be a green and multi-modal hub. Take a look at some of the parks-atop-water reservoir lids in Seattle. Also, pedestrian-bicycle connections should be in the open and in expansive areas, rather than crammed underneath 520 or into cramped areas like the access to Bill Dawson.	Oct 5, 2012 3:44 PM
21	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
22	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic	Oct 5, 2012 3:36 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	(owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
23	Great! add well -lit, which may fall under safety.	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM
24	The goal for non-motorized connections are great, but they need to be realized with a non-trivial commitment to actually build infrastructure for bike/ped/transit users. We need safe and efficient routes, not just paint and platitudes!	Oct 5, 2012 3:28 PM
25	They cannot come at the expense of automobile traffic which is the primary purpose of the bridge and facilitates the transit of people and products into and out of the greater area.	Oct 5, 2012 3:25 PM
26	I strongly support these goals.	Oct 5, 2012 3:24 PM
27	OK	Oct 5, 2012 3:18 PM
28	Reduce car/bike interactions as much as possible	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
29	Goog goals, but the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd. E. does not adhere to the goals. I note that the City Council just voted against the 2nd Montlake drawbridge. The lid as conceived will hids SR-520, but am not sure it will do much else.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
30	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:06 PM
31	Please have it provide connections from the east side all the way to South Lake Union and Downtown Seattle.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
32	this is very important.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

33	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
34	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to	Oct 5, 2012 2:58 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
35	I support these goals, but I don't think the Montlake lid design meets them very well. It looks like the 520 interchange was expanded for auto traffic, hidden with a lid, and then bicycle/ped facilities were shoehorned in around the edges. The hairpin ramp access to the Bill Dawson trail and associated tunnel is an example of this, as are the token shared-use on the paths on the lid that do little but link crosswalks together. I would like to see a design that recognizes that the area is a focal point for all modes of traffic. If any mode is to be favored in a new design, it's hard to imagine why it's auto traffic given that traffic volumes fell drastically with the advent of 520 tolling, and the trend line for auto traffic regionally is flat or falling over the past several years.	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
36	Good start.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
37	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:36 PM
38	The goals are good BUT the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd. East Corridor does NOT reflect adherence to the goals. It is disappointing because members of the community have taken the time to carefully convey the importance of pedestrian and bicycle traffic SAFETY in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of Seattle. The proposed design does not create a space for safe, efficient, and direct pedestrian and bicycle crossings, nor does it connect the neighborhoods safely. Please take the time to listen to the needs of the residents, understand the multi-modal traffic patterns in this area, and include them in the design!!!	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
39	Critically important.	Oct 5, 2012 2:33 PM
40	They are all important, but in particular "access" and "safety." To ensure access, please make sure that the regional trail connects to other infrastructure. Please don't just abandon it in Montlake. Please, please connect it all the way to Roanoke so that we can have safe access from the East Side, Montlake, and the U-district to Capitol Hill and Downtown.	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM
41	Good goals. Worth extra money.	Oct 5, 2012 2:22 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

42	The goals are well-intentioned but designs seem to fall short. We need to have more focus on how to design paths for automobile, transit, and most especially pedstrian and bicycle traffic that works for each of them. The lid is not quite there yet... it seems to just be a cover of the 520 bridge rather than a great opportunity to connect neighborhoods.	Oct 5, 2012 2:15 PM
43	Sounds fine. Building a bridge without planning for mixed use (bike + peds) would be ludicrous and short-sighted.	Oct 5, 2012 1:57 PM
44	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 1:57 PM
45	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile,	Oct 5, 2012 1:49 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
46	The goals as stated in the page 16 vision statement are admirable. More consideration needs to be given to achieving these goals with respect to safe and efficient connections for transit and especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city.	Oct 5, 2012 1:16 PM
47	I would put health and safety first. add connectivity to access and mobility. Love to see character and clarity (I'm assuming this includes wayfinding)	Oct 5, 2012 1:13 PM
48	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 1:10 PM
49	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
50	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting	Oct 5, 2012 12:52 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	
51	Goals should be to reconnect the neighborhood by allowing for bikes and peds to cross I-5 without auto traffic of any kind impeding their pathways. This needs more work. There is too much traffic routed into this area, not safe for peds and bikes. Need a complete redesign adhearing to goals that truly reflect the community desires and needs and to address the increased bikes with particular attention to how people use this area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
52	Those are good goals. Traffic will not suddenly decrease in the future. As population and traffic grows, people now - and more importantly in the future - need safe ways to bike and walk to get to their destinations. With the light rail station, the Husky stadium reopening, and all the other various commuting and recreation that draws cyclists and pedestrians north/south/east/west along 520, having safe options, separated from cars, is important. Items such as a shared use trail along the future portage bay bridge. It is much harder to obviously redesign these items in the future - now is the time to design it right. reiterating the importance of (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 PM
53	Forget the bicycle and pedestrian connections. It's too expensive for the few people who would use it. Spend the bridge money to improve access and safety for autos. This is a bridge project, not an urban renewal project.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
54	Great goals, and the current plan is a poor implementation. Needs a lot more work, with bike/ped travel seen as equivalent to cars, needing separation and protection.	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
55	Sound utopian enough to me.	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
56	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
57	too expensive	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
58	The goals are good but further implementation is needed. A better separation of bicycle and motorized traffic will provide a better traffic flow for both types.	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
59	Its about time Seattle became a world-class city in the sense of bringing its transportation infrastructure up to the latest standards. People should be able to get from downtown to Sea-Tac without a personal vehicle or cab, and without walking more than a total of 100 yds. Similarly, there should exist the option of continuing a bike ride or pedestrian stroll on a bus or tram. We can't be a world-class city so long as the automobile dominates our transportation plans.	Oct 5, 2012 12:30 PM
60	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 12:25 PM
61	These are key to fostering good commute patterns that reduce our traffic congestion while improving the experience and safety of alternative commuters.	Oct 5, 2012 12:25 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

62	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
63	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

64	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
65	Goals are good - we need to optimize for and encourage non motorized or mass transit in these areas and ensure residents can enter and exit in safety.	Oct 5, 2012 12:18 PM
66	Design such shared use paths with clear separation form auto and bus traffic corridors.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
67	The goals for access, mobility, health (environmental), and safety are excellent. It is not clear at all what 'character' and 'clarity' mean. Everything has character. Few things have clarity. 'Character' and 'clarity' are public relations words, not goals. "Character' in whose judgement? 'Clarity' to which persons? Focus more on what things 'do' and rather than on preconceptions about how they should 'look'.	Oct 5, 2012 12:05 PM
68	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?	Oct 5, 2012 12:03 PM
69	My belief is that access to Cap Hill and downtown from the new bridge by bicycle traffic needs to be extended. It makes no sense to dead-end the trail in Montlake. Continue/improve the ability to bike all the way to Cap Hill from Portage Bay/UW/Montlake.	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM
70	Remind vehicles that there are going to be interferences to disrupt their their motoring.	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
71	I strongly support these goals, though there should also be a clause discussing the financing, budgeting and time table of the project.	Oct 5, 2012 11:48 AM
72	Again, make sure that bike flow is not impeded. Both figures of your design concept below show bikers walking their bikes in order to not collide with pedestrians. This doesn't seem well thought out. Bikers will not take a route if it means that they will have to walk their bikes or if there are too many lights and stops. They will always find the least obstructive path and take that instead.	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
73	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, and noise pollution.Thousands of cars move north and south on Montlake Blvd. each day between homes, business and 520. The lid doesn't seem to do anything to separate the people on foot and bike form all these cars. What if only one lane of vehicle traffic in each direction actually crossed Montlake and the other lanes were 520-only entrance lanes? How many cars are actually crossing over the freeway at peak tiimes? The removal of the Lake Washington ramps further exacerbates the traffic through this area. It needs to re-thought	
74	a bike path across 520 would provide enhanced bike-commuting and recreation opportunites for seattle and bellevue residents. this path should be wide enough, and protected from traffic to ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians	Oct 5, 2012 11:35 AM
75	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 11:33 AM
76	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never	Oct 5, 2012 11:25 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
77	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 11:22 AM
78	Excellent. Should be requirements instead of goals.	Oct 5, 2012 11:22 AM
79	We absolutely need a shared use path for bicycle and peds.	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
80	Very important goals.	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM
81	build to promote bike use on trail - that will be main constituency group using the shared trail (see I-90 use for likely users).	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 AM
82	I can hardly believe better cycling facilities have not been included in the plan. Look at the trend: bicycling is growing as people become frustrated with car and bus transit. More bicycles will reduce the need for larger motorized facilities.	Oct 5, 2012 11:04 AM
83	fine goals	Oct 5, 2012 11:01 AM
84	Great	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

85	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
86	I would like to see more, and this includes safer, bike and pedestrian options be made available.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
87	Goals The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
88	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 10:36 AM
89	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 10:23 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

90	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
91	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
92	I think we could do well to emulate and improve on Portland's infrastructure. There is a large pool of existing shared-use paths to take ideas from.	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
93	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
94	The MPCC believes that these Goals are great, but questions whether the Plan for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor meets them. We support the Central Seattle Greenways comments about this part of the Plan.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
95	These are worthy goals.	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
96	Completely agree. But don't leave out commuting by bike as a key option. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don’t know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each “preference”. I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can’t afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 AM
97	Support	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
98	I think the goal for bicycle and possibly pedestrian access should only be for crossing Lake Washington, not Portage Bay, too. Bicyclists and pedestrians can easily get from Montlake to downtown on surface routes. The additional width required from Montlake to I-5 is not worth the other costs.	Oct 5, 2012 10:10 AM
99	Please continue working to improve bicycle and pedestrian connections; the	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	existing proposals are not sufficient. More emphasis on non-motorized connections is needed, especially the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor .	
100	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM
101	No funding should go to bicycle planning. This is a reckless and dangerous form of transportation, which should be banned.	Oct 5, 2012 9:51 AM
102	These are critical goals. Nonmotorized connections are key to making our tax-payer funded road network actually function for all citizens. This is a major opportunity to reduce auto-dependence by making it possible for people to move themselves between important, popular locations by foot, bicycle or bus.	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM
103	I agree with the goals as stated. Balanced with cost and functional efficiency	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
104	Glad to hear these connectivity aspects are being strongly considered for bridge design. Shared use path is critical for 520 corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
105	I-5 makes a giant pedestrian dead zone in middle of our city right now. I like these goals.	Oct 5, 2012 9:35 AM
106	As I wrote earlier, make it efficient, easy and comfortable to walk or ride cycles, to decrease vehicular traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 9:32 AM
107	Okay	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
108	Shouldn't these be the goals of every urban traffic development? It wasn't done 50 years ago, but can be implemented today.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
109	I support these goals.	Oct 5, 2012 9:29 AM
110	Waste of money. Just improve and maintain roads properly and cyclists will have a better experience. People don't walk there. Pedestrian traffic is light because there is not a reason to walk there. No shops or other things that people will actually walk for.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
111	That is the goal of the SCDP, but that is not the goal of the SR-520 project. Make	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	this the goal of the SR-520 project and actually invest in health, safety, and non-motorized infrastructure.	
112	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 9:05 AM
113	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
114	This is one of the weakest aspects of the project. The Montlake lid needs to be more than a simple "lid" that covers SR520. It has the potential of becoming a big unsafe congested mess of pedestrians, cars, cyclists and commuters. I am not reassured that the current designs will prevent his outcome. Investing in optimal solutions here is critical.	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM
115	Goal should include separation of bicycles and pedestrians	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM
116	Paths should connect in a network and connections should be fast	Oct 5, 2012 8:52 AM
117	The goals are good and appropriate.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
118	The goals are admirable, and you're on the right path. I'd like to see more thought on bike and pedestrian access and connections integrated into the design and not stuck on as an afterthought.	Oct 5, 2012 8:42 AM
119	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 5, 2012 8:07 AM
120	I think these goals are great, but it's not clear to me that the lid's current design takes into account the way the community actually uses the existing infrastructure. The design is beautiful and I can see a lot of thought has gone into it, but I feel like a little more consideration could lead to a layout that better conforms to the needs of locals. The Montlake multimodal hub must connect the 520 bus station, UW light rail station, UW campus, Burke Gilman Trail, SR520 trail to the Eastside, new Arboretum Trail, and the Portage Bay Bridge Trail.	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
121	These are good goals. I would add the goal of minimizing user conflict between bicycles and pedestrians on the paths.	Oct 5, 2012 7:55 AM
122	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally,	Oct 5, 2012 7:45 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
123	Access and safety are the most important. Character is a nice to have, but people will use it if safety is prioritized.	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
124	Absolutely agree	Oct 5, 2012 7:34 AM
125	these are very vague. This is an urban freeway running through a park. The onus is on WSDOT to be more respectful than the last time it built this freeway.	Oct 5, 2012 7:24 AM
126	Too much rhetoric. We're talking about a bike path. No need to over-think it.	Oct 5, 2012 7:12 AM
127	Instead of integrating bikes with cars, the goal should be integrating bikes with pedestrians, keeping pedestrians and bikes off the roard. Major cities around the world have larger sidewalks that safely accomodate bikers and walkers (much like the burke gilman trail	Oct 5, 2012 7:11 AM
128	I like the goals, and they make wonderful sense.	Oct 5, 2012 6:57 AM
129	good you have nonmotorized connections but lets not forget there are others.	Oct 5, 2012 6:54 AM
130	The goals are great. The project design to date does not meet them. These goals need to be applied across the entire project length and to transitions and connections throughout and at either end.	Oct 5, 2012 6:14 AM
131	They sound fantastic and needed for future growth and happiness of our local community	Oct 5, 2012 5:44 AM
132	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will	Oct 5, 2012 5:39 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
133	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 5:24 AM
134	Ok	Oct 5, 2012 5:14 AM
135	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of	Oct 5, 2012 4:59 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you /// For a significant amount of background material supporting these preferences as well as a detailed map, please see: http://centralseattlegreenways.com/2012/10/we-need-your-help-sr520-portage-bay-bridge-trail/	
136	Sounds good to me!	Oct 5, 2012 4:04 AM
137	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution.	Oct 5, 2012 12:56 AM
138	I strongly support these goals given the importance in developing alternate forms of transportation and ensuring the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.	Oct 5, 2012 12:27 AM
139	All important goals.	Oct 5, 2012 12:05 AM
140	Goals sound good. Stick to them!	Oct 4, 2012 11:24 PM
141	I am in line with these goals. We need to make non-motorized passage the most attractive for a wide swath of users.	Oct 4, 2012 11:03 PM
142	The goals are good, but the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 10:47 PM
143	The return on investment should also be considered. Because of the low wear and tear of bike and pedestrian traffic, the lifespan of these paths is much longer than that of the roads, so the annualized cost over the lifetime of the non-motorized paths is many times lower than that for the motorized paths.	Oct 4, 2012 10:36 PM
144	The path needs to go all the way to I-5. There should be no blind turns in the Bill Dawson trail. The law requires a robust connection to the Burke Gilman trail. This should be honored.	Oct 4, 2012 10:23 PM
145	I think it is very important to create something with the least impact on the environment. I also think that it must be built with special consideration for cyclist and pedestrians. Anything we can do make it more accessible is better!	Oct 4, 2012 10:08 PM
146	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
147	There is still the question of air quality that will exist within 300 meters SR-520. WSDOT has never measured the air quality in these hot spot zones. There is already a higher level of asthma in Montlake.	Oct 4, 2012 9:54 PM
148	As a motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Removing the Arboretum ramps will lead to less access and mobility in the Montlake area and extremely heavy/backed up traffic on the 24th Ave. and on Montlake Blvd.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 PM
149	Need easy access, safety (minimal homeless, violence, crimes, well lit), good sightlines, visually pleasing (greenery, etc). As for maintainence, many of the local parks are a pride and maintained through neighborhood work parties, even if only for major annual work.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 PM
150	The goals should be extended to include nonmotorized connections to the east side of lake washington by means of a 14 foot wide mixed use trail. Existence of a mixed use trail across Lake Washington would encourage alternate modes of transportation during the week and provide for additional recreational options on the weekend.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
151	i think this is an admirable goal. walkable cities are a necessity not a luxury.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
152	Additional bike and pedestrian pathways will benefit the city	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 PM
153	Use common sense in separating cars, pedestrians, and bicycles. It's clear to me that we will see increased mixed-mode bike-bus and bike-lightrail ridership and we need to encourage riders to do so. Nobody likes dealing with a bike in congested areas, so avoid too much mixing of bikes and pedestrians near bus loading and lightrail station areas.	Oct 4, 2012 9:28 PM
154	I'm all for these goals, a major problem is that they've been ignored with respect to the Montlake area. The ped/bike paths are shoved in and around the cars.	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	Look at how much foot traffic attractive areas generate, the current plans will not generate that traffic as people will feel uncomfortable and confused.	
155	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
156	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution.	Oct 4, 2012 9:10 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
157	The goals are great, but they do not seem fully reflected in the current design. Pedestrians and cyclists need safe, direct, and unimpeded routes that provide easy through passage away from cars and buses. Further, if these public spaces are to be used and enjoyed, they need to be easily accessible from all sides, and, again, safely protected from car and bus traffic. The various users should not be crowded and crossing paths, as that makes the experience unpleasant and unsafe for all and will lead to "dead," unused space.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
158	I support these goals. Additionally, there should be more independent non-motorized infrastructure. Improve physical barriers.	Oct 4, 2012 9:02 PM
159	These goals are so very important to the health of our citizens and the livability of our city. Thank you.	Oct 4, 2012 8:52 PM
160	Keep them going	Oct 4, 2012 8:40 PM
161	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally,	Oct 4, 2012 8:20 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
162	As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle.	Oct 4, 2012 8:09 PM
163	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
164	There should be a goal to make the new bicycle infrastructure first-class in quality. As a major bicycle thoroughfare, it should have priority treatments at intersections with minor roads, and an equal treatment with major roads.	Oct 4, 2012 7:53 PM
165	met!	Oct 4, 2012 7:49 PM
166	I support these goals but would add attractiveness of the connectors and openness to create clear visual corridors to enhance safety.	Oct 4, 2012 7:48 PM
167	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 7:23 PM
168	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger	Oct 4, 2012 6:58 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
169	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
170	use tax payer money and tolls only for what is required -there are many esisiting areas close by for cyclists and pedestrians	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
171	Designing safe pedestrian and bicycle connections at the Montlake/24th/520 interchange is critical not only for user of the planned 520 multi-use path, but also for regular commuters from Capitol HIll/Montlake to the U District.	Oct 4, 2012 5:26 PM
172	These sound great. Adding high density housing and some commercial space to the area would also be a good goal. It would help making non-motorized transport more possible by allowing shorter commutes.	Oct 4, 2012 5:21 PM
173	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
174	separate bikes from ped traffic	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
175	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 5:10 PM
176	I believe that to move this city forward we need to accommodate everybody. This includes pedestrians and bicycles. Seattle people are very outdoorsy, they excersice and I believe that if you make our city more enjoyable, more people would want to come and live here and make this a even greater city. And this is not even mentioning the health benefits that excersice brings.	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
177	Yes - I try to use bike commuting and am blocked consistently by I5	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
178	The goals are good, but the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. The design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you!	Oct 4, 2012 4:52 PM
179	Goals are good but design for the Montlake lid and entire Montlake Blvd. E. corridor does not show adherence to the goals. The design team apparently does not have a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and ship canal. It is imperative that there by safe routes for pedestrians, very much including school children, and bicyclists, especially on the West side of Montlake Blvd.	Oct 4, 2012 4:45 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

180	These goals reflect my priorities.	Oct 4, 2012 4:40 PM
181	Great idea. North Capital Hill in particular is too cut-off from Roanoke and Eastlake and vice versus. Where this could really be solved by building parks and lids over the freeways that truly connect the neighborhoods	Oct 4, 2012 4:11 PM
182	Of critical importance.	Oct 4, 2012 4:07 PM
183	goals are allright, but missing goal is frugality of construction and maintainance. We do not need lots of new artificial public space to maintain while noone uses it.	Oct 4, 2012 3:43 PM
184	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
185	I support these goals	Oct 4, 2012 3:31 PM
186	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 3:21 PM
187	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of	Oct 4, 2012 3:20 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
188	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 3:17 PM
189	All of these goals are good, but without actively putting all modes of transportation (walking, biking, cars, transit, commercial traffic) on EQUAL footing nonmotorized connectivity will suffer.	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
190	he goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
191	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale	Oct 4, 2012 3:06 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
192	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot	Oct 4, 2012 2:49 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	(especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
193	Good goals. Anything that includes cyclists and peds in planning is good with me!	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM
194	Good goals.	Oct 4, 2012 2:26 PM
195	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you.	Oct 4, 2012 2:23 PM
196	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you /// For a significant amount of background material supporting these preferences as well as a detailed map, please see: http://centralseattlegreenways.com/2012/10/we-need-your-help-sr520-portage-bay-bridge-trail/	Oct 4, 2012 1:57 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

197	It would further these goals a lot if you had a solid plan for the bike connection from the Burke-Gilman Trail to the 520 bike path, and communicated that plan. These are fine goals, but they need to move up on the overall project priority list.	Oct 4, 2012 1:56 PM
198	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 1:44 PM
199	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints.	Oct 4, 2012 1:38 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want.	
200	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 1:26 PM
201	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete	Oct 4, 2012 1:09 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
202	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 1:04 PM
203	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 1:04 PM
204	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of	Oct 4, 2012 12:52 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
205	Residents along the corridor and their protection should have priority	Oct 4, 2012 12:50 PM
206	The goals are good. Emphasis on noise reduction, the largest lid possible and reuniting the neighborhood while creating a safe efficient space for pedestirans and bicycle crossings.	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM
207	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you /// For a significant amount of background material supporting these preferences as well as a detailed map, please see: http://centralseattlegreenways.com/2012/10/we-need-your-help-sr520-portage-bay-bridge-trail/	Oct 4, 2012 12:41 PM
208	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the	Oct 4, 2012 12:24 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you -Greg	
209	he goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 12:20 PM
210	Right now it needs more work. It seems like the current design is just a cosmetic cover to hide the bridge, I want more done to ensure the best possible amount of mobility for pedestrians and cyclists through the area, in a way that maintains neighborhood connections.	Oct 4, 2012 12:18 PM
211	Yes, but also using good judgement about costs associated with obtaining these goals.	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM
212	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 12:14 PM
213	Only through increasing nonmotorized connections will we be able to give people more options in their commute and reduce the dependency on cars as a primary source of commuting!	Oct 4, 2012 12:13 PM
214	Good goals, especially those with integrating with the existing Bike and Transit master plans.	Oct 4, 2012 12:13 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

215	community integrity should be a specific goal.	Oct 4, 2012 12:08 PM
216	Access and mobility is key. Clarity of pathways will lead to good mobility. Safety and character will result from use.	Oct 4, 2012 12:05 PM
217	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
218	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
219	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire	Oct 4, 2012 12:01 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
220	Although I live in North Capitol Hill, I support the Montlake lid idea to help this neighborhood feel more like a neighborhood and less like a freeway.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
221	Overall, I think the goal are great.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
222	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
223	The goals as stated are good, but the designs, specifically for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. corridor do not live up to the goals. The lid needs to do more than just hide SR 520.	Oct 4, 2012 11:48 AM
224	Goals are great! I think though that this is a really challenging area and ultimate priority should be given to improving bike/ped/transit experience. This is a place where many, many Seattlites are walking/biking/connecting on transit. I just don't quite see a cohesive picture of that in this survey and am worried that the plan doesn't address it as specifically as it might.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
225	See prior comments, please	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
226	More thought as to how to increase pedestrian and bicycle mobility between the neighborhoods, rather than just throwing down a park and covering up the 520 interchange.	Oct 4, 2012 11:35 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

227	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
228	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
229	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 11:27 AM
230	Good goals! Maybe take comfort and aesthetic quality into account.	Oct 4, 2012 11:11 AM
231	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 11:10 AM
232	I own our home a half mile from the highway and strongly support these goals.	Oct 4, 2012 11:03 AM
233	All goals are great, and I would add "keep noise down" as much as possible. I fear this design will do nothing to minimize the noise from I-5 while crossing I-5 - it is 'lethal'.	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
234	This sounds nice but I have no idea what outcomes you will use to measure the success of your goals. I see no point in specifying goals without a clear idea of what you think would achieve them. For example safety of bikes does not mean a painted "sharrow." Real safety means a fully separated bike lane that has barriers between moving cars AND parked cars.	Oct 4, 2012 10:09 AM
235	I encourage an attempt at harmonizing the the path with the bicycle master plans (when they exist) of the cities the path will traverse.	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

236	The goals are good, but the design needs work to meet the goals	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
237	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 4, 2012 9:24 AM
238	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange,	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportation and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
239	Forget about anything but motor vehicles! You people seem to think that we have endless money to build facilities that will be used by hardly anyone.	Oct 4, 2012 7:08 AM
240	Yes--we need more walking and biking access to cross the lake and access the bridge	Oct 4, 2012 6:08 AM
241	these are great goals and I wish you luck in making all these factions happy. I just wonder if there could be more done to simplify/ reduce the feeling that the design is there to 'hide' 520. I like that the design mitigates some of the noise, visual disruption etc and helps to reestablish wildlife/ biodiversity in the area while letting people explore/ engage in this gorgeous place. I just think that good, simple design can be more powerful and more satisfying to all the senses if is not buried under a lid.	Oct 4, 2012 3:22 AM
242	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportation and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
243	Good goals, nice sketches. The future reality of the traffic on Montlake Boulevard if the current plan is built will turn these nice sketches into a not very funny joke.	Oct 3, 2012 9:17 PM
244	Support	Oct 3, 2012 9:08 PM
245	Sounds good, but no opinion about specifics.	Oct 3, 2012 8:50 PM
246	Great goals	Oct 3, 2012 8:39 PM
247	Have to happen. Good goals, could even expand on existing plans as bicycle faculty design has evolved since the 2007 bicycle master plan was adopted.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
248	the more non-motorized the better	Oct 3, 2012 6:17 PM
249	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution.	Oct 3, 2012 4:05 PM
250	The current Montlake Blvd. interchange doesn't seem to adhere to these goals. The off ramps should be north of the Montlake bridge, connecting directly to Sound Transit light rail instead of weaving through a neighborhood with very heavy pedestrian and bicycle traffic.	Oct 3, 2012 3:57 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

251	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 3, 2012 3:51 PM
252	Access to Arboretum, Madison Valley/Park, Madrona and Leschi appears to be severely curtailed. Specifically, southbound Lake Washington Blvd will be much less accessible then currently, and more direct co-mingling of northbound and southbound vehicles from westbound 520 will exacerbate delays for all vehicles. Unfortunately the best way to improve access for westbound-to-southbound vehicles will involve widening lanes and reducing green space across the new Montlake lid.	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
253	Reducing noise is integral to all of those goals and should be a stated goal as well.	Oct 3, 2012 2:48 PM
254	The goals are much too vague. You need clear design principles: for example, grade-separate transport modes traveling at different speeds (e.g. pedestrians versus bicycles versus cars), minimize the number of mode crossings to minimize the number of spots requiring cyclists and cars to stop, as they will be	Oct 3, 2012 2:00 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	tempted not to stop, eliminate all sharrows because of their dangers, and so forth.	
255	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 3, 2012 1:51 PM
256	bicycle connections are essential across the bridge	Oct 3, 2012 1:23 PM
257	All these goals are extremely important, but WSDOT should also make transit an integral part of these goals. It's imperative that buses be able to move well through and over this interchange.	Oct 3, 2012 1:22 PM
258	they sound good. separated bike lanes from traffic would be ideal	Oct 3, 2012 1:16 PM
259	I agree with them!	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
260	Safety for bicycles and pedestrians should balanced with safety for motor vehicles. Avoid "traffic calming" features that actually increase the danger of driving: big bumps, poor visibility, sharp turns, narrow lanes, short merges and harzardous barriers.	Oct 3, 2012 12:34 PM
261	make it right first time	Oct 3, 2012 12:13 PM
262	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the	Oct 3, 2012 12:00 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
263	I think there should be a goal to INCREASE non-motorized traffic and provide the infrastructure to do so.	Oct 3, 2012 11:32 AM
264	I like these goals. Access, mobility, and safety are the ones I think that WSDOT should focus on as primary - health is up to the individual - character and clarity (signing?) should be integrated after the first three are established.	Oct 3, 2012 11:07 AM
265	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the	Oct 3, 2012 10:50 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
266	Those are exactly the kind of goals we need to have a real neighborhood and not a through-way for commuters.	Oct 3, 2012 10:00 AM
267	Encourage safe bike routes. Build them, and the bikes will come. Those intrepid enough to brave the area as it is now run the risk of riding in an area that is congested with limited visibility and room to maneuver safely.	Oct 3, 2012 9:54 AM
268	Good standard to try and uphold.	Oct 3, 2012 9:54 AM
269	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 3, 2012 9:53 AM
270	These are good goals. But please pay more attention to greenways groups (groups of local citizens who have invested huge amounts of time in researching	Oct 3, 2012 9:44 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	this issue AND who spend a ton of time walking and biking in these areas. The goals WSDOT is preaching are not adequately being met in many of the current designs.	
271	I am excited for a 520 bridge for ped and bikes and forsee using them frequently on my biking choices.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
272	The goals are fine, but I fear the implementation.	Oct 3, 2012 9:00 AM
273	We have an opportunity to finish the Olmstead plan with a green natural path connecting Capitol Hill , Portage Bay, Montlake to the new bike lanes on the 520 across to east side but DO NOT pave over another 14 feet of Portage Bay by expanding the concrete another 14 feet	Oct 3, 2012 8:45 AM
274	Great goals. Integrate bikes throughout, please.	Oct 3, 2012 8:43 AM
275	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As a motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

276	Ensure proper sight distances at all intersections. This means only very low shrubs or grass should be planted at intersections.	Oct 3, 2012 8:26 AM
277	The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	Oct 3, 2012 8:02 AM
278	I applaud these goals. I am an avid cyclist and use Seattle's network of streets, bike friendly roads, paths and corridors. The new SR 520 bridge must include full and robust bicycle access.	Oct 3, 2012 7:45 AM
279	Sounds like something from a political campain. I think that small E/Vs like Segways and other single person non poluting motorized modes of transportation S/B allowed with the bikes and pedestrians since they can't run with the cars/trucks/bus traffic.	Oct 3, 2012 7:24 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

280	That is good	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 AM
281	These are great goals. Seattle should be a city that is accessible by foot, bicycle, and public transit.	Oct 2, 2012 9:01 PM
282	I use my bike for transportation. I want direct passages. I do not want pretty turns for they slow me down and pedestrians are all over.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 PM
283	Connected is another goal I think you should outline. As in, it should have good connections to the Burke Gilman, the path towards Seward Park / I-90, towards downtown, etc.	Oct 2, 2012 7:00 PM
284	This should be a very high priority. We should design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 6:19 PM
285	Absolutely. This is key for this project.	Oct 2, 2012 5:51 PM
286	Please please please prioritize the bike path. This is such an important part of the project.	Oct 2, 2012 5:38 PM
287	Bike and ped lanes please	Oct 2, 2012 4:50 PM
288	Provide a shared-use trail and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:21 PM
289	Strongly agree on the need for good non-motorized connections, wide enough pathways, signage and signals.	Oct 2, 2012 3:27 PM
290	The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollutionO) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the mandate of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot	Oct 2, 2012 12:14 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	(especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
291	Those are good goals. Width would be another though. The width of the 90 path bridge portion in very tight and can be quite difficult to maneuver at times.	Oct 2, 2012 12:10 PM
292	The main goals should be (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 11:49 AM
293	good idea but this overpass is a nightmare for traffic in general	Oct 2, 2012 11:09 AM
294	The goals are fine -- fulfilling them REQUIRES that a bike/ped facility be provided on the new Portage Bay bridge!	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
295	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities. You would be shocked at how many cyclists would use this bridge and at how many of us there are that ride between Bellevue and Seattle.	Oct 2, 2012 10:13 AM
296	OK, so long as the designers understand the reality of this VERY busy intersection. Not only is it busy, but it is one where drivers are tightly focused on access to I5. I've lived in this neighborhood for over 30 years and have watched how this intersection has changed from rush-hour busy to busy-and-intense at rush hour and very busy other times and weekends. This is one of those intersections that looks one way on paper and is much more complex in real life. Currently, bike/car interactions are very scary because both drives and peddlers are distracted by the need to access I5 and the complex no-right-turn/one-way-street/I5-exit/entrances intersections. Please, please, do not put a bike lane on the north side of Roanoke going west where it meet Harvard. That right turn should be considered part of the access to I5 North 500 ft down Harvard -- it's certainly used that way by drivers. At that point, for the safety of the pedalers and the sanity of the drivers, please have bikes use the sidewalk/crosswalk and be governed by traffic signals. Those cyclists will be coming down the 10th east hill on the bridge over 420 and they are moving very fast through the intersection of 10th and Roanoke onto Roanoke going west. Unless they cut through the Roanoke neighborhood to access Harvard further north through the side streets, they are terrifying once they so speedily reach the Roanoke/Harvard intersection. With a bike path on that stretch of road, they would have a very	Oct 2, 2012 10:01 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	false sense of safety...and people are going to get killed in accidents.	
297	A goal of "safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections" may generate better support for those who need to move through the corridor. The current goals have not yet yielded designs that meet the health and safety goals. Much has been learned from best practices worldwide. For the massive investment, we have an opportunity to create excellent bike and pedestrian connections.	Oct 2, 2012 9:21 AM
298	A bridge without accommodations for pedestrians and bicycles is not a bridge at all. We, the People with two feet and/or two wheels would definitely accrue further health benefits by being able to take a pleasant walk or ride along the proposed I-520 bridge project. Some of us are interested in our long term health, saving our local atmosphere from unnecessary pollution, and inreducing health care costs in general. Exercise for the masses ought to be more than a tertiary concern for our public officials and for the SDOT. Build pedestrian and bicycle lanes and they will come	Oct 2, 2012 8:21 AM
299	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 9:26 PM
300	the 520 needs to have good access from seattle and to major locations in the kirkland area such as evergreen hospital	Oct 1, 2012 8:05 PM
301	Bicycle mobility is going to be increasingly valuable as we start to 9 months of decent weather in the future.	Oct 1, 2012 7:25 PM
302	This is critical goal that will help the long term health and livability of the area.	Oct 1, 2012 4:09 PM
303	I agree that bicycling support is critical.	Oct 1, 2012 2:46 PM
304	I agree with them	Oct 1, 2012 2:28 PM
305	More bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths! Include light-rail!	Oct 1, 2012 1:32 PM
306	Great, but we have to have a mass transit option that isn't burdened by surface traffic. We must have a rail option like mono rail or light rail built into the 520 plan. As for bicycles, ensure there is a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 1:24 PM
307	They should all be achieved by the design.	Oct 1, 2012 12:48 PM
308	My two most important goals are: (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 10:23 AM
309	Yes. These should be wide and gracious, with lots of greenery, interesting paving, and clear signage/wayfinding. Make it a joy not to be driving.	Sep 30, 2012 9:26 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

310	A primary goal should be investing in bicycle traffic. It will lead to less automobile traffic and a better Seattle.	Sep 30, 2012 7:57 PM
311	Highly in favor of goals	Sep 30, 2012 4:58 PM
312	The goals are very good. Add "efficiency". Efficiency for daily users is essential, otherwise these connections will not meet current or future demand. This is difficult to quantify in planning but worth the effort.	Sep 30, 2012 10:56 AM
313	Less trees	Sep 30, 2012 7:29 AM
314	As long as bike and pedestrian way is included. Crucial!	Sep 30, 2012 7:14 AM
315	Good goals, just make sure they are followed to the end: again pedestrian and bicycle access are of utmost importance.	Sep 30, 2012 3:47 AM
316	The idea of prioritizing non-motorized transit in this area is particularly galling.	Sep 29, 2012 11:47 PM
317	Yes, non motorized conenctions should be an important element in the new bridge design & construction. There should be options to commute between two sides on bicycle, walk/run & accesibility options. There should be a provision to add water fountains on the bridge & maybe a toliet/porter potty option. Do the Right Thing. Build a bridge that will allow pedestrians and cyclist to cross 520. Future and current citizens will applaud your good judgement and forward thinking.	Sep 29, 2012 10:24 PM
318	Speed of bike travel	Sep 29, 2012 9:18 PM
319	This is an excellent time to link up with the existing bike and pedestrian paths on both sides of the lake.	Sep 29, 2012 7:43 PM
320	Your goals are vague and broad enough to be nearly meaningless. blah, blah, blah, etc.	Sep 29, 2012 6:34 PM
321	These sound like very good goals.	Sep 29, 2012 4:38 PM
322	I am very excited about this project, and think it will literally transform this area for the better. The only feedback is to consider making the bike lanes fully separated with plantings or short concrete bulwarks	Sep 29, 2012 1:50 PM
323	You need to actually do this, not just pay lip service to it.	Sep 29, 2012 1:38 PM
324	Good goals	Sep 29, 2012 1:22 PM
325	Pedestrian safety needs some work. Bicycle riders routinely violate speed limits and "push" pedestrians off the path.	Sep 29, 2012 10:10 AM
326	Positive: focus on those connections.	Sep 28, 2012 10:58 PM
327	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:25 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

328	I think these goals are spot-on. People aren't going to use these paths unless they are safe and inviting.	Sep 28, 2012 9:33 PM
329	connectivity between parks/university/greenspaces is very important too and i hope that's considered under access.	Sep 28, 2012 9:22 PM
330	I think that any investment in non motorized access will reap rewards to the people of our region.	Sep 28, 2012 8:17 PM
331	We've come a long way from building roads to accommodate our mobility needs, to spending money we don't have to provide "clarity" (which seems to be in short supply).	Sep 28, 2012 6:03 PM
332	a safe 13-14 ft path for walkers, including adequate room for baby carriage and more bulky baby joggers , joggers and bikers	Sep 28, 2012 4:31 PM
333	So encouraging to see this design.	Sep 28, 2012 4:26 PM
334	Keep the commute users near the top of the design considerations. Direct simple routing will be more useful than winding paths.	Sep 28, 2012 4:24 PM
335	There should be enough room for both cyclists and pedestrians, so that the possibilities for collisions is minimal. When possible, this should include clear divisions between the pedestrians and cyclists.	Sep 28, 2012 3:56 PM
336	They're great.	Sep 28, 2012 2:41 PM
337	Don't underestimate the number of cyclists likely to use the new "shared-use" trail	Sep 28, 2012 2:28 PM
338	Yes, make sure that there is easy bicycle and pedestrian access	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM
339	Please don't let the tail wag the dog with respect to bike vs. automobile utility. Automobile users are paying the cost and represent >95% of the daily users.	Sep 28, 2012 1:44 PM
340	Those are appropriate goals, and as long as we have good signage, a path across the Portage Bay Bridge, and a safe route along Montlake between 520 and the Montlake Bridge, we're in good shape for achieivng them.	Sep 28, 2012 1:31 PM
341	yes, key!!!	Sep 28, 2012 12:15 PM
342	These are excellent goals.	Sep 28, 2012 11:48 AM
343	The I-90 trail is too narrow and pedestrians on it (except runners) are kind of dangerous. Plus the side rails seem like they'd grab your handlebars. The bike path along the lid on Mercer Island positively sucks, with water running over it and moss growing on the winter time. Plus it's taken over by moms with strollers and dog walkers. I ride the streets through there. I would hate to see the terminus of the bike route over 520 made unusable by pedestrian interaction issues.	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

344	I support these goals as outlined. The definition is important as well; how will they be achieved?	Sep 28, 2012 11:16 AM
345	Yes yes yes! Our goal should be to make Seattle the most bicycle friendly city in America. Our two greatest national problems (obesity and dependence on foreign energy) can be resolved with a single device - the bicycle.	Sep 28, 2012 10:34 AM
346	Please help to provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 28, 2012 10:20 AM
347	No bridge is a bridge without pedestrian/bike access! the I-90 bridge bike trail is heavily used. We need the same for 520.	Sep 28, 2012 9:57 AM
348	These are very important. People should be encouraged to walk and bicycle instead of always driving.	Sep 28, 2012 9:07 AM
349	Important goals. Cross lake bicycle commuting is very important	Sep 28, 2012 8:39 AM
350	Yes	Sep 28, 2012 7:40 AM
351	paths don't always need to be built separate from the street, just incorporate good design and work to minize street crossings.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 PM
352	I am all for new and improved bicycle lanes/paths.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 PM
353	Provide ample, separate facilities for pedestrians and bike commuters.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 PM
354	If people are willing to remove cars from the road and cycle instead let them at it. Kudos to Seattle for trying to make it safer and more practical to do so.	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 PM
355	It is a priority for me that you provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge . And please design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 PM
356	The vast majority of cross-lake, non-motorized traffic will be bicycles. The design should consider safe two-way bicycle traffic even at the expense of pedestrian facilities. Pedestrian/bike separation should be considered.	Sep 27, 2012 9:25 PM
357	Please continue to focus on the goal of providing a wide clear multi-use path that creates a cycling commuter route	Sep 27, 2012 9:08 PM
358	Yes, important to make bridge accessible to bicycles/pedestrians. If you build it they will use it.	Sep 27, 2012 8:37 PM
359	Good goals!	Sep 27, 2012 8:20 PM
360	We need to do the best we can with the money we have to invest in this area...This area is a hub for going all directions, the university, the lake, eastside. It needs to meet these goals at least...	Sep 27, 2012 8:13 PM
361	maintaining the connections created to ensure they don't become unsafe.	Sep 27, 2012 7:42 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

362	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM
363	These are fantastic goals. Of course it would be best to have separate bicycle and pedestrian paths for safety. But it depends on space, if enough is reasonably available. Otherwise any extra costs would definitely be appropriate, even if taxes or tolls had to be increased.	Sep 27, 2012 6:38 PM
364	Must include safety features for bicycle commuters.	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
365	Give people more options to bike, more will bike, which means less cars on the road!	Sep 27, 2012 6:18 PM
366	Please provide bicycle/walking lanes for this bridge. It would be a fantastic way to promote healthy living and commuting in this area!	Sep 27, 2012 6:02 PM
367	I am all for making the city more livable and pleasant. From a transportation infrastructure point of view, to me that means providing for safe, convenient, and enjoyable routes for pedestrians and cyclists. It also means providing convenient connections between different parts of the transportation infrastructure. This means bus, train, pedestrians, and cyclists can connect conveniently, safely, and enjoyably.	Sep 27, 2012 5:59 PM
368	Please let me bike.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
369	Good goals to have.	Sep 27, 2012 5:35 PM
370	This is huge for me. I spend countless hours on a bicycle and don't enjoy areas where I feel I am risking my own safety with people trying to get to work. If bicycles are not taken into account sufficiently in the design, it will be decades before they can be accounted for again.	Sep 27, 2012 5:14 PM
371	It certainly seems that future transportation modes will include a higher proportion of transit and bicycling. With this in mind it's imperative that all designs accomodate current and future needs. This means that all designs should include a full 14-foot multi-use path.	Sep 27, 2012 5:01 PM
372	Focus on designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 5:00 PM
373	I think it is important to designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 4:56 PM
374	Continue as goals	Sep 27, 2012 4:49 PM
375	Please! Highest priority. Best use of limited financial resources for the city.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
376	Safety is a high priority. There are a ton of cars/buses/bikes/pedestrians moving through this area - many crossing paths. We need to make sure everyone makes it through without a problem.	Sep 27, 2012 4:34 PM
377	These are very important goals.	Sep 27, 2012 4:12 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

378	Yes -- agree. Don't pay it lip service -- do it right. This is your legacy. Keep in mind: You must build a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 4:11 PM
379	These are great steps towards keeping Seattle a world-class city.	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
380	good goals	Sep 27, 2012 3:44 PM
381	Pedestrian and bicycle friendly integration should always be a primary ingredient to all new highway construction and upgrading of existing roadways.	Sep 27, 2012 3:05 PM
382	These are the right goals, we must include nonmotorized connections.	Sep 27, 2012 2:59 PM
383	fully support shared use path - need to connect all the way - including portage bay connection	Sep 27, 2012 2:44 PM
384	Supporting a bike/ped link between I-5 and Medina, as stated. Path width and design should accomodate ample space for diverse speeds and modes. As a commute corridor, expect some bike use at relatively high speeds. On lids and other areas with adequate space, consider separation of ped and bike trail use. Corridor should offer ample connections with Montlake and northern Capitol Hill. Parts of the corridor may function as a to bypass local vehicle traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 2:39 PM
385	I agree but think the issue of mobility is often overlooked. In order for bicycle connections to be useful, they must not be blocked by slower users. And in order for pedestrian spaces to be safe and comfortable, they must not have higher-speed users zipping by. The current focus on shared-use paths hurts both mobility and safety. Not all nonmotorized users have the same needs.	Sep 27, 2012 2:33 PM
386	I support all of these goals! We need to embrace alternate forms of mobility for those who are able to take part. It will make our whole society healthier and our roads less congested.	Sep 27, 2012 2:24 PM
387	Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:19 PM
388	Bike lanes on the north side of the bridge	Sep 27, 2012 2:09 PM
389	I think these are great goals! One of the biggest issues within seattle's transit network is its nauseatingly confusing transit corridors and a lack of aesthetic appeal. Pushing towards clear, public imputed design shows real dedication and the product will likely reflect that.	Sep 27, 2012 1:59 PM
390	Support, especially for bikes....	Sep 27, 2012 1:49 PM
391	It is absolutely essential to design a system of interconnected and seamless bike path. No piecemeal approach!	Sep 27, 2012 1:41 PM
392	Shared goal with many and too many gains to ignore this idea stay the course and get the job done again better safety and less congestion of BIKE , CAR ,	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	BIKE , CAR	
393	I like the focus on pedestrians and bicycles	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
394	Safety and the designed to handle current and higher future traffic are most important.	Sep 27, 2012 1:15 PM
395	Support these goals. Safety and efficiency for bike and ped transit will help ensure use.	Sep 27, 2012 1:07 PM
396	simple design for I-5 crossing.	Sep 27, 2012 1:00 PM
397	Great! Love the non auto inclusion	Sep 27, 2012 12:58 PM
398	Would be nice if you actually applied this to mean that a portage bay path on 520 would be a natural outcome of these goals	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
399	As someone who does not commute by bike, but would if the route were safer, I applaud these goals. I live on a busy street on Capitol Hill, which is also a bicycle and pedestrian area, and I've found drivers aren't very considerate of either mode of non-auto transport. Why rely on drivers to be considerate? Plan the roadway to provide security for pedestrians and bikers.	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM
400	yay! i love the buzz words - access/mobility, health/safety, character, clarity. let's move more people in more different (and SAFE!) ways!	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM
401	It is critical to provide greater access for walking and cycling with amenities designed to meet future demand and encourage people of all ages and abilities to use human powered transit.	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
402	I am in agreement with these goals, and would like to add that it is important to design bicycle and pedestrian connections with increased future demand for such in mind. Bicycle connections should be designed to encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:33 PM
403	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 12:21 PM
404	Ensure that non-motorized plans anticipate future greenway projects such as Federal.	Sep 27, 2012 12:20 PM
405	Excellent!	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
406	yes, good goals	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
407	I highly support these goals for good nonmotorized connections.	Sep 27, 2012 12:12 PM
408	The design must incorporation a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and address non-motorized transport as a critical component.	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM
409	This is very important. Providing non-motorized access to 520 will help with	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	congestion as well as give those of us who want to cross the lake an option to do so.	
410	They address my concerns, in particular, being able to cycle across the bridge, to work in Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
411	Go nonmotorists!	Sep 27, 2012 12:01 PM
412	Yes, Awesome, do it!!!	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
413	We should stop increasing motorized capacity-it doesn't make sense. If you increase it, traffic will continue to be an issue. Increasing non-motorized infrastructure should be the goal and should be incentivized.	Sep 27, 2012 11:44 AM
414	looks very nice	Sep 27, 2012 11:44 AM
415	Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
416	Sounds good. Utilitarianism/safety would be my top concerns.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
417	Please Please Please (1) provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
418	I like the plan and if bikes can cross 520 back and forth from Bellevue to Seattle, that is all the better.	Sep 27, 2012 11:29 AM
419	All good in theory. Signage needs to be LARGE and clear; the I-90 signs are very small and it's hard to read these from a distance. For safety's sake a wider-than-you-think path should be designed with clear paint delineating the mandated direction of travel (i.e. keep to the right like vehicles).	Sep 27, 2012 11:22 AM
420	I highly support nonmotorized connections especially including bicycle trails for commuting and recreation	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
421	They're critical! Please incorporate.	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
422	That's great...I think mobility and health are two key factors I've previously brought up.	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 AM
423	Great goals. Safety and convenience are the highest priority in my opinion.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
424	As described, this reads as non-controversial. I would ask that you take into account future demand so the connections will not be constrained when they are complete.	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
425	All important, particularly bicycle mobility and safety.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
426	These are great goals, we need dedicated, separated cyclist/ pedestrian access across 520 with safe connections.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

427	Low priority goals	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
428	Best served by: (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
429	Yes, please add easy access to bikes crossing the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
430	Nonmotorized connections are the lifeblood of a large segment of our population, whether by choice or economic limitations. It is, simply put, unacceptable to create any roadway without an equivalent nonmotorized accessway which is AS or MORE direct than the roadway.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
431	I agree with those goals, but I would specifically mention convenience to transit and bicycle users and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
432	Always provide space that is safe and accessible for all users, all ages and abilities	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
433	I agree	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 AM
434	It would be such an improvement if the city made non motorized connections a priority. For all the above reasons.. Make it easy and safe and they will come.. many now use connections that are less than satifactory.. think if connections consisdered the above criteria and it was done well.. WORLD CLASS CITY !!	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
435	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
436	I've always supported this. I don't have a problem with owning a car or motorcycle. But the county really needs to includes cycling as a legitimate means of transportation in the area as a default, not a luxury.	Sep 27, 2012 10:40 AM
437	please - remember pedestrians are increasingly distracted by their electronics.	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
438	My main feedback is that the design must (1) include a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) have bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
439	The more we seal the loud deafening highways, the better off society will all be, I live next to I-5 all of these ideas work to improve the noise levels of the city.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
440	These are the correct goals. Anticipating future useage must also address increased participation by an older segment of nonmotoized commuters such as recumbant two and three wheeled vehicles that travel at slow speeds with a more limited visibility than typical bicycles.	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
441	1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

442	Think ahead for the coming century and build well thought out, highly functional access and alternative transportation modes. Cars are fine but limited in what positives they give back.	Sep 27, 2012 10:32 AM
443	It is critical we have a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 AM
444	We dont have any way across today and really need some bike access to cross the north end of the lake the new bridge provides this and is required.	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
445	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
446	These are good goals. Connectivity is key. They are also a driver of sustainable living, a keystone in scalable transport systems and can be a tourist attraction	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
447	It's essential that WSDOT: (1) Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use.	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
448	Your plan must extend bicycle access across the lake or it becomes a disgrace to modern, non motorized traffic planning.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
449	agree that bicycle & pedestrian needs must be considered.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
450	They are good goals to work toward as long you consider them through the perspective of what we are becoming rather than what we have been.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
451	CONTINUOUS connections!!! Eastlake is a major N/S route. Make sure that the project extends all the way to Eastlake in the most DIRECT fashion possible.	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
452	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
453	designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
454	looks good. ease of biking without excessive stopping should be a design requirement.	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
455	Bicycle use is essential and absolutely critical to the long-term success of the project. Safe bicycle routes will encourage the use of that transportation method, particularly between Redmond and downtown Seattle. Direct connections to the Burke Gilman Trail seem like an obviously essential design element.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
456	great goals	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
457	Love them	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
458	Those goals sound great	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

459	notice your drawing has pedistrians scattered through out the path - separate the bicycle commuters from people strolling - it's dangerous to try to bike though pedestrians walking on any side of the path and between ballards	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
460	These should be top priorities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:52 AM
461	Please design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:52 AM
462	I agree with the goals. I would like to see bike & pedestrian path across 520 and better connections to the area.	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
463	Please include a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail as part of the Portage Bay Bridge design. It’s only a half-mile connection, and if built would connect the Eastside of Lake Washington to North Capitol Hill in Seattle by a completely separated trail that is safe, convenient, and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities to ride and walk on.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
464	These are great goals.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
465	These are essential goals. The 520 is a dinasaur and is useful for cars only. In my mind replacing it with same is a waste of taxpayer dollars. I drive this bridge everyday and feel that way.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
466	Please continue on these goals. Let us not sacrifice some great long term community building items for the short term	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
467	Strongly support	Sep 27, 2012 9:40 AM
468	good	Sep 27, 2012 12:49 AM
469	These goals are critical and must take priority.	Sep 26, 2012 11:23 AM
470	Walkers and bikes should trump trains which trump buses which trump cars.	Sep 26, 2012 11:20 AM
471	no opinion	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 PM
472	I would love (love!) some way to cross from Bellevue to Seattle by bicycle on the 520. I am in favor of the stated goals.	Sep 25, 2012 9:33 AM
473	excellent goals - best achieved with SEPARATED pedestrian and bicycle facilities as much as feasible	Sep 25, 2012 8:58 AM
474	good. kids who go to TOPS would appreciate this.	Sep 25, 2012 8:21 AM
475	Having good bicycle connections is important. Having safe places for people to walk is important. Separating bicyclists from cars on Montlake Blvd (and enforcing it) is necessary to prevent further disabled bicyclists and lawsuits.	Sep 24, 2012 11:45 PM
476	I like them.	Sep 24, 2012 9:21 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

477	The goals are admirable, but somehow managed to exclude vehicular traffic flow! This overpass area is a regular logjam of vehicles making connections between 520 westbound, I5 both north and southbound, between Eastlake, Capitol Hill and other residential areas. Making it nice for foot and bicycle traffic is lovely, but it makes no sense to do so by increasing the congestion of already tangled motorized traffic.	Sep 24, 2012 6:38 PM
478	All I care about it being able to get thru by bicycle without threat of being run over by a vehicle, and without having to dodge around pedestrians. Anything that provides noise reduction is good. If its got nice plantings, even better, but thats all optional. My fear is that the path built will be good looking, but not functional due sharp curves, too many pedestrains, and other obstacles. The ablity to get somewhere safely is the prime concern.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
479	excellent	Sep 24, 2012 1:03 PM
480	I strongly support a goal of making all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 24, 2012 12:59 PM
481	They're very good goals - the one thing they don't directly seem to address is connectivity. We have a lot of great bicycle roads and trails in the area, but not many of them seem to connect together... (See the west end of the I-90 trail, for example. It runs halfway around Beacon Hill, and then stops, having connected to neither 12th Street to the north nor the Chief Sealth trail to the south.)	Sep 24, 2012 12:59 PM
482	I believe that an important goal that is not being explicitly stated is efficiency for nonmotorized commuters. Too often we end up with designs that significantly inconvenience bicycle commuters, including merging casual and in-a-rush commuter traffic, placing too many intercept point/traffic lights in commuters' paths, etc. Please think about cyclists moving at above-pedestrian speeds carefully as you design this project.	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
483	these improvements are critical to accommodate the increasing cyclist traffic and provide a safe solution for drivers and cyclists alike.	Sep 24, 2012 12:32 PM
484	These are great goals and I appreciate all the hard work you do to balance all the competing concerns.	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
485	Excellent goals.	Sep 24, 2012 12:00 PM
486	good goals	Sep 23, 2012 2:45 PM
487	These are excellent goals and need to be as important as the motorized goals!	Sep 23, 2012 8:22 AM
488	I support these goals.	Sep 22, 2012 4:48 PM
489	You can not re-connect the Shelby/Hamlin neighborhood with Montlake if the transit lanes are to remain on the lid. The design does not meet the intermodial requirements outlined in the SR-520 legislation. Without the changes that are necessary to meet the goals, the project will fail. The goal cannot be met if the LOS is to remain basically the same at Montlake, Pacific Street and Pacific	Sep 22, 2012 1:01 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	Place. These intersections will remain unsafe, unable to increase access and mobility for pedestrians and bikers. The design will not be met if additional lanes are added to the Montlake intersection and you do not have a sense of separation between cars, transit, bikers and walkers. By eliminating the Lake Washington Blvd. ramps, the design will add additional cars and transit to the Montlake intersection, further exasperating the failure of the non-motorized connections.	
490	This is my highest priority. Thanks.	Sep 22, 2012 10:32 AM
491	agree. important to make it easy, safe and attractive for bikes and peds to use alternatives that also improve traffic congestion	Sep 22, 2012 10:19 AM
492	Yes, I think that is a good heirarchy of goals.	Sep 21, 2012 3:49 PM
493	I am a motorized commuter, and do not use those facilities often enough to comment.	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
494	It doesn't work if you have to bike from downtown to Eastlake, over the University Bridge through UW, around Pacific and over the Montlake Bridge.	Sep 20, 2012 6:31 PM
495	Admirable goals	Sep 20, 2012 10:41 AM
496	Lets add speedy make it a fast cycling corridor.	Sep 19, 2012 3:26 PM
497	Need to separate bicycle & auto traffic as much as possible. New "sharrows" on Lk WA Blvd potentially diver bikes from designated bicycle trials on 24th, Roanoke, 25th & Azailia Way to areas of greater conflict wtih autos on Lk WA Blvd -- stirve to have bike trials for bikes, and roads for autos.	Sep 19, 2012 1:45 PM
498	SDOT/WSDOT has to make sure they create separated facilities for bicycles. We will not get another chance here. If you get this wrong, it will not change for decades.	Sep 19, 2012 12:34 PM
499	YES Bicycling is a form of transportation. It will reduce traffic if you place SAFE Cycle routes across this bridge-- in it's entirity- inclugding portage bay bridge and all of it!!! This should be a no brainer!!! I predict the cycle and foot traffic to triple that of the 1-90 commute!	Sep 19, 2012 12:20 PM
500	Agreed, this is the best way to design	Sep 17, 2012 5:20 PM
501	Agree with them	Sep 17, 2012 4:40 PM
502	There should be an increase and improvement in pedestrian/cycle friendly connectivity as a result of this work. Not improving pedestrian/bicycle access and connectivity would be a serious missed opportunity that would negatively impact the quality of life in Seattle.	Sep 17, 2012 11:20 AM
503	I hope you are making this a priority. Sounds like you (and the East Side folks) just want more and more roads build like Los ANgeles. Don't make the same mistake as Los Angeles. Seattle is unique and different. Please build more LIDS	Sep 17, 2012 10:08 AM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	to cover up the highways!!! This is genius idea and makes everyone happy. It is money well spent. I realize it is expensive, but the rewards over the long term make it all worth it. Build a lid over I5!!!	
504	Support of bikes, press and transit and creating new safer links from north Capitol hill to montlake and UW is needed	Sep 17, 2012 6:19 AM
505	The Community invovlement and the SCDP process was the most thorough and thoughtful and objective transportation corridor planning process I have ever been involved in. With expert review and advisors, and many public meetins to update the Community on what was being designed for westside SR 520 project/	Sep 16, 2012 4:53 PM
506	Emphasis on keeping the character of the neighborhood and enhancing it with additional green space and pedestrian/bike paths.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
507	I support the goals.	Sep 16, 2012 10:07 AM
508	characert and clarity? has no meaning for general people.	Sep 16, 2012 9:21 AM
509	GREAT!!! Consider bike access from this area ll the way to Burke Gilman and transit centers.	Sep 16, 2012 7:27 AM
510	These are good goals but the design so far does not meet them. The Montlake Lid does not improve pedestrian connection (more busy traffic lanes to cross) and the Portage Bay Bridge must extend the regional path. Underbridge areas are not suitable for good, heathy, and safe spaces - they should be landscaped for natural areas. The Montlake Lid should prioritize non-motorized people first and RECONNECT the neighborhood. Connectivity should be favored over open space.	Sep 16, 2012 2:36 AM
511	You need to listen to the public feedback about destroying all the neighborhoods and areas that this over designed section of the bridge will create. Maybe keeping the scale and cost within reason will get more people off the roads and supporting public transportation	Sep 15, 2012 9:35 PM
512	Please consider the perception of safety, not only absence of crashes and engineered safety features in planning this facility. Factors to consider: separation of motorized and non-motorized travel (also separation of bicycles from pedestrians, altho this has less impact on perceived safety); preserving sightlines while incorporating green space; limiting traffic speeds; providing priority for pedestrians and bicycles at intersections; designing facilities to connect pleasant and desirable destinations (shopping, parks, schools, etc)	Sep 15, 2012 8:48 PM
513	Please preserve as much of the wetlands and urban parks as you can.	Sep 15, 2012 7:53 PM
514	I could give a shit less about cars being able to get around. We need to start designing a city on a more human scale, so anything about pedestrians or bicycles is fine by me.	Sep 15, 2012 6:14 PM
515	I like the goals and the outreach. I'm curious what data has been used with regard to bike counts, bus usage data, traffic data, etc. has played in this.	Sep 15, 2012 1:44 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

516	Worthy goals.	Sep 15, 2012 1:04 PM
517	The goal of enhancing bike usage is fine. Doing it at the expense of a smoothly functioning network of motor vehicle roads is insane. PHYSICALLY separate the bikes from the motor vehicles everywhere. Like it or not, the Arboretum is a MAJOR Arterial and IT SHOULD BE. Take what ever land you need to enhance the free flow of motor vehicles through the area and physically separate the bikes, pedestrians, and motor vehicles. Lots of BIG trees. Take this opportunity to start the eventual physical separation of bikes people and motor vehicles that needs to extend all the way south through the Arboretum along Lake Washington Blvd along its entire length - all the way south to the Mt. Baker neighborhood	Sep 15, 2012 12:40 PM
518	They are good goals. The key is in the specifics. I would hate to see the Olmstead legacy and the wildlife resources undermined in the process.	Sep 15, 2012 11:45 AM
519	Fix the 7' wide east side of Montlake bridge where peds and bikes going both ways pass dangerously.	Sep 15, 2012 11:30 AM
520	Trying to integrate the access in the difficult geography will be difficult but quite necessary.	Sep 15, 2012 11:02 AM
521	The less interaction between motorists and pedestrian/bicyclists the better.	Sep 15, 2012 1:28 AM
522	Safety for every type of transportation is important, bicycles wheelchairs strollers walkers runners. Clear signage, well lit, cut ins on the sidewalks, these are important goals.	Sep 14, 2012 5:57 PM
523	Reasonable goals.	Sep 14, 2012 5:56 PM
524	The bridge is being built to reduce traffic congestion. Nonmotorized connections are fine but the goal is to move vehicles, that should be the primary goal. It would be wasteful to create new pinch points for the sake of nonmotorized connections. That being said a new bridge without a bike or walkway is a major mistake and the DOT director should know this.	Sep 14, 2012 5:46 PM
525	What do you mean by "character"? I'm afraid it means "be tough and bike on the streets with busy traffic" (character-building), instead of biking on separated facilities.	Sep 14, 2012 5:26 PM
526	Make sure cyclists and pedestrians are separated from the FUMES and NOISE of auto traffic. The existing I-90 crossing is atrocious due to deafening noise and choking fumes.	Sep 14, 2012 4:43 PM
527	These are excellent goals, but without excellent transit service people will complain it's too slow to drive through or turn into a traffic chokepoint.	Sep 14, 2012 4:28 PM
528	they are supremely important. They make the new bridge acceptable to me.	Sep 14, 2012 3:56 PM
529	The Arboretum is in a class by itself, and its master plan should be an important consideration. Friends of Olmsted Parks advocates for consideration of the	Sep 14, 2012 3:32 PM

Page 7, Q1. Goals
The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals?

	values of historical preservation and faithfulness to the Olmsted Plan. Its principles should be park of the goals.	
530	Is the amount of traffic that needs to come through this area conducive to ped/bike safety? I'm all in favor of improving non-car accessibility and safety. The goals sound just fine.	Sep 14, 2012 2:16 PM
531	looks nice but very few bikes and pedestrians currently cross here (in my experience). So maybe not so important	Sep 14, 2012 2:06 PM
532	Great goals. Please make biking safer in Seattle.	Sep 14, 2012 1:56 PM
533	You seem to have totally forgotten about the MAIN USERS: SOVs!	Sep 14, 2012 1:51 PM
534	I think that these are being furthered, but a car-centric project will always fall well short of providing the actual needs and benefits to nonmotorized traffic. These are good, but there are many ways it can be better.	Sep 14, 2012 1:39 PM
535	Seems like a reasonable job at it. I dislike the idea of cutting off cars to East Montlake Park, though.	Sep 14, 2012 1:26 PM
536	Very important	Sep 14, 2012 1:23 PM
537	ease of access, good lines of sight to and from for bus back to U/W primarily - students and real users with employment centers north of the lid.	Sep 14, 2012 1:17 PM
538	OK	Sep 14, 2012 12:53 PM
539	I agree with them	Sep 14, 2012 12:44 PM
540	Good Goals	Sep 14, 2012 12:18 PM
541	you forgot "enhance Madison Park at any cost" ;-) I think you're doing the best you can.	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
542	Yes please!!! Please make it easy for people who walk and bike to use this bridge and please connect multiple communities to the bridge. The 520 bridge serves the region and many people will use it on foot and on bicycle.	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
543	Love the goals but wonder how a westbound off-ramp on the Montlake lid makes sense with these goals in mind.	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
544	Yes, those sound like great goals. Pedestrian and bicycle safety is essential. However, I also believe that we need light rail across the 520 bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 12:01 PM
545	Use "reasonableness". Not every little nook and crany of green spce needs to be accessible to evry human being. It's OK to have a green median between lanes that people can't walk along. Not every green space needs to have ADA access from "every" direction, as long as a reasonable access is provided from at least one direction. Don't overdue it and waste tax dollars.	Sep 14, 2012 11:27 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

1	This path should remain separated from street crossings and continue on the Portage Bay Bridge up to the Delmar lid. There should also be safe and as-separated-as-possible connections to the current and future bike paths and greenways in the Montlake, Lake Washington Blvd, and Capitol Hill areas.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	It should minimize distance and elevation up/down and connect smoothly to 1) the University near the stadium 2) the Arboretum 3) south Montlake neighborhood 4) University bridge 5) north Capital Hill and 6) Eastlake neighborhood (and downtown).	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 PM
3	Bikes need full connections into all Seattle neighborhoods that can feed into the bridge	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 PM
4	Continuous and separated bike lanes from Medina to downtown. The 520 project should be built to fully support this; the rest of the connections (say, through Eastlake) can be paid for later. Path should be continuous to Boylston as part of this project. The shared use idea, in practice, will really only apply to bikers and some runners over the Lake Washington span. From Montlake to Boylston may include walkers and larger diversity of bike riders.	Oct 5, 2012 11:05 PM
5	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 PM
6	Minimize grade differences within and between modes, esp with connections to transit. Wayfinding for Bikes is very important. Bike transitions should provide for both experienced and novice or nervous riders, and minimize crossing difficult or slow intersections, even in crosswalks.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 PM
7	I think that the path really needs to continue across the Portage Bay bridge with a dedicated path lane on the bridge, and connect into the major bicycle routes near the junction of I-5 and 520, such as Harvard Ave, 10th Ave, Roanoake/Delmar, and Eastlake Ave.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 PM
8	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Oct 5, 2012 8:35 PM
9	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 7:47 PM
10	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 7:22 PM
11	If it could link easily into the Burke-Gilman system that would be a great start.	Oct 5, 2012 6:15 PM
12	Turn offs available before Montlake, at Montlake, and onto Roanoke	Oct 5, 2012 4:40 PM
13	It should have good connections to burke gillman over Montlake bridge, and also be connected to capital hill with a good grade (highway or better) and access	Oct 5, 2012 4:21 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	controlled path in other words don't make me fight my way up the hill on the streets where I have to go up steep grades and at the same time dodge cars from driveways and street intersections.	
14	The shared-use paths should continue as far and in as many directions as possible throughout the area. At the very least, the shared-use path must continue along the Portage Bay bridge to connect with the new Delmar lid and provide a way to connect this regional path with Capitol Hill and beyond. It is also important to have a smooth and safe connection with UW, preferably a shared-use path that continues all the way across Montlake bridge. Connecting to the arboretum and Lake Washington Blvd is an also must.	Oct 5, 2012 4:16 PM
15	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:10 PM
16	This path should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid so that it connects with bike trails and greenways leading the Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, and downtown Seattle.	Oct 5, 2012 3:44 PM
17	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 3:36 PM
18	Montlake Park?	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM
19	It really needs to go straight over Portage Bay to connect with a safe route to downtown. If there is a gap then it can't really be considered a "regional path"! From when I commuted to the Eastside, I know something about gaps in "regional" paths... it means scary stuff like having to ride up Northup Way in the dark and rain.	Oct 5, 2012 3:28 PM
20	Figure out a workable connection to the Burke-Gilman trail	Oct 5, 2012 3:25 PM
21	A shared-use path along the Portage Bay Bridge, providing an easy pedestrian/bicycle connection between Montlake and Roanoke, would be the best connection to Seattle, especially if combined with some bicycle improvements to Eastlake.	Oct 5, 2012 3:24 PM
22	Simply account for the possible destinations in your plan (downtown, u-district, montlake, capitol hill, lake-front, etc)	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
23	Peds/bicyclists should be able to [1] get to the Burke-Gilman trail; [2] get on the bike path that takes them to and through the Arboretum; [3] get on Montlake Blvd S. for further travel.	Oct 5, 2012 3:07 PM
24	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:06 PM
25	Please have it provide connections from the east side all the way to South Lake Union and Downtown Seattle. Having a connection that is not interrupted will really increase the number of people that bike instead of drive.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

26	connect to the burke gilman trail on the north. construct a trail on the south that will connect to lake washington blvd and to downtown.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM
27	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 2:58 PM
28	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar lid on the Portage Bay Bridge to connect Eastlake and North Capitol Hill with Montlake, UW, and Medina.	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
29	It should continue all the way to Seattle Center and/or downtown. It's also silly to call it a non-motorized connection when it provided access for people who require assisted personal mobility like electric scooters, Segways, powered skateboards and the like.	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
30	With as many branches to UW and downtown and capitol hill as possible.	Oct 5, 2012 2:33 PM
31	There should be a bike path across the 520 bridge	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM
32	It should continue all the way to Roanoke area lid, and then should connect to E Roanoke St (for access to upper East Lake and downtown), 10 Ave E, and Federal Ave E (for connection to Capitol Hill). Abandoning it in Montlake would be lunacy.	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM
33	That's great.	Oct 5, 2012 2:22 PM
34	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 1:57 PM
35	Obviously, the shared use path needs a great connection to the Burke-Gilman. But, for getting downtown, the Portage Bay bridge should absolutely have a bike lane to the Delmar Lid and all points wouth and west from there.	Oct 5, 2012 1:33 PM
36	A bike lane is a must from montlake towards downtown! It will fill a need of more then just riders across the new 520, as it will allow those coming from NE Seattle to have a much better way to get downtown then currently. Getting from the Burke Gillman trail to the this Portage Bay crossing for peds and bikes and then the easy and quick access downtown is a must.	Oct 5, 2012 1:32 PM
37	Connect up with the Seattle bike/pedestrian master plan and transit stations.	Oct 5, 2012 1:13 PM
38	There should be connections/transitions on the Seattle side where 520 intersects with significant roadways, i.e., Lake Washington Blvd, Montlake, and Roanoke.	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
39	primarily concerned for fluidity to UW and Montlake	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
40	This should not be a shared use path on Portage Bay Bridge. Find alternative more pleasant ways to make this connection continue on through the Montlake neighborhood and purchase available properties south of the bridge to do it. DO	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	NOT WIDEN PORTAGE BAY BRIDGE TO MAKE A SHARED USE PATH CONNECTION.	
41	Paramount: designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities. Connections need to be on dedicated walking/biking paths - away from cars.	Oct 5, 2012 12:47 PM
42	Don't bother; it's too expensive for too few users. The money should be spent on bridge users who are in autos and who are paying the tolls.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
43	The addition of the shared use path the Portage Bay Bridge is essential and obvious. It completes the routes from the Eastside to Downtown. Bridges are for people too.	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
44	Provide connections to existing lake washington route to south, montlake bridge to north, transit facilities in Montlake, and W. Montlake Pl E (to SW).	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
45	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM
46	keep it simple - too expensive	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
47	This is important. Access to local neighborhoods without a large impact on motorized traffic will provide a safer and faster alternative to driving and will help keep motorized traffic flowing better.	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
48	Bus transport is the most logical interconnection for bikes and peds.	Oct 5, 2012 12:30 PM
49	I prefer a path that I can take from the Denny/Eastlake area over I-5 then a staight path to the water near UW. There is currently no way to connect to the Montlake area unless you go over the large hill and through back roads or via the Burke Gilman then south. This is not efficient for biking to the area. Like in Redmond a path to follow the road is basic and protected for non-motorists.	Oct 5, 2012 12:25 PM
50	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
51	No preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
52	Care should be taken to provide safe, well thought out engineering to minimize or eliminate car and bicycle/pedestrian shares and instead segregate the areas when possible.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
53	connect to existing street where these is plenty of space to transition with existing sidewalk/road.	Oct 5, 2012 12:18 PM
54	Regional shared use paths should be developed to maximize separation of pedestrian and cyclists from automotive traffic. Dedicated Pedestrian and cyclist	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	pathways and lids connection the west side lids and viewing areas with other currently designated city pathways must be an essential element of the overall westside 520 approach design.	
55	The city is really a different condition and context for the "shared-use" path. The city is built on a relatively dense grid of shared-use paths and destinations. compared to the eastside. But a direct shared-use connection to Lake Union, the waterfront and the Sound makes sense. So continuing to Roanoke and across I-5 is a good idea.	Oct 5, 2012 12:05 PM
56	Like the rest?	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
57	I strongly support shared-use facilities for this project.	Oct 5, 2012 11:48 AM
58	It should ideally meet up with the BGT... if this is not possible, then dumping out onto a dedicated bike lane such as that on Dexter would be best.	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
59	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
60	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 11:25 AM
61	With efficient higher speed integration with Burke-Gilman and 24th ave cycle commuter arterials and quieter connections to neaighborhood streets and the Arboretum for recreational users please.	Oct 5, 2012 11:22 AM
62	This needs to create easy access to established trails, and we must absolutely be able to connect from Medina to I-5 via a shared use path.	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
63	Connect with existing surface streets effectively. A highway path is not required.	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM
64	promote bicycling across the through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities. Shared use trials on future Portage Bay bridge and easy clear transition onto Burke Gilman and other surface street routes.	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 AM
65	In a safe ,sensible, and attractive manner. Bring in some commuting cyclists to give advice and feedback at all stages of the design.	Oct 5, 2012 11:04 AM
66	as above	Oct 5, 2012 11:01 AM
67	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
68	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	Lake Union.	
69	Regional shared-use path The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
70	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
71	I don't think it needs to be more than 11feet wide.	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
72	It should be narrower than planned it is to wide	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
73	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
74	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
75	The MPCC believes that there should be a connection from Montlake to the Delmar Lid that ties together the network of pedestrian and bicycle routes leading to Downtown, Capitol Hill and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
76	There should be a direct connection to the Burke Gill man trail, a connection to the Arboretum, and direct route over I-5	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
77	Absolutely critical that we have a single uninterupted path from I5 to the east side. Hopefully connecting through to the existing 520 bike path (personally critical for me). The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don’t know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each “preference”. I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can’t afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 AM
78	Provide clear and direct connections to all destinations.	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
79	I support the new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path but don't have specific suggestions	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM
80	It should provide safe comfortable connection between Lake Washington Blvd. UW, Capitol Hill and Eastlake.	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

81	It should connect and transition with the likely destinations of users in mind. Pedestrians and bicyclists will be going different distances than each other and than cars and buses. They are all equally important.	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM
82	Please continue the path so that users can get to the arboretum, U of W, and surronding neighborhoods as well as downtown.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
83	The connection should be continued to Downtown in a way that meets AASHTO guidelines for shared-use paths.	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
84	Utilize existing burke-Gilman trail as access point to downtown, or provide continued path to Eastlake ave via Roanoke for downtown access.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
85	In some way that makes it easy to get to the light rail station at the UW from it, and also to connect with the Burke-Gilman trail and other major bike routes and greenways. The interface between the I-90 trail and Lake Washington Boulevard via S. Irving street is an example of how NOT to do it- steep hill with a blind corner.	Oct 5, 2012 9:35 AM
86	It must allow, at Montlake, both northbound and southbound entry/exit; and continue across Portage Bay bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:32 AM
87	Into other bike routes.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
88	Dedicated path/trail.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
89	Probably just end at Montlake, maybe have an off shoot to foster island/arboretum.	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
90	In Seattle it will not only become a regional trail but also the local trail. This means more users on the infrastructure so there should be more resources, though, and space dedicated to the non-motorized users of our state transportation system.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
91	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 9:05 AM
92	no opinion	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM
93	Sure, try to make logical connections	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM
94	There should be a north-south trail through Eastlake, and/or a flat path connecting Roanoke St to the end of Lakeview Blvd (Lakeview being an existing safe street for cycling that connects to trails and downtown).	Oct 5, 2012 8:52 AM
95	The path must be continuous to the path east of I-405 and provide a connection to downtown Seattle. The proposed concepts seem suitable as long as there are no major traffic crossings. It is not clear how the west end of Roanoke will ultimately connect to downtown Seattle.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

96	Montlake to Delmar, tie it all together! Love this idea.	Oct 5, 2012 8:42 AM
97	It would be nice if it was a free standing bridge (i.e. not right next to fast moving cars) which would make it more pleasant and less stressful.	Oct 5, 2012 8:17 AM
98	A Dexter-style dedicated bike lane on Eastlake (or improved shared-use facilities along the east Lake Union waterfront), connecting directly with both Amazon's proposed downtown bike facility and the Lake Union Loop, would be absolutely huge. Right now, the main psychological barrier to cycling on Seattle's existing paths is that almost every trip requires crossing through very bike-unfriendly areas. Connecting UW, 520, downtown, South Lake Union, and the Burke Gilman with continuous and safe shared-use facilities would result in a profound shift in the perceived safety and practicality of cycling in Seattle.	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
99	Ideally, the path would continue across the Portage Bay Bridge and connect to a good bicycle route downtown.	Oct 5, 2012 7:55 AM
100	You have to make connections of the shared use path into the existing bike/ped network at all points. There can be no gaps in the paths to the Udistrict, to Roanoake, to the Arboretum, to 24th Ave E/Interlaken, to Eastlake and south of the University Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 7:45 AM
101	A safer route through Eastlake would be ideal.	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
102	should connect easily to Burke Gilman to the west and north, and towards Interlaken and through Arboretum on the southwest and south	Oct 5, 2012 7:34 AM
103	This should be considered the same way you consider freeway off ramps: sketch out the points likely to be connected by this bridge. Safe access, including long sightlines, lack of intersection with freeway on ramps, and high-quality pavement must connect the path for those headed north to the University across the bridge, East to East Lake, South Lake Union, and downtown, and finally those headed south to Capitol Hill.	Oct 5, 2012 7:24 AM
104	Not many will use it. Guaranteed. Keep it simple and cheap.	Oct 5, 2012 7:12 AM
105	Seems that the proposed shared use path along 520 would connect with the Lk Washington Bike trail would now connect via the new Montlake Lid...? I'd like to see a direct connection there vs. just existing cyclists onto surface streets.	Oct 5, 2012 6:57 AM
106	i as of now have no ideal. i did but somehow i lost that thought.	Oct 5, 2012 6:54 AM
107	it could connect onto the exisiting Burke Gilman trail and the future light rail station. South bound it can connect to the existing Lake WA trail.	Oct 5, 2012 5:44 AM
108	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 5:39 AM
109	At capital hill	Oct 5, 2012 5:14 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

110	Ask the professionals!	Oct 5, 2012 4:04 AM
111	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 5, 2012 12:56 AM
112	Not sure, but smoothly with emphasis on quick movement and not super slow bike movements, like a too small shared path corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 AM
113	The I-5 to Medina and SR-520 bridge project offer an incredible opportunity to create a 8+ mile bike and pedestrian route connecting the Eastside and Westside. It would be fantastic to have on/off-ramps to the Arboretum, Montlake, and Roanoke/Eastlake.	Oct 5, 2012 12:27 AM
114	Along the Portage Bay bridge!	Oct 4, 2012 11:24 PM
115	plan safe access all the way to Lake Union / downtown	Oct 4, 2012 11:14 PM
116	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 11:04 PM
117	It should act as a hub and give users clear connections to existing and future shared use pathways. It should be a beautiful welcome to the city and show how progressive we are at getting people around our city in an enjoyable fashion.	Oct 4, 2012 11:03 PM
118	Connections are needed to Capitol Hill, Eastlake, and the University bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:37 PM
119	The path should have multiple exits. The first should be connected to Madison Park, the second to Foster Island, the third to Montlake Blvd, and the 4th to Roanoke.	Oct 4, 2012 10:26 PM
120	t should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 10:23 PM
121	The connection and transition must be continuous and direct: routing non-motorized users onto side streets to get to S.Lake Union (aka Amazon) and downtown discourages alternative transportation (ie cycling). Get the bike lane all the way through the zone. Make it actually I5 TO Medina, not just partway.	Oct 4, 2012 10:22 PM
122	Marked bike routes and enhanced bus service to this new terminus would strengthen it substantially	Oct 4, 2012 10:07 PM
123	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 PM
124	Connect to existing good bikeways - Roanoke/10th Ave, Washington Blvd, etc. Include a safe and direct route to cap hill and downtown.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

125	Connections to the shared use path should be convenient and safe for users of all ages and abilities. The shared use path should be at least 14ft wide to allow for safe two-way bicycle traffic and optimize connections to existing bicycle routes and mixed use trails.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
126	not really sure what you're asking, but if we're building a new path from 520 into the seattle bike path network it needs to connect to a number of existing trails. it should connect to the burke gilman over the montlake cut, to the interlaken bike boulevard via 24th, and the arboretum/lake washington boulevard route heading south. i also think it would be fantastic to build a path that connects to south lake union. my ideal route for said path would be along the waterfront with as few hills as possible: montlake playfield > boyer > furman> fairview along lake union. Please take hills into account when you are planning new bike routes. cyclist would rather ride a bit extra than have to climb up a steep hill.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
127	connect near Delmar/Boylston to provide access to Cap Hill and downtown	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 PM
128	It needs good connections to Montlake/UW, 23rd, 10th Ave, and Eastlake!	Oct 4, 2012 9:27 PM
129	Smoothly, at or above grade.	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 PM
130	Goals The goals for making good nonmotorized connections include: access and mobility, health and safety, character and clarity. These are built upon public feedback, existing bicycle and pedestrian master planning and best urban design practices. What is your feedback on these goals? The goals are good. But, your design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, thereby reuniting the neighborhood and creating a vibrant connection that benefits the entire city, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520 scar, pollution, noise pollution. As an motorized vehicle interchange, the design replicates on a grander scale the existing outdated system which is the main source of backups (and pollution) extending from University Village to Boyer Ave E. Given that additional traffic (owing the removal of the Arboretum ramps and the re-routing of this traffic to this location) is being forced on this interchange, one cannot hope that it will function well for the city of Seattle. Worse, it is clear that the pedestrian and bicycle connections are an after-thought, stuck in corners of the area sometimes clearly unsafe (under SR520), condemned to use cramped spaces (the access to Bill Dawson), never designed to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe from cars and buses, created without a clear understanding of how people use the Montlake neighborhood and crossing of SR520 and the ship canal. The design needs to be entirely revised from the ground up, so that it meets the goals of Safe Routes To School, meets visually impaired commuters needs, takes into account the fact that foot (especially) and also bike traffic increases steadily on the west side of Montlake Blvd E (failed Level Of Service), demonstrates a genuine concern for safety for all expressed by a separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, and offers direct routes on both sides of Montlake Blvd E., and on the eastern part of the project. Finally, the addition of	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	a multi-use trail on the Portage Bay Bridge is an obvious choice: it will complete the trail that will cross Lake Washington on SR520 and will offer a connection to downtown, Capitol Hill, First Hill, and South Lake Union that does not exist. Your willingness to study this preference is greatly appreciated. This bicycle and pedestrian trail has the potential to offer a very viable alternative to other mode of transportations and to truly help Seattle increase significantly the number of people using non-motorized modes of transportation.	
131	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 9:10 PM
132	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
133	Make the non-motorized connection as independent as possible from the intersection. Drivers don't want to have to deal with waiting for pedestrians or cyclist.	Oct 4, 2012 9:02 PM
134	This path should cross I-5, connect to the Burke-Gilman, connect to Green Lake, and connect to urban green streets like Ravenna Boulevard. I know this is a great distance, but these bike facilities need to connect in all directions to serve people in all neighborhoods.	Oct 4, 2012 8:52 PM
135	Yes! This would at least offer people a route that is non-car based and provide connections between high density areas	Oct 4, 2012 8:40 PM
136	cleanly, for users north and south.	Oct 4, 2012 8:18 PM
137	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 8:09 PM
138	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
139	Should go all the way to north Capitol Hill at the 10th/Delmar lid, with marked routes continuing from there up 10th to Broadway, down to Eastlake and SLU, and down to the University Bridge. There should also be routes branching off at the Montlake lid towards UW campus, towards the Arboretum and towards Montlake/East Capitol Hill.	Oct 4, 2012 7:53 PM
140	It should connect to the Lake Washington loop and other on-stree trails. Better connections to the Burke north of the ship canal is critical too. The current use of the sidewalk across the Montlake Bridge is not acceptable as a long-term solution.	Oct 4, 2012 6:58 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

141	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
142	There should be several places for peds and bikes to connect from or with the path across the lake. Into Montlake, into UW and the Burke-Gilman trail, further west to connect into downtown seattle or north across the ship canal bridge and into Wallingford. Safe, clear, direct acess is key.	Oct 4, 2012 6:17 PM
143	lowest dollrs should be spent that meets the requirement	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
144	connect up with existing bike paths	Oct 4, 2012 5:37 PM
145	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM
146	NO share	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
147	Definitely it should have a dedicated pedestrian and bicycle path, if possible all the way through. This is very important, this could be the foundation stone that we need to make Seattle and unique city. This could be the chance that we need to make things better for all of the citizens of this city. Or at least give them the opportunity and the means to have a share-use path available to them.	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
148	bring me into non-artierial with easy connection to SLU	Oct 4, 2012 4:59 PM
149	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, South Lake Union and downtown Seattle.	Oct 4, 2012 4:45 PM
150	It should connect extensively.	Oct 4, 2012 4:40 PM
151	it should connect into montlake and then provide lake-to-lake access. Where people can walk from the far banks of Lake Washington to the bank of Lake Union	Oct 4, 2012 4:11 PM
152	There needs to be a path on the portage bay segment.	Oct 4, 2012 4:07 PM
153	focus on connections with light rail where possible	Oct 4, 2012 3:43 PM
154	A continuous path all the way through Montlake and Portage bay to the Eastlake Neighborhood and the edge of Lake Union. Connectors from this spine to both north and south nonmotorized corridors.	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
155	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 3:06 PM
156	Need to add missing connection to Madison Park	Oct 4, 2012 2:59 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

157	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 2:49 PM
158	via Montlake then Eastlake Ave (?)	Oct 4, 2012 2:45 PM
159	Frequent and clear signage; options to go S, N, or W once it exits 520, including continuous paths without onerous way finding/crosswalks/waiting for lights, and without dark dreary unsafe underpasses.	Oct 4, 2012 2:26 PM
160	YES! We must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 2:00 PM
161	Obviously a clear, convenient, well-marked connection to the BGT. If part of it is on 24th that's great! Pedestrians and cyclists need more width than Montlake Bridge/Montlake Blvd sidewalks can provide. A connection to the arboretum (and thus southeast) is nice, and it looks like you have that covered. Make sure it's easy to get to the excellent Lake Washington Loop route. And through the Montlake Playfield. Obviously the Portage Bay Bridge should have a bike path. Maybe it should even provide a dump-out point west of I-5 so people going through to downtown don't have to climb all the way up to Roanoke.	Oct 4, 2012 1:56 PM
162	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 1:44 PM
163	It is key for the transition to Seattle be on dedicated nonmotorized path for as long as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 1:24 PM
164	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 1:09 PM
165	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 12:52 PM
166	It should connect from Montlaketo the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and South Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM
167	Burke-Gilman access for north seattle connections, and an improved bike route from the area to downtown.	Oct 4, 2012 12:24 PM
168	The key is to make it efficient to get to your destination once you arrive on the Seattle end of the bridge. That means considering where and how cyclists	Oct 4, 2012 12:18 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	choose routes, which include stoplights, traffic, dedicated bike lanes or not, and steepness of hills. Similar considerations influence how pedestrians choose a route.	
169	Once on land in Seattle, users of the cross lake connection will disperse toward several different locations. Including the UW, the Burke Gilman Trail, the Arboretum, Capital Hill, and downtown Seattle. The dispersement will result in much lower volumes to each of these destinations. This is where return on investment should come into play. Don't spend an exhaustive amount of money on the Portage Bay connection for few riders and also for a destination where multiple routes currently exist that have much less vehicle volume and it's related noise. If these connections are so desirable by the City, they should contribute to the cost and not make the entire state pay for it.	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM
170	The regional shared-use path should follow 520 from Medina all the way to I-5 with connections to Montlake/UW, North Capitol Hill, East Lake, and a connection to South Lake Union/downtown. It should be just as efficientand seamless for a cyclist/pedestrian to get from east of Lake Washington to downtown as it will be for motor vehicles. Infrastructure at this scale needs to accommodate all users and potential future users. This is a 100 year decision and needs to reflect the future needs of the region and it's inhabitants.	Oct 4, 2012 12:14 PM
171	It should have a connection to/from Madison Park. It should have a connection to Foster Island. It should connect to Montlake. It should continue at the bridge grade up to Roanoke to allow an easier climb to the upper eastlake area. It should allow for a connection around the south/west shore of portage bay to the Univ. Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 12:08 PM
172	As long as there are bike / multi-use trails I would be happy.	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
173	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
174	Pop over to Eastlake with a continuation of the path, through South Lake Union and into downtown.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
175	I think that there should at least be exits at Montlake, Roanoke and on the west side of I-5. That way it will be a true bicycle highway.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
176	As completely as possible	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
177	It should be seamless for people using the shared-use path. There should be adequate sidewalk and trail access from the path and plenty of signage and lighting.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
178	Connect the communities with thoughtful and usable design.	Oct 4, 2012 11:35 AM
179	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	
180	Maybe have information placards along the way about Seattle/the east side? Art representing the olympic peninsula (heading towards Seattle)/The Cascades (heading towards Medina).	Oct 4, 2012 11:11 AM
181	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 11:10 AM
182	I own our home a half mile from this location and support a continuous bikeway throughout the corridor.	Oct 4, 2012 11:03 AM
183	See my earlier comments on Portage Bay Viaduct proposed bike/ped lane. I favor a lower "hung below" option to these paths, much line the ped path under the north side of the Montlake bridge, a wonderful viewing area because it is quiet, and separate from the traffic lanes (noise and safer)	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
184	The new non motorized corridor should provide users with ways to continue North/South at both the Montlake and Roanoke interchanges.	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 AM
185	If there's room, offering gravel paths for walkers/runners in transition areas could help minimize conflicts between folks on wheels and people on foot. It would be great if there were a connection to Harvard Ave E, north of E Roanoke St.	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 AM
186	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
187	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 9:24 AM
188	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 AM
189	What a joke! Too expensive. Trendy bicycle crap that hardly anyone will use.	Oct 4, 2012 7:08 AM
190	as seamlessly as possible but with as many connections as possible (no easy task I am sure)	Oct 4, 2012 3:22 AM
191	The 520 crossing will be a huge improvement for non-motorized commuting. Obviously, the better it connects to routes leading to other destinations, the more useful it will be. Connections at Montlake are covered elsewhere in the survey. On the west side, a continuation of the trail across portage bay would be a major improvement for trips into/out of south lake union and downtown Seattle. On the eastside, a "diagonal" connection through Medina to downtown bellevue (without going all the way to 405) and a similar "shortcut" towards Kirkland would be useful. The new trail should also connect seamlessly to the existing 520 trail east of 405.	Oct 4, 2012 2:28 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

192	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 PM
193	Tie it together nicely with your mobility hub in 11 above. Hire a competent parks design architect as part of your project delivery process.	Oct 3, 2012 9:17 PM
194	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:50 PM
195	Should integrate for use	Oct 3, 2012 8:39 PM
196	Needs to be a part of the design and connect to the west side of I-5.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
197	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 3, 2012 4:05 PM
198	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 3, 2012 3:51 PM
199	Connect to Montlake lids offering interchange to Montlake, UW, Arboretum Connect at Roanoke lid offering interchange to Roanoke, Portage Bay, North Capitol Hill, and down the hill to Eastlake Do not expand the scope to worry about solving 520 to downtown bike connectivity -- the city can pursue that via 10th Ave/Broadway and Eastlake Ave improvements. Consider placing the Portage Bay shared-use path on the north side of the bridge for easier connectivity through the Montlake lid & paths, and the terminus with the stairs/path from Roanoke down to Boyer below.	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
200	Well! It's important that it have good connections in the Montlake/Portage Bay/UW area, designed to handle north/south and east/west bicycle traffic flows merging into one other. It also needs good access from both the north and south sides of 520, good connections at the west end (including the nice multi-use trail proposed over I5 there).	Oct 3, 2012 2:00 PM
201	It should have great connectivity on the Montlake lid and be extended to the Roanake lid via Portage Bay, with a new safe crossing of I-5.	Oct 3, 2012 1:22 PM
202	with easy connections to UW and n'hoods to the south	Oct 3, 2012 1:16 PM
203	not sure about this	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
204	The shared use path on 520 is great across the lake, but it should NOT continue across the Portage Bay Bridge. Connections to Seattle are available on dry land from Montlake.	Oct 3, 2012 12:34 PM
205	needs further review	Oct 3, 2012 12:13 PM
206	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing	Oct 3, 2012 12:00 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	
207	I like the idea of a shared-use path across I-5, but can't quite figure out how you'd connect with existing routes on the west side of I-5. I don't want to ride down Boylston, and there's quite a steep hill down to the bike route on Eastlake ... but I guess it would work - Roanoke down to Eastlake would need bike lanes or some similar designation so folks know to expect bikers on that route.	Oct 3, 2012 11:07 AM
208	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 3, 2012 10:50 AM
209	Transition to commuter-oriented bike path system.	Oct 3, 2012 10:07 AM
210	It would be great to have bike-only parallels to any major car arterials.	Oct 3, 2012 10:00 AM
211	Smooth and clear connections to Eastlake Avenue East and Lakeview Boulevard past the Colonnade.	Oct 3, 2012 9:54 AM
212	Via a lid for safety reasons	Oct 3, 2012 9:54 AM
213	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 3, 2012 9:53 AM
214	There should be clear, easy to follow, and safe connections in all directions.	Oct 3, 2012 9:44 AM
215	Providing easy safe access to trails on both sides of the bridge which should give access to lake washing loop trail (seattle Side) and lake washington Blvd on the West side.	Oct 3, 2012 9:40 AM
216	I prefer multiple distribution routes at either end. I think much care and thought should be given to the northbound route to the university. Basically, the Montlake bridge is fine, but requires a railing separation between the sidewalk and the car deck. Also, I support separation between the bike and pedestrian routes. I walk to the uw from Montlake and fear the bike traffic on the bridge. My son has epilepsy and his life is definitely at risk on that bridge, with significant traffic volume and careless high speed bike traffic on narrow sidewalks.	Oct 3, 2012 9:00 AM
217	Is should connect at Montlake to a new urban surface path that can lead to South Lake Union	Oct 3, 2012 8:45 AM
218	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 AM
219	Be on the new bridge all the way to I-5.	Oct 3, 2012 8:26 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

220	The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle? It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 3, 2012 8:02 AM
221	Please provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 3, 2012 7:45 AM
222	It should connect with a minimal elevation change bulid up so as to ease the effort of bikers/walkers.	Oct 3, 2012 7:24 AM
223	connect from Burke Gilman to E Lake Sammamish Trail	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 AM
224	It should continue across the Portage Bay Bridge, with connections to pedestrian and bicycle facilites (e.g. greenways, bike lanes) in Montlake, Roanoke, and Eastlake.	Oct 2, 2012 11:57 PM
225	I prefer a dedicated bike lane. Or at least, clear expectations for both bikes and pedestrians.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 PM
226	Need maximum connectivity to Eastlake and N. Capitol Hill	Oct 2, 2012 8:32 PM
227	14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Oct 2, 2012 6:19 PM
228	It should mainly connect to the Burke-Gilman Trail but also provide an easy connection to Capitol Hill and Downtown, similar to the I-90 bike tunnel.	Oct 2, 2012 5:51 PM
229	Connecting to another shared-use path would be ideal to keep peds and bikes safe from the heavy car traffic this project will create.	Oct 2, 2012 5:38 PM
230	Provide a shared-use trail and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:21 PM
231	The path should be integrated to create safe and easy access to the UW, Burke Gilman, Montlake neighborhood, Lake WA Blvd, Capitol Hill and bike lanes and paths running to downtown. On the East side, the path should be integrated into bike lanes on Bellevue Way, Lake WA Blvd (Kirkland), Evergreen Point Drive, and Points Drive (leading down the hill to LWB). The final result should be the ability to go safely from Bellevue and Kirkland to Seattle neighborhoods and downtown (and vice versa).	Oct 2, 2012 3:27 PM
232	It should connect from Montlake to the Delmar Lid and tie in the developing network of bike routes and greenways leading to Capitol Hill, downtown and S. Lake Union.	Oct 2, 2012 12:14 PM
233	A connection at Montlake and maybe one at 10th would be the best option. That would make it easy to access DT Seattle as well as Capitol Hill and the U District.	Oct 2, 2012 12:10 PM
234	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:09 AM
235	The answer is obvious: Complete the system by connecting it from Montlake, up	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	the Portage Bay Bridge to Capital Hill and them down to Eastlake. Anything less would be totally inadequate and short-sighted. Let's not create another 'Missing Link' in the regional system. Many path users will want to travel to/from Capital Hill, Eastlake, South Lake Union and downtown Seattle to/from the Eastside. The floating bridge and Medina sections will provide great connectivity to major residential and employment centers on that side of the lake. Let's not make a HUGE mistake of not providing the same access/connectivity on the west side of the lake.	
236	As long as this is wide enough and engineered for riders of differing abilities it should work.	Oct 2, 2012 10:13 AM
237	Please have planners walk through any proposed routes -- walk in the sun AND the rain AND the dark.	Oct 2, 2012 10:01 AM
238	Request B: Portage Bay Bridge multi-use lane We urge WSDOT to carry out Portage Bay Bridge design preference #8, which is to “study safe, direct and comfortable bicycle and pedestrian connections from Montlake to downtown Seattle and north Capitol Hill, including a bicycle and pedestrian facility on the Portage Bay Bridge.” Importance of this request: This corridor has been deemed very important at the regional, citywide and local levels. Supporting this preference would have positive implications for the safety, health, economy, and environment of our communities and the city as a whole.	Oct 2, 2012 9:21 AM
239	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 9:26 PM
240	It should connect with the lake washington loop and with the burke gilman trail	Oct 1, 2012 8:05 PM
241	at multiple points?	Oct 1, 2012 7:25 PM
242	Bicycling connections are critical. Should connect to existing bike routes on surface streets and trails in the area. Connect to Burke-Gilman trail and Lake Washington bike route via Montlake. Connect all the way across Portage Bay to East Lake, so that bike commute to S Lake Union and downtown can be a reality.	Oct 1, 2012 2:46 PM
243	Need to provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 2:28 PM
244	Obviously Seattle needs to commit to this as well. The city needs to include what they plan to do to provide the smooth transition to other parts of Seattle.	Oct 1, 2012 1:32 PM
245	It should connect to both bus and rail hubs at either end. But, there should also be mass transit rail along the bridge to make connections from downtown to places like Redmond faster and easier.	Oct 1, 2012 1:24 PM
246	Priority should be on the section which isn't possible now which is the across the lake bridge. Once you get to and thru safely Montlake interchange, there are	Oct 1, 2012 12:48 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	many options.	
247	Good connections to the University and points north, to the Montlake neighborhood, and, in order to connect to downtown, a bike/ped path on the Portgage Bay bridge.	Oct 1, 2012 12:45 PM
248	It should provide clear continuity to the city structure as a whole, so people's mental map is "complete". They think of the path and they know they can get anywhere without linking a convoluted series of discordant paths.	Sep 30, 2012 9:26 PM
249	I	Sep 30, 2012 3:32 PM
250	Transitions from the new I-5 lid must be safe, clear, and spacious for bicyclists and pedestrians. Expand bicycle lanes on Eastlake Ave E, or turn Boylston Ave E into a dedicated bicycle/pedestrian path that funnels into South Lake Union. Attention should also be paid to travelers bearing north from the lid onto Eastlake and across the University Bridge.	Sep 30, 2012 10:56 AM
251	Less trees better visability	Sep 30, 2012 7:29 AM
252	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 30, 2012 3:47 AM
253	This shared-use n/m connection must traverse Cap Hill so that the terminus of 520 at I-5 is kept as simple as possible.	Sep 29, 2012 11:47 PM
254	This is an excellent time to link up with the existing bike and pedestrian paths on both sides of the lake.	Sep 29, 2012 7:43 PM
255	frequently	Sep 29, 2012 6:34 PM
256	It should go all the way from Medina through Montlake up to Roanoke, all using the structure that's being built for cars. At Roanoke there should be a good connection for bikes over I-5. Then there should be a good way to get down to Eastlake. Cyclists should be able to head south from Eastlake to downtown or north to the u-district.	Sep 29, 2012 4:38 PM
257	The Portage Bay connection is critical; please include this.	Sep 29, 2012 2:37 PM
258	This is a necessity.	Sep 29, 2012 1:38 PM
259	The major bike pathways in the neighborhoods should be served: Burke-Gilman, Interlaken park, the Arboretum, the existing bike path along the east side of I-5.	Sep 29, 2012 1:22 PM
260	Fix noise problems, or else use will be minimal.	Sep 29, 2012 10:10 AM
261	I like the connection at the 24th location. As already stated further study of the connection to cap hill is nrrded.	Sep 29, 2012 7:00 AM
262	Taking the time and money to create a shared-use path that is separate from car traffic in this busy corridor is an investment that will pay dividends for decades. This is a great opportunity for Seattle.	Sep 29, 2012 6:40 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

263	Want multi-option for path users to get anywhere in Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 10:58 PM
264	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:25 PM
265	It needs to have a north and south connection into the city. Example of the north would be to tie into the Burke Gilman at U of W. South connection would be some were along Eastlake south of the Montlake Cut.	Sep 28, 2012 9:33 PM
266	it needs to provide an off ramp at montlake, but it can't stop there, it needs to continue up to i-5/roanoke	Sep 28, 2012 9:22 PM
267	Somehow the shared path needs to connect to Burke Gilman as well as to routes downtown.	Sep 28, 2012 8:17 PM
268	With a toll booth, so this 7th 520 lane collects revenues from the direct users.	Sep 28, 2012 6:03 PM
269	Northern sky bridge from Mountlake to UW and BGT . Crossover and new pathway South though Arboretum to Madison into Downtown or Lake Washington Blvd	Sep 28, 2012 6:02 PM
270	It should have good connections through into Eastlake and Fairview bicycle routes to go south into the city.	Sep 28, 2012 4:24 PM
271	I mentioned earlier about connecting north to Burke-Gilman and south to the Lake Loop trail. How will the trail connect to downtown Seattle? Could the bike trail continue along 520 to the west side of I-5 and from there down into Seattle?	Sep 28, 2012 3:56 PM
272	Efficiently, sensibly, and effectively. Straightest path possible.	Sep 28, 2012 2:41 PM
273	Leave the 520 route at Montlake if there is a reasonable alternative route. Otherwise, continue on the 520 to Delmar, then cross the I5 and turn left through Eastlake.	Sep 28, 2012 2:32 PM
274	With as many access points as possible versus one mega-connector.	Sep 28, 2012 2:28 PM
275	The path should link to existing trails and bicycle/pedestrian corridors, as well as with future corridors.	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM
276	Provide a connection to UW, to Capitol Hill and to Seattle that is safe and not far removed from transit.	Sep 28, 2012 2:10 PM
277	It should connect with the trail across the Portage Bay Bridge, for starters, and provide easy access to the Burke-Gilman trail with well-signed routing. Ideally, 24th Ave E heading up to Capitol Hill would have a bike lane or other infrastructure making it a safe road to bike. (I'd also love for the main drag of Montlake Blvd to have bike accommodation - riding on the sidewalk only works so far, and it's not always practical to go over to the B-G trail if you're heading a different direction, or even going to U Village.)	Sep 28, 2012 1:31 PM
278	BOTH at UW (onto Montlake) and west of I-5 (i.e., downtown.) Dropping down into the Arboretum is a distant third priority.	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

279	Connection through Arboretum to Capitol Hill area (south) and through U District (north).	Sep 28, 2012 11:16 AM
280	Preferably by isolating bicyclists from cars all the way from Hunt's Point to the east shore of Lake Union.	Sep 28, 2012 10:34 AM
281	A connection through Roanoke (make it 2-way?) to Eastlake and the Cheshiahud loop	Sep 28, 2012 10:03 AM
282	Yes, definitely.	Sep 28, 2012 9:07 AM
283	Montlake area	Sep 28, 2012 8:39 AM
284	Multiple shar-o's stemming from more major bike and ped path over i5. Emphasis on smooth transition.	Sep 28, 2012 7:40 AM
285	DO NOT MIX BICYCLES, PEDESTRIANS AND CARS. DEVELOP DIFFERENT PATHS... ENOUGH OF THE FOCUS ON CARS AND DISREGARD FOR THE REST OF THE COMMUNITY.	Sep 28, 2012 7:09 AM
286	Conecting not only at Montlake but also at Roenoke is very important. At this time bike traffic is forced on to difficult intersections to make the transition form 520 Montlake to Eastlake which is the best access to downtown. This can be improved by assuring that bikes access Eastlake from Roenoake.	Sep 28, 2012 6:28 AM
287	I'm hopeful that the shared-use paths will be designed to transition to lower elevation trails or routes, such as Fuhrman	Sep 27, 2012 11:41 PM
288	end path in Montlake and connect with existing facilities across Montlake Cut to the north, thorugh the Arb to the south and by Montlake Playfield/Boyer/Delmar to the east.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 PM
289	It should go all the way to Eastlake neighborhood, ensuring equitable and safe access for bicyclists from various neighborhoods, not just the U District.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 PM
290	Needs to come all the way to I-5 for connections to capitol hill, eastlake, and downtown.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 PM
291	Link up with existing bike routes east lake etc	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 PM
292	ensure minimum 14 foot wide bicycle lanes	Sep 27, 2012 10:04 PM
293	Please focus on a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Sep 27, 2012 9:08 PM
294	Speaking as a cyclist, try to keep it as flat as possible, and connect with existing paths and bike-friendly streets.	Sep 27, 2012 8:20 PM
295	It needs to be at least 14'W with cycle path and pedestrian path, safe for pedestrians and safe for cyclist...This should be very high on priority list	Sep 27, 2012 8:13 PM
296	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

297	The path needs to have a "landing" at Montlake but must go beyond that. Perhaps using part of the Montlake community center land to make a safe and streamlined cycling path with the ability to go up to Roanoke area and connect to Capitol Hill and Eastlake and routes to downtown. Possibly a serpentine path up to Roanoke under or alongside 520, connecting to lid and improved and safe ways to cross I-5	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
298	Transition to a bike path.	Sep 27, 2012 6:18 PM
299	The more easily the new 520 trail can connect to the Burke Gillman the better. Any added connections to any planned greenway type project in the UW area would be a bonus. I would love to be able to use this new corridor to cycle between the UW area and the Eastside with ease and convenience.	Sep 27, 2012 5:59 PM
300	Please don't make me cross dangerous amounts of traffic or insane hills on either end.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
301	Please connect to Burk Gilman trail on west side. Also connect to Lake Washington Bulavard. East side should connect to Bike trail that connects to Kirkland and Bellevue.	Sep 27, 2012 5:35 PM
302	It should make connection to downtown and other trail systems safe and convenient to encourage use	Sep 27, 2012 5:14 PM
303	This path should provide north-south connections to Montlake and the UW, north capitol hill, and north-south Eastlake.	Sep 27, 2012 5:01 PM
304	The easiest way with separated lanes for bikers	Sep 27, 2012 4:56 PM
305	Non motorized direcct access for bicycles and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 4:49 PM
306	multiple places to get on and off the path.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
307	As well as connections in Montlake, there should be a Portage Bay bridge bicycle path to get over to Eastlake and to head up Capital Hill.	Sep 27, 2012 4:34 PM
308	provide multiple paths and connections at Roanoke, Portage Bay, Montlake. good connections to BGT and Lake WA Loop.	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
309	There must be a similar path on the west side of the bridge to connect into the city, particulary a path over I-5	Sep 27, 2012 4:12 PM
310	Ideally, the connection into Seattle will prioritize the three main directions that nonmotorized traffic will travel -- Capitol Hill, Downtown, and University of Washington. The path must provide safe, wide connections directly onto existing dedicated pathways (or optimal shared-use roads).	Sep 27, 2012 4:11 PM
311	Please plan to connect to major bicycle and pedestrian routes seamlessly: Portage Bay Trail, Burke Gilman, Lake Washington Boulevard, etc. This will likely be a part of the popular lake cycling routes, so plan to avoid conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists by providing adequate space and possibly separated lanes.	Sep 27, 2012 4:03 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

312	We need better bike access into downtown from the East Side	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
313	By providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge with connections to Cap Hill and Downtown	Sep 27, 2012 3:44 PM
314	Bicyclists should be able to ride from Montlake to down town Bellevue via a shared use bridge and designated cycle lanes.	Sep 27, 2012 3:38 PM
315	It should connect to the Burke Gilman and a clear path downtown, perhaps along Eastlake, or whatever the preferred cycle path is from UW area. The eastside should connect safely to the north/south corridor cycle path. Currently it is very unclear where the safest cycle path is from 520 to downtown bellevue.	Sep 27, 2012 3:08 PM
316	A 14 foot wide shared use path should be a minimum size to consider, with convenient tie-ins to existing trails and routes.	Sep 27, 2012 3:05 PM
317	Again, I disagree that a shared-use path is the best answer. I would prefer separated bicycle facilities with easy and fast connections to both north/south and further east/west routes.	Sep 27, 2012 2:33 PM
318	It should connect effectively for easy use.	Sep 27, 2012 2:24 PM
319	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 2:19 PM
320	Portage Bay bridge should have bicycle facilities	Sep 27, 2012 2:09 PM
321	There should be easy access to making north/south connections at multiple points and connections to transit and light rail.	Sep 27, 2012 2:08 PM
322	I think the designs highlight an excellent solution as is.	Sep 27, 2012 1:59 PM
323	there should be easy, logical connections to Burke Gillman and Lake Washington trails as well as to key bike routes for commuters.....	Sep 27, 2012 1:49 PM
324	Should just be seamless on the route of least resistance instead of having a lot of turn and side road. I bet easiest is to build a bith path in every bridge and freeway upgrade	Sep 27, 2012 1:41 PM
325	options UW , CAP Hill and Down town basically a spider web to different destinations	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
326	The shared use path, like I-90's path, should make it easy for pedestrians and bicycles to walk/ride to and from Bellevue and Seattle via 520.	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
327	As much as possible, connect with existing bike infrastructure.	Sep 27, 2012 1:07 PM
328	onto surface streets at montlake and Broadway T.	Sep 27, 2012 1:00 PM
329	If the goal is to create better connectivity for non-motorized used and to encourage more non-motorized use, then I believe it is important to continue the shared use path from Medina all the way to the Delmar/10th Ave E lid.	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

330	If the path can stay with the 520 bridge until it gets to west of I5 that would be ideal!	Sep 27, 2012 12:58 PM
331	Gee, let's see. Hmm.. Oh I know! Put a bike path along the entirety of 520 which includes Portage Bay!!	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
332	Should provide easy access to Montlake, Eastlake and Capitol Hill.	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM
333	connections in Seattle should include safe, clear ways to exit in various places between Montlake and I5. As much as we can integrate this with existing paths and bikeways and/or add more would be great! There needs to be a shared use trail on the Portage Bay bridge in order to make this work (i don't see that in the plans).	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM
334	The path must reach deep into seattle with a protected cooridor to efficiently get cyclist and pedestrians distributed from and collected to the bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
335	MUST include continued path/connection via Portage Bay Bridge. MUST include better options for north/south bicycle options on Montlake Blvd.	Sep 27, 2012 12:35 PM
336	Good idea	Sep 27, 2012 12:21 PM
337	The trail should continue to north capitol hill. It should also be designed to minimize conflict with vehicles when traveling from 520 to UW via the Montlake bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 12:20 PM
338	As seamlessly and directly as possible.	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
339	use the model on Mercer Island - connections to roadway cycling routes, and connections to parks and "slow" mode users (walkers, kids on bikes, etc.) don't try to mix the two...	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
340	There should be good signage (unlike that of the regional paths in Mercer Island and Bellevue). Also there should be a nonmotorized connection across the Portage Bay bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 12:12 PM
341	This would be wonderful	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
342	Since I am not strong enough for long hills, I would prefer improved connections to the Burke Gilman trail, Eastlake Avenue, and Arboretum road. The climb up to I-5 from Portage Bay is nice for strong cyclists, but not for me.	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
343	ok	Sep 27, 2012 11:44 AM
344	dump out into a bike lane that autos have been given lots of warning is coming.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
345	Please design to give cyclists and pedestrians peaceful access to these trails.	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
346	If it could exit in Montlake bike and pedestrian only area that would be good.	Sep 27, 2012 11:29 AM
347	From Medina there should be a clearly signed path that connects with the I-90 path, which will allow transition into Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 11:22 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

348	It would be nice to extend the current path that runs through Montlake Playground to something that would work through the adjacent neighborhood and over to Eastlake	Sep 27, 2012 11:18 AM
349	It will be a BIG improvement if there IS a path! How it connects is less critical to me, as long as there is a ramp (as opposed to stairs) access for cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 AM
350	no thoughtful opinion on my part because this is a very complicated issue. Sorry.	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
351	It's important to providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge for safety and access.	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
352	By feeding in to other nonmotorized paths in and through Seattle, particularly some way to get downtown on a bike safely.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
353	A safe connection is important for a shared use-path. But it does not need to be fancy.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
354	The current trend is to create indirect, winding paths -- pretty, but not efficient for primary transit. While these are needed, straight-line high-speed bike routes are crucial to our city's continued growth and stability.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
355	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
356	provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Sep 27, 2012 10:55 AM
357	I would focus on connecting nonmotorized users to the downtown, walkable area of Bellevue, and the parks.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
358	Not sure how, but I'm sure that it should.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
359	By providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 AM
360	Needs to connect to transit, and other bike/ped paths in a safe efficeint way. Dead end not and option. Smooth transitions, clearly marked will make for greater use !	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
361	safely. major employers around lake union and into the city will benefit in many many ways from employees arriving safe and healthy	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
362	My main feedback is that the design must (1) include a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) have bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
363	It should connect through and we should be making bicycle highways that can allow people to avoid direct road sharing	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
364	See above goals.	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
365	1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	by people of all ages and abilities.	
366	It is critical we have a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 AM
367	It would be good to tie in with any existing or future (envisioned) paths/connections so we have an integrated pathway system.	Sep 27, 2012 10:21 AM
368	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
369	Existing Elliot Bay/Olympic sculpture cycle path is one place. Another is along the current route along easlake. Ideally the eastlake route would be dedicated, connect with lake union and on into downtown.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
370	Just having it is 90% of the job. But it would really hamper many users without at least one "major" option for non-motorized users in each direction. That is, westbound users should have easy access to at least one major route northbound, one southbound, and one that continues west.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
371	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
372	Portage Bay Bridge: Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
373	Bicycle use is essential and absolutely critical to the long-term success of the project. Safe bicycle routes will encourage the use of that transportation method, particularly between Redmond and downtown Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
374	Make it easy to not use single-use cars. Thus, it has to be easy and safe to use feet, bicycles, and mass transit.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
375	The shared use path should split and meander. Connections should be made direct to UW, Cap Hill and Eastlake neighborhoods	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
376	Most of my commuting by bike from the Eastside ends at the UW, but a continuation of the bike path into Eastlake would be desirable	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
377	with a dedicated path -	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
378	Not exactly sure of the design, but please design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:52 AM
379	Completely and safely	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
380	Non motorized and light rain is KEY!!!! THANK YOU	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
381	yes!!!	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
382	We must establish that cyclists and pedestrians have the right to safely move	Sep 27, 2012 12:49 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	through the city. Then we establish that some public space must be re-appropriated to this end. If we pedestrians and cyclists are 10 percent of trips, then perhaps we deserve 10 percent of the impervious surface. Notice that I write "trips" not miles. Trips are a more accurate indicator of utility since car drivers will drive further from their home on a whim, rather than shopping or working close to home.	
383	The regional shared-use path needs to go all the way past I-5 to Lake Union and provide access to other nearby destinations.	Sep 26, 2012 11:23 AM
384	It should go all the way to Eastlake and then connect with a path there to downtown. We don't stop cars at Montlake, why would we stop pedestrians or bikers?	Sep 26, 2012 11:20 AM
385	no opinion as eastsiders don't commute in anything other than cars	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 PM
386	seamlessly with a continuous 14'+ pathway the entire length and separated pedestrian and bicycle facilities as much as feasible	Sep 25, 2012 8:58 AM
387	I had assumed this 520 path would connect north to the Burke Gillman and south to the existing bike routes. This survey talks about a path along the Portage Bay Bridge, which raises the question what is a good way to connect north to the U District or south to Seattle downtown, or up the hill to Capitol hill. Could you create a path running along the west side of I-5 to connect to downtown? A marvelous elevated bike / pedestrian bridge to connect to Seattle center and downtown? The whole Eastlake area seems really hard to find a good route through ... I end up going through Fremont and taking Dexter to go downtown because the path is safer and Dexter has always worked for bicycling (and the new bike path / islands for the bus stops made it much safer) ... (and even when Dexter was a mad house of buses and bikes fighting a war a rush hour ... it was a war where everyone knew the rules and there were surprisingly few accidents ...) Could East Lake become like Dexter ... It does not feel that way to me because East Lake is almost entirely commercial and Dexter is residential (and the people who live there know how to drive safely on the road.) I think the commercial nature of East Lake would make it hard to get a good thoroughfare for pedestrians and bikes in that neighborhood.	Sep 24, 2012 11:45 PM
388	What are my options? A little help here woudl be great.	Sep 24, 2012 9:21 PM
389	Until there is a dedicated shared-use path or clearly marked corridor for pedestrians and cyclists connecting the greater UW area with downtown, I have no suggestions. Every current possibility simply dumps nonvehicular traffic into harm's way.	Sep 24, 2012 6:38 PM
390	The key is connecting to existing bike routes, particularly the ones that are low traffic. The less bikes interact with cars and pedestrians the better. Connections at montlake is probably good enough, although improving access to downtown from the montlake area would be a good thing.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
391	North and south connections. A bicycle-friendly route on or parallel to Eastlake would connect northwards to the university and southwards to South Lake	Sep 24, 2012 12:59 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	Union, providing another bicycle route connecting central and north Seattle together.	
392	The path should provide convenient, high-speed connection points to Burke Gilman trail, the lake washington cycling route, a path to safely ascend capitol hill (likely by connecting to Interlaken park), and a connection to Eastlake neighborhood for Downtown Seattle and South Lake Union-bound cyclists.	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
393	I like the current proposals. From a westbound-perspective, a cyclist would have the ability to ride into the arboretum, Montlake, the U-district, and Capitol Hill via existing bicycle infrastructure. Moving further west to I-5, having a safe, straightforward way to cross over to the bicycle infrastructure in Eastlake would be a great idea.	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
394	Hopefully this logically connects to existing bike infrastructure, like the Burke Gilman. Let's avoid another "last mile" problem like we have in Ballard, and get a solid connection between the major bike/pedestrian thoroughfares in Seattle.	Sep 24, 2012 12:00 PM
395	I hope WSDOT will plan on the NONMOTORIZED folks being tolled.	Sep 24, 2012 10:07 AM
396	Step 1: it needs to be continuous from the bridge across Lake Washington on; otherwise people will be stuck with very roundabout routes which will depress ridership. Step 2: for going West, just dropping people on Roanoke Street, once it's become quiet after passing over I-5, ought to work fine, with some helpful signage. For going East, the hill up from Fairview Ave could be forbidding to a lot of riders, so a connection from Eastlake or Franklin Ave seems more useful.	Sep 23, 2012 6:53 PM
397	seamlessly and with as much separation from car traffic as possible	Sep 23, 2012 2:45 PM
398	It is critical that the regional shared-use path connect all the way to I-5 on the Portage Bay Bridge. At that point, good pedestrian and bicycle connections should be made to the west across I-5 to Eastlake Ave to allow travel north to the University District and south to South Lake Union, to 10th Ave East to the north to reach Capitol Hill, and also from 10th to Lakeview Boulevard for good connections to South Lake Union and downtown.	Sep 22, 2012 4:48 PM
399	The east-west connection is pretty well designed. The only issues would be: 1. The stairs from Montlake Blvd. to the tunnel. 2. The switchback on the west side of Montlake Blvd. 3. The lack of mobility at the Roanoke and Montlake intersection. 3. The west storm drain detention wall at the Bill Dawson trail. 4. The use of the Prep property.	Sep 22, 2012 1:01 PM
400	Please do not leave bicyclists stuck in Montlake. A Medina to Capitol Hill connection (with dedicated regional shared-use path over Portage Bay) is critical to connecting Seattle with Bellevue.	Sep 22, 2012 10:32 AM
401	bike it easy for path users to get to the u district, downtown, capitol hill and south to madison	Sep 22, 2012 10:19 AM
402	It should seamlessly connect to any existing paths on both sides of the bridge.	Sep 21, 2012 3:49 PM
403	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

404	Both. But seriously, a cyclist should be able to ride from Redmond, along the 520 trail, all the way across the bridge, through Montlake, up Portage Bay Bridge, under 10th, south to Lakeview, then onto the "Hobo" trail that connects to Melrose. Cyclists and pedestrians should also be able to ride comfortably from Montlake to Madison Park and back to UW without fearful places where kids or old people might be dissuaded from riding or walking. Think 8-80. There should also be a cycle track from Montlake south to Interlaken at the very least as well as uninterrupted access to UW and points north. After all, that's the plan for cars.	Sep 20, 2012 6:31 PM
405	A series of well-marked routes into Montlake/University District and Capitol Hill/Roanoke.	Sep 20, 2012 10:41 AM
406	Link it to the Link Light rail.	Sep 19, 2012 3:26 PM
407	It needs to go all the way from the west side of I-5 all the way to the existing 520 trail on the east side of the I-405. Also we need to create traffic separated facilities through Seattle from this trail to the major neighborhood and business centers.	Sep 19, 2012 12:34 PM
408	As directly as possible, both visually and physically (particularly for pedestrians, visual clarity is an important piece of mobility, since even short distances going "the wrong way" cost relatively large amounts of time)	Sep 17, 2012 3:31 PM
409	It should be continuous, connected and make use of the construction that has to be done anyway. Walkers and riders should not be diverted to city streets when there is a glorious new bridge that could include them as users.	Sep 17, 2012 11:20 AM
410	Do it through montlake and North Capitol Hill...Right past Seattle Prep, over/under 10th Ave E, across Broadway East, and ON TOP of a NEW I5 lid!!! It would be perfect and connect citizens to the city. It would be like an extension of the Burke Gilman trail - which could also connect downtown through Lake View/North Capitol Hill area. Have you thought about that?? A Burke-Gilman like trail going through Montlake, up and over Broadway East (just south of 520) and over I5...spectacular view for all the peds/bikes!!	Sep 17, 2012 10:08 AM
411	As seamlessly as possible with as much continuity into exiting infrastructure.	Sep 17, 2012 6:19 AM
412	Ideally it should continue, if possible, to and from the Portage Bay Bridge to new Roanoke,C|Sr. crossing, and have an exit to Montlake Blvd.	Sep 16, 2012 4:53 PM
413	Should be able to bike to lake union via Burke-Gilman Trail and make a comfortable transition to capital hill or downtown areas.	Sep 16, 2012 1:56 PM
414	If there is a way to safely make connections or create paths into downtown Seattle that would be good.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
415	This is a stupid question. It should provide safe transition to all the seattle bike paths.	Sep 16, 2012 9:21 AM
416	THE REGIONAL PATH SHOULD CONTINUE TO THE ROANOKE LID AND ACROSS I-5.	Sep 16, 2012 2:36 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

417	This only makes sense if Seattle is willing to truly support nonmotorized transportation options.	Sep 15, 2012 9:35 PM
418	This path MUST connect with a pedestrian-bicycle facility across Portage Bay to South Lake Union. There will be high demand for this route. The pedestrian and bicycle path across the Montlake Cut to the University of Washington is already at capacity and will need to be upgraded to accommodate the increased demand.	Sep 15, 2012 8:48 PM
419	Please preserve as much of the wetlands and urban parks as you can.	Sep 15, 2012 7:53 PM
420	I should function as a optimized throughfare that facilitates fast and same connections between the neighborhoods to the northeast (U District, U Village, Roanoke, Laurelhurst, etc) and Capitol Hill/Eastlake/Downtown. It should allow users to avoid the hazards and inconvenience of cycling through UW or Delmar St.	Sep 15, 2012 1:44 PM
421	Best would almost be if it passed through a tunnel under I-5 and dropped out somewhere along Eastlake Blvd in order to limit the uphill. Would make it much easier/palatable for many to bike into town from U district, Eastside, etc.	Sep 15, 2012 1:04 PM
422	New? What is new about it. You are catching up with a project to enhance are renew a major state highway project that has been deferred for way too long. Adding bikes and HOV lanes and separate lanes for light rail is fine - provided it does not reduce the capacity of the existing four lanes of motor vehicle traffic. If you have to - make the bride wider to accommodate these additional uses of an EXISTING corridor.	Sep 15, 2012 12:40 PM
423	Flattest way	Sep 15, 2012 11:30 AM
424	By integrating these somewhat disparate neighborhoods to the future mass transit options and urban transit corridors well, we can further improve the character of the city itself.	Sep 15, 2012 11:02 AM
425	Link into existing north/south bike paths. Link into new dedicated pedestrian/bicycle paths that extend through capitol hill and down town	Sep 15, 2012 1:28 AM
426	Safely and directly.	Sep 14, 2012 5:57 PM
427	no opinion	Sep 14, 2012 5:56 PM
428	Walk way and Bike way must be incorporated! In any new DOT design. T is not Transportaion for motorized vehicles. Walking and biking are methods of Transportaion.	Sep 14, 2012 5:46 PM
429	It should allow for easy, safe, convenient access to residences, businesses and employers in Capitol Hill, the University District, downtown through direct, separated bikeways, just as the Eastside projects should provide. The shared-use trail should not abruptly end and dump users onto busy roadways to find their ways to their destinations.	Sep 14, 2012 5:26 PM
430	With a grand visual statement that reminds/announces to travelers that they're	Sep 14, 2012 4:43 PM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

	entering a green, cyclist/ped/transit-friendly world-class city of the future that values its natural environment, where sea meets mountain. Lots of impressive art and landscaping! And, don't forget great, clear directional signage!!!!	
431	Ideally a set of separate bike/walk paths toward downtown and into the UW area would be created. I'm thinking of what it's like to walk from Brooklyn to Manhattan--bikers and pedestrians are separate from traffic and have a continuing system on either side of the bridge, instead of being dumped into traffic.	Sep 14, 2012 4:28 PM
432	It should have plenty of connections to neighborhoods at different elevations throughout the corridor. In part, this means continuing the trail along the Portage Bay Bridge, all the way to the Roanoke Lid.	Sep 14, 2012 3:56 PM
433	I not really sure how to answer this. I would like several possible options to choose from. I suspect there would need to be some kind of "staging area" where people could rest, park bikes, and get oriented before joining the Seattle street system.	Sep 14, 2012 2:16 PM
434	no t sufficient knowledge	Sep 14, 2012 2:06 PM
435	You seem to have totally forgotten about the MAIN USERS: SOVs!	Sep 14, 2012 1:51 PM
436	it should connect both at montlake, 10th and across roanoke into eastlake	Sep 14, 2012 1:39 PM
437	I would keep the trail on the east side of I-5 (e.g. along Harvard to Lakeview/Fairview) so as to make for nice views, and then make a trail down near Mercer St.	Sep 14, 2012 1:26 PM
438	Strong support	Sep 14, 2012 1:23 PM
439	Connection on the east side of I-5 though the arboretum, and across Roanoke Ave to the west side of I-5 down towards the Lake Union area.	Sep 14, 2012 1:17 PM
440	Hopefully transition gradually from the facility to a neighborhood-like street, to generous arterial-parallel ways, then to the I'm in the urban transportation system situation.	Sep 14, 2012 12:53 PM
441	not sure but it needs to	Sep 14, 2012 12:44 PM
442	Not sure	Sep 14, 2012 12:18 PM
443	to the Arboretum and south, to the UW/B-G Trail and north/west; onto 10th for Capitol Hill & Eastlake, I guess...	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
444	Seamlessly. Consider that many more people will walk and bike in the future.	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
445	not sure there is a simple answer to that, it is going to have to be looked at each intersection point and determine the best way to connect or transition.	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
446	Connect along the SR 520 corridor to Roanoke, down to Franklin Avenue and the City of Seattle should turn Franklin Avenue into a bike/pedestrian-only street	Sep 14, 2012 11:27 AM

Page 7, Q2. Regional shared-use path
The I-5 to Medina project provides a major new east/west nonmotorized connection with the dedicated regional shared-use path. How should the regional shared-use path connect or transition into Seattle?

(and resident parking) connecting to downtown.

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

1	Need to provide pathways for through cyclists at higher speeds and, especially in view and relaxation areas, pedestrians and slower cyclists. This may necessitate some duplication in pathways in some areas.	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 PM
2	Width is critical for supporting older and less steady riders - especially if we start seeing European levels of use (and we'd better or health costs will bankrupt us all ...)	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 PM
3	Continuos path. Traffic separation. Where shared, such as on the lids and across I5, further separate bikes from peds. Control exits and entrances onto the path, and provide wide spots with clear visibilty. Be realistic and recognize that some times of the week, ie weekend days, there will be 20mph bike traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:05 PM
4	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 PM
5	Better and more bike lockers at montlake.	Oct 5, 2012 9:58 PM
6	These sound like good goals.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 PM
7	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The	Oct 5, 2012 7:47 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520.	
8	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 7:22 PM
9	Keep cars and bicycle traffic either separated or using a "calming" approach to the traffic to make co-existence better for all parties.	Oct 5, 2012 6:15 PM
10	Make the highway narrower through waivers on lane/shoulder widths, etc.	Oct 5, 2012 4:16 PM
11	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:10 PM
12	Add the Portage Bay Bridge shared-use trail. Provide a separate crossing for	Oct 5, 2012 3:44 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	pedestrians and bicyclists across Montlake Blvd (west side).	
13	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 3:36 PM
14	Stroller access.	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM
15	I wish that path had been there when I used to commute that way! The real refinement that needs to be made is connecting the east/north portion of the 520 trail to make it a true regional path.	Oct 5, 2012 3:28 PM
16	MAKE BICYCLE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Oct 5, 2012 3:06 PM
17	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor	Oct 5, 2012 2:58 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
18	The Dawson trail ramp should not include sharp blind turns in places where bicycle and pedestrian users will meet. The sidewalks on the Montlake Bridge should be wider to reflect the amount of bike/ped usage here.	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
19	Will there be speed limits along the "nonmotorized" route?	Oct 5, 2012 2:51 PM
20	Separate bicycle and pedestrian paths if possible.	Oct 5, 2012 2:33 PM
21	Without extending the regional trail to the Roanoke lid area, there is no way to provide safe non-motorized access from I-5 to Medina for users of all ages and abilities. The grades on the roads are simply too steep. The only way to meet the planners goals is to extend the regional trail all the way up to the Roanoke lid area.	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM
22	Keep climbs to a minimum or provide gentle slopes.	Oct 5, 2012 1:57 PM
23	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped	Oct 5, 2012 1:57 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	commuters need to be met.	
24	Please do more to make it easier to get across 520 by, for example, including a path on the west side of Montlake blvd that is seperated from traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 1:33 PM
25	Safe transitions from the nonmotorized path on to roadways, for both the Seattle and Medina ends of the project are very important. Is any thought being given on how to extend the pathway to where the current 520 path begins, just east of 116th? That would provide safe, nonmotorized transportation all they way to Redmond.	Oct 5, 2012 1:01 PM
26	No blind turns on Bill Dawson trail connections. Separate peds bikes from motorized trafic on west side of Montalke blvd. No connections from SR 520 hared use path and arboretum shared use paths should not cause peds and bikes to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th ave e bike route can be merged with the arboretum bike trail and connected at e Miller. Study types of crossing lights. There SHOULD NOT BE ANY DARK AREAS UNDER 520 for pathways of any type. Good light levels should be designed into any pathways under the freeways and also security cameras imbeded into the walls that are monitored by local police for safety. Design elements in these areas should involve permanent art features, graphics, tiles, etc. Children need safe routes to schools, libraries, and play areas in the neighborhood not routes not under 520	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
27	A major bridge project should not be about exercise and recreation; it should be for access by commuters and users in autos who are paying the tolls. Seattle can pay for its own urban renewal if they want to enhance the area.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
28	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
29	Most important is nonmotorized crossing of lake. Interstate 90 nonmotorized	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	route is a bit narrow during weekends and commute hours, so providing a slightly wider path on SR-520 would be ideal.	
30	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM
31	keep it simple - too expensive	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
32	A shared use path along side motorized traffic across the entire bridge is key to local area connections and businesses.	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
33	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
34	No Preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
35	Care should be taken to provide safe, well thought out engineering to minimize or eliminate car and bicycle/pedestrian shares and instead segregate the areas when possible.	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
36	Do this within the proscribed footprint and it should be a win / win for all. Add width of the 520 corridor on the west side without significant vetting and mitigation is not desirable!	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
37	This is an infrastructure project. There should be clarity about which things are permanent and which things will change over time. Adaptability for programmatic and systems changes is critical to the way cities evolve. In trutly public space, program changes spontaneously. Will universities as knowledge and activity centers survive further developments in communications technologies? Activity centers and desitnations 'float' in an infrastructural field. Providing "opportunities" is as much as can be done.	Oct 5, 2012 12:05 PM
38	Don't they turn you away unless you live there? Will there now be access?	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
39	Provide lanes and paths for nonmotorized use, that are separate from motorized traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:48 AM
40	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
41	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 11:25 AM
42	The transitions between the bridge and cycle commuter arterials need careful design to preclude conflict with recreational users. Please make it easy to share the space.	Oct 5, 2012 11:22 AM
43	No	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM
44	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 AM
45	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
46	The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
47	Diverse users The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
48	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
49	I also think that curves should be free of potential blindspots to aid in preventing collisions and mishaps. For example the I-90 west end of the bridge has two curves where oncoming bicycle/pedestrian traffic can lose uptrail visibility at the base of a downhill ramp.	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
50	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

51	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
52	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
53	The MPCC supports the recommendations of the Central Seattle Greenways comments.	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
54	Just to state my prefs once again. The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don’t know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each “preference”. I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can’t afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 AM
55	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
56	I support continued design efforts to support non-motorized transportation.	Oct 5, 2012 9:53 AM
57	I am not sure, but would be happy for my family to show up and test options. I	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	have household members from age 1 to over 70. We prefer to bicycle and walk.	
58	Please make it fit into current budget limitations.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
59	Connection needs to be continued to Downtown and South Lake Union	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
60	No	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
61	I am now curious about what the path is going to do in Medina, but I suppose that is beyond the scope of this survey.	Oct 5, 2012 9:35 AM
62	Ideally, a cyclist / pedestrian should be able to go non-stop both east / west (totally) or north south (largely). Motor vehicles can already go east / west non-stop. Currently, to walk on the sidewalk from Roakoke Street to the Montlake Bridge, is a tortuous matter. Make it simpler.	Oct 5, 2012 9:32 AM
63	Making a bike friendly trail is not difficult; Belgium has been doing them for over a century. Remove the trail from interactions with autos as much as possible. Make the surface 5-6 feet wide, smooth, graded when possible, and void of large lips, curbs, transitions and grates.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
64	nope	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
65	On a project level, non-motorized needs should be given higher priority in this urban context than motorized needs.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
66	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe	Oct 5, 2012 9:05 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
67	no opinion. this sounds a little too much babying of wimps.	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM
68	Safety is important here: 1) The staircase and Bill Dawson tunnel should connect safely to reduce collisions, 2) Remove Blind turns on the Bill Dawsom trail, 3) Design it so pedestrians and bikers do not have to cross SR 520. 3) Widened Montlake sidewalks 4) Don't route pedestrians and cyclists under SR520.	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM
69	Goal should include separation of bicycles and pedestrians	Oct 5, 2012 8:59 AM
70	No, these are good.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
71	The Bill Dawson path has a lot of concerns for bicyclists. Please add the Portage Bay bike/ped path.	Oct 5, 2012 8:42 AM
72	I like Myrtle Edwards Park's separation of bicycles and pedestrians. This does a great job of minimizing user conflict.	Oct 5, 2012 7:55 AM
73	sounds good as proposed	Oct 5, 2012 7:34 AM
74	Keep it simple.	Oct 5, 2012 7:12 AM
75	I'd like to make sure any new space is designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings	Oct 5, 2012 6:57 AM
76	from looking at your design you have more non-motorized planning solved...	Oct 5, 2012 6:54 AM
77	No -	Oct 5, 2012 5:44 AM
78	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle	Oct 5, 2012 5:39 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
79	On street bicycle facilities directly adjacent to shared use paths need to be evaluated 1st	Oct 5, 2012 5:14 AM
80	Safety, safety, safety!	Oct 5, 2012 4:04 AM
81	Please improve the Montlake area pedestrian/bike usability.	Oct 4, 2012 11:24 PM
82	drinking fountains and bathroom facilities. Kiosk that show how to best navigate the city on bike / transit / foot.	Oct 4, 2012 11:03 PM
83	As I stated earlier. The bike trail should be better sheltered from the road spray and debris generated from the automobile traffic. Put it below the bridge deck would better shelter it from the noise and road spray and rocks and other debris that gets thrown up by the cars and trucks. An alternative would be to put up a fabric screen or at least put those green fins up that are used to screen headlights from blinding oncoming traffic. These would help avoid being blinded by the cars' headlights and reduce the chance of getting hit by flying debris from the traffic without the concerns of windsail. While you're at it, the same should be added to the I-90 bridge too. It really sucks to have to cross the bridge in the rain. Not because of the rain falling, but because of the road spray thrown up by the cars. It's nasty and full of grit and oil and gets all over your clothes and face. Winter bicycle commuting is miserable with the rain, road spray and blinding headlights!	Oct 4, 2012 10:36 PM
84	If you go with a cable style design consult with SF Bay Bridge for safety issues around the cable towers (impaired sight has led to many collisions on this very busy bridge). Include bike boxes (green marked spaces) to improve bike traffic on/off of bridge. Clear signage for getting to/from bridge (the current L. Washington route mappings are wonderful).	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 PM
85	Focusing on connecting existing routes and trails to the mixed use trail will provide additional safety and convenience for users.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
86	k.i.s.s. keep it simple stupid. make it as non complex as possible. please see the bike path on mercer lid as an example of what not to do. hills, a million turns, multiple routes, curbs and uncontrolled intersections. please take into account how quickly and directly people can use the trail, and error on the side of commuters that will use the trail everyday. if it's complex and not efficient people won't use it as much.	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
87	Look at the paths around Montlake and Roanake, some of the current ideas are not "comfortable and clear" but dark, twisty, confusing paths. It is "scary" to have 90 and 180 degree turns (lack of visibility) and tunnels (can't escape) and	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	crosswalks (when all of a sudden bicycles and peds are squished close together).	
88	I live on 25th Ave E and witness several bike/car encounters a year. There is too much bike traffic on this tight one lane road. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM
89	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas	Oct 4, 2012 9:10 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
90	The list is long: The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
91	Increase sound attenuation as much as possible to limit freeway noise. Nobody likes car noise.	Oct 4, 2012 9:02 PM
92	Great.	Oct 4, 2012 8:52 PM
93	Portage bike to Montlake bike and ped connection should be provided	Oct 4, 2012 8:40 PM
94	too far for anybody but hardcore bikers. montlake flyer stops need to be added back to include mortals.	Oct 4, 2012 8:18 PM
95	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and	Oct 4, 2012 8:09 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met. Effective planning and broad participation The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	
96	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
97	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
98	tax payer money should be for the bridge not to connect actiivty centers please stop the cost over runs at tax payer expense	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
99	Wide paths, well separated from traffic	Oct 4, 2012 5:37 PM
100	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
101	NO bikes	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
102	Just the fact that the paths need to be consistent from beginning to end. That is all and to make sure there is enough signs for car drivers to see and that there is also plenty of information for drivers and cyclist as to the rules of the road.	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
103	No comment.	Oct 4, 2012 4:45 PM
104	Connect Federal and 11th Avenues in North Capital Hill directly via pedestrian ways into / over the new Roanoke Lid. That would really integrate the neighborhood. Fix the 11th Avenue, 1 way intersection next to Seattle Prep (it needs to be changed into a 2 way intersection to increase traffic flow and improve safety). Also anything you can do to manage freeway noise, any way to continue to cut down on the noise would be fantastic (such as different forms of concrete or roadway surfacing on the new bridges).	Oct 4, 2012 4:11 PM
105	Nope.	Oct 4, 2012 4:07 PM
106	focus on easy connection and safety, not exercise or recreation.	Oct 4, 2012 3:43 PM
107	providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities	Oct 4, 2012 3:31 PM
108	Need to add missing connection to Madison Park	Oct 4, 2012 2:59 PM
109	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th	Oct 4, 2012 2:49 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
110	Bathrooms near the trail when they pass parks.	Oct 4, 2012 2:26 PM
111	YES! We must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 2:00 PM
112	Paths, particularly bike paths, are for going places. When people that don't actually bike places design bike paths, they design silly things like a 30-foot wide MUP on Roanoke over I-5. A cyclist would design something that can actually be used (bike lanes on the bridge? A clear way for westbound cyclists to make the left onto Boylston with minimal merging?).	Oct 4, 2012 1:56 PM
113	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 4, 2012 1:44 PM
114	There is a lot of expertise in urban design in the region, and a lot of experience in designing paths. it is frustrating to see the same mistakes being made repeatedly by the same planners who are not willing to learn from others in the region. Please take a field trip to PDX and see what they have been doing to improve bicycle access.	Oct 4, 2012 1:38 PM
115	he I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all	Oct 4, 2012 1:09 PM

	ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
116	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and	Oct 4, 2012 12:52 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
117	Widen the sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge to better handle pedestrians and bicycles.	Oct 4, 2012 12:43 PM
118	Keep in mind that for cyclists there will definitely be a small divide between those who must absolutely have a seperate bike path to ride on, and those who will happily choose a street if it has wide lanes or mellow traffic. Depending on the proximity of the path to the street -the design might want to take this in mind.	Oct 4, 2012 12:18 PM
119	The new 520 corridor should not become a barrier to non-motorized north/south traffic. Frequent and adequate crossings must be incorporated into the final design. These include connections to the regional shared-use path. The goal should be seamless integration of bike/ped infrastructure that enhances user experience.	Oct 4, 2012 12:14 PM
120	areas where significant ped traffic will occur should either have wider paths or separate peds from bikes.	Oct 4, 2012 12:08 PM
121	As long as there are bike / multi-use trails I would be happy.	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
122	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
123	I don't think that there should be a shared path, it is way too dangerous. Commuting cyclists and pedestrians, runners, roller bladers, little kids on bikes, etc.. do not mix well.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
124	Please prioritize separated paths for peds/bikes. People won't feel comfortable walking or biking through here if the area continues to be dominated by cars.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

125	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
126	Limit sound from car traffic as much as possible.	Oct 4, 2012 11:11 AM
127	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 4, 2012 11:10 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

128	Providing an attractive Boyer to Delmar Lid connection will activate the underbridge area, and hopefully a waterfront access "minipark" to Seattlelites. Note that there is a water trails kayak route all around Portage Bay, using the landings at many street ends for picnicking and rest stops. This bay and neighboring wetlands near MOHAI and FOSTER ISLAND are "natural areas" important to all Seattle. I would add to your goals above, the preservation of an attractive wetland, the last,and biggest in Seattle (the MOHAI sign says so!)	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
129	I mentioned earlier in this survey that I didn't get a clear picture of how bikers are supposed to travel north from the montlake area. Clarifying this will help the plan.	Oct 4, 2012 10:09 AM
130	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions.	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
131	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 4, 2012 9:24 AM
132	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a	Oct 4, 2012 9:17 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
133	I am sick and tired of you people throwing money at a handful of bicyclists.	Oct 4, 2012 7:08 AM
134	Some kind of permanent monitoring system should be set up to measure and track the ongoing use of the facilities.	Oct 4, 2012 2:28 AM
135	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 PM
136	Make it easy and safe to get from here to there. Hire a competent parks design architect as part of your project delivery process.	Oct 3, 2012 9:17 PM
137	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:50 PM
138	Shared use path should be at least 12 feet wide to accommodate both direction travel and lots of space for passing on foot and by bike.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
139	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill	Oct 3, 2012 4:05 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
140	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 3, 2012 3:51 PM
141	More defined recreation space in the new lids please! Bikers and hikers are accommodated but playfields, climbing, canoe/kayak launches are not yet.	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
142	The long unbroken over-water stretch needs special consideration, and will likely have a different mix of users and speeds than the Montlake-I5 stretch. Its design should facilitate having a majority of relatively high-speed bike traffic, and possible adverse effects from wind and waves mid-span (e.g. more frequent wet conditions that may surprise cyclists not used to biking across the bridge).	Oct 3, 2012 2:00 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

143	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 3, 2012 1:51 PM
144	not sure	Oct 3, 2012 1:16 PM
145	not able to comment on this	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
146	In any planning of Greenways, residents of the streets impacted should be primary participants.	Oct 3, 2012 12:34 PM
147	disaster prepardness (like snow), may be good brometer to determine finessing management to getting around	Oct 3, 2012 12:13 PM
148	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 3, 2012 12:00 PM
149	Make sure that the intersection at Boylston and Roanoke is extremely safe for bikes and peds - perhaps providing an all direction walk signal phase? Using Roanoke down to Eastlake as a bike-highway (local access only) would also be important. Mixed bikes/cars on a steep hill is bad news. I don't really like riding with traffic on Eastlake either (often use the waterfront street - Fairview - instead) so if another parallel road could become a dedicated bikeway (with local access) that would make it so much safer. This whole "share the road" thing is a joke for bikers.	Oct 3, 2012 11:07 AM
150	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E.	Oct 3, 2012 10:50 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
151	Please keep in mind the impact of roadway noise as a disruptive factor--that and the fragmentation created by multiple crossings of on ramps, etc.	Oct 3, 2012 10:00 AM
152	Places to rest for those who may need to stop before the beginning/end. Places for people to put trash.	Oct 3, 2012 9:54 AM
153	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge	Oct 3, 2012 9:53 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
154	A clean efficient north south bike/ pedestrian route through Montlake that connects to the Burke Gillman on the north end and a well though out transit connection with a small footprint. This does does not require large buildings or fancy infrastructure changes, just some thought.	Oct 3, 2012 9:00 AM
155	Focus on community connectivity verses the use of 14 feet of concrete on the Portage Bay Bridge	Oct 3, 2012 8:45 AM
156	More non-motorized paths throughout.	Oct 3, 2012 8:43 AM
157	Yes. The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 AM
158	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements to the design preferences that can help better address user needs? The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service.	Oct 3, 2012 8:02 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
159	Since abilities are mentioned I suggest that the non motorized part be elleminated to allow small non-polluting single person motorized vehicles like Segways, wheelchairs and other personal transport devices.	Oct 3, 2012 7:24 AM
160	Separate pedestrian and bike traffic	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 AM
161	No. These preferences are good.	Oct 2, 2012 9:01 PM
162	Transportation by bike is my priority.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 PM
163	Add light rail across the bridge	Oct 2, 2012 7:58 PM
164	When possible bikes should be given their own dedicated space. Ideally off the road, but if its on the road it needs to be super wide and out of potential doors being opened by parked cars.	Oct 2, 2012 7:00 PM
165	East Montlake Park should be walk- and cycle-centric	Oct 2, 2012 6:19 PM
166	Provide a shared-use trail and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:21 PM
167	A non-motorized path is of limited benefit unless connected to other bike/ped facilities such as bike lanes, sidewalks, other paths, etc. Having to cross lanes, cut against car traffic and similar problems in high-traffic intersections at freeway exits should be addressed and avoided.	Oct 2, 2012 3:27 PM
168	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay	Oct 2, 2012 12:14 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A user-activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
169	Wide paths and marked bike and pedestrian lanes.	Oct 2, 2012 12:10 PM
170	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:09 AM
171	If you really want to accomplish these needs, include a Portage Bay bridge nonmotorized connection.	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
172	As long as this is wide enough and engineered for riders of differing abilities it should work. Wider paths will help with newer riders. Although much recent bike construction throughout King County meets these requirements, there is a danger of going back to older, less usable designs to save money. If you are going to have a usable bridge for cars, you need a usable bridge for bikes. If you aren't going to create a usable bike route, you should not be constructing the car route, it really is that simple.	Oct 2, 2012 10:13 AM
173	Paths must be wide enough for walkers and bikes and strollers. Do not cut corners/widths here, if you want these paths to be used. Provide shelters from the weather at decent intervals, also call boxes. Pls do not assume that everyone has a mobile phone or can get to one that they do have if in a panic or scared. Remember that reaction abilities change with age and if accompanied by children/pets.	Oct 2, 2012 10:01 AM
174	Request A: Improve Montlake connectivity We urge WSDOT to redesign the North-South pedestrian and bicycle connections from the University of Washington and light rail station to Montlake and beyond. Of particular safety concern is the Montlake Bridge; the west side crossing of SR 520 over 7 lanes of traffic; and the lack of safe, direct, or comfortable connections to south of the project. As stated by the Seattle Design Commission, “we recommend WSDOT to re-examine choices to improve multimodal connectivity.”	Oct 2, 2012 9:21 AM
175	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 9:26 PM
176	It should provide a connection to major locations in the Kirkland area such as Evergreen Hospital	Oct 1, 2012 8:05 PM
177	for the love of anything sane, don't put the kiddies in the way of the commuters /	Oct 1, 2012 7:25 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	racers	
178	Make sure it is wide enough. The I-90 bridge path width is quite a tight squeeze for two way traffic, especially when walking or cycling with a friend. Also be sure to keep in mind drainage and clearing debris from the path.	Oct 1, 2012 2:46 PM
179	easy connection to Eastlake and Bellevue	Oct 1, 2012 2:28 PM
180	Include a (pay for) parking structure to allow people to at least park and then ride, cycle, walk, from there to across the bridge. Have a direct bus line from the parking facility.	Oct 1, 2012 1:32 PM
181	Just keep in mind future expansion and need for this corridor. Make bike paths 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 1, 2012 1:24 PM
182	Nope	Oct 1, 2012 12:48 PM
183	Assure continuous trails/paths for bikers and walkers - no sudden breaks in paths across car traffic.	Oct 1, 2012 10:23 AM
184	A 14-foot wide shared-use path MUST be incorporated in the new Portage Bay bridge, completing the I-5 to Medina span. All designs for interchanges (I-5 lid, Roanoke, Montlake) must plan for increased future bicycle/foot traffic. It must also focus equally on bicycle commuters and weekend bicyclists: if commuters are frustrated and unhappy with the new interchanges, this is a sign that potential dangers exist for less experienced bicyclists.	Sep 30, 2012 10:56 AM
185	Lighting and ADA compliant restroom	Sep 30, 2012 7:29 AM
186	One would be to desig all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 30, 2012 3:47 AM
187	It is ludicrous to think that this link will support use by people of all ages....nice sound bite but impractical at best. The bell curve of users of the entire path will be skewed to the younger demographic. Money is better spent elsewhere.	Sep 29, 2012 11:47 PM
188	Yes, having water fountains/provision to have clean drinking water. Option to have toilet should be considered to make this easy for all age groups/families to use the bridge to cross via non motorized transport.	Sep 29, 2012 10:24 PM
189	Permit fast commute lanes for bikes.	Sep 29, 2012 9:18 PM
190	I support the I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized plan to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. I don't have other refinement ideas.	Sep 29, 2012 7:43 PM
191	set a maximum gradient.	Sep 29, 2012 6:34 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

192	I think it's important to turn Federal Avenue from Aloha to Roanoke into a neighborhood greenway. 10th avenue, even with the bike lanes, is a very scary road to bike on given all the traffic.	Sep 29, 2012 4:38 PM
193	I think an uninterrupted, clear path is the most important piece. Having all the bike lanes in this project connect to one another (and ideally also to connect to already constructed bike infrastructure like the Burke-Gilman) will make this project exponentially more effective at encouraging occasional or recreational bike riders. I know if I had a safe-feeling route between the routes presented in this project, I would choose to bike rather than driver every time.	Sep 29, 2012 1:50 PM
194	Isolate bike/pedestrian traffic from motorized traffic, all along the length of the bridge with enough of a buffer, and high enough walls to make the path safe and enjoyable.	Sep 29, 2012 1:22 PM
195	Rail transit is needed.	Sep 29, 2012 10:10 AM
196	No	Sep 29, 2012 7:00 AM
197	Ensure paths are safe.	Sep 28, 2012 10:58 PM
198	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:25 PM
199	The other things would be light rail with access and a green belt with bench's facing the lake.	Sep 28, 2012 9:33 PM
200	when you say all ages and abilities, the separated bike infrastructure along the bridge is important, but how about how people get onto those paths. are they separated from traffic as well, or simple bike lanes or sharrows. can wsdot implement separated on-street facilities back to the first intersection after the on/off-ramps?	Sep 28, 2012 9:22 PM
201	Please try to also connect Medina to existing 520 trail.	Sep 28, 2012 8:17 PM
202	Perhaps the cost of this recreational facility could be offset by leasing spaces to latte carts and other vendors (except the 200 users/day WSDOT forecasts would be a VERY small market).	Sep 28, 2012 6:03 PM
203	The bike path from Redmond to Medina can be very confusing to follow close to the Mediana area, Including a solution for this would be useful.	Sep 28, 2012 5:07 PM
204	Please look at restroom options. It is nice to have at least one option near each end of the SR-520 bridge open all year.	Sep 28, 2012 4:24 PM
205	Not that I know of.	Sep 28, 2012 2:41 PM
206	Medina is a speedbump on the way to Redmond. They should consider themselves warned. Mercer Island rejected the cyclists initially and look at them now.	Sep 28, 2012 2:28 PM
207	Make sure that the Portage Bay bridge has a bicycle and pedestrian path.	Sep 28, 2012 2:17 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

208	Solar panels could be installed to show that the project is working to create a sustainable project that meets our objectives for a greener highway.	Sep 28, 2012 2:10 PM
209	Do whatever is possible to keep levels of automovile noise down on the trail - its a punishing experience walking across I-90 and being buffetted by winds and noise. Unpleas	Sep 28, 2012 12:15 PM
210	They aren't super duper clear.	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM
211	Consider all non-motorized users and the speeds at which they will travel. Create pull-outs to provide opportunities to stop and move out of 'traffic'.	Sep 28, 2012 11:16 AM
212	Please design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 28, 2012 10:20 AM
213	Please include pedestrian, bicycle path along Portage Bay bridge.	Sep 28, 2012 9:07 AM
214	No, just allowing for safe multi-user space.	Sep 28, 2012 7:40 AM
215	MUST HAVE SEPARATE AND SAFE PATHS FOR ALL AGES, SAFETY AND AWAY FROM CAR ROADS	Sep 28, 2012 7:09 AM
216	the ease of through bike and pedistrian traffic needs to be considered. As Bike traffic increases, the ease of moving through traffic congestion areas needs to be addressed. This is one area where it can be done.	Sep 28, 2012 6:28 AM
217	Good signage, landscaping and basic sidewalk construction at junctions points can provide a welcoming atmosphere for all users.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 PM
218	Ensure that path crossings of major streets (such as Montlake Blvd) are GRADE-SEPARATED so that bicycle commuters can ride unimpeded. Other crossings and trail intersections should be designed with bicycle roundabouts (they exists on college campuses now!) or separated T-intersections so that crossing conflicts are minimized.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 PM
219	I am all for new and improved bicycle lanes/paths.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 PM
220	Connections to nonmotorized trails, bike boulevards, and (worst case) low-traffic routes are valuable. Maximize the network effect by making it possible to *go places* via bike trails. A continuous path from 520 to the Cheshiahaud Loop would be a reasonable start. (Obviously it had best connect to the BG.) A better route down Lake Washington would be a welcome improvement.	Sep 27, 2012 10:23 PM
221	If you build a clear, intuitive, efficient, and distinct path for bike commuters, all users will be safer and happier.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 PM
222	Wheels and feet paths somehow separated simply but to be as safe as well. It almost seem cyclist need their own lane as many just commute and ride pretty quick. Just a though as I think that would be a challenge to separate much with limited space and dollars	Sep 27, 2012 8:13 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

223	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM
224	Design to keep pedestrians from crossing back and forth across path used by cyclist - i, e, the pedetrian lane shoud be on the same side of the path as view overlooks etc so peds can stop to enjoy and not block cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
225	Design it to meet future demand.	Sep 27, 2012 6:18 PM
226	I only hope that the final plans include support for these diverse users.	Sep 27, 2012 6:02 PM
227	From a pleasantness and convenience point of view, I would say a wider path along the 520 than 90 provides and some better buffering from interstate traffic would be very welcomed by both pedestrians and cyclists. Providing convenient bus stops near either side of the bridge path would also be very welcome.	Sep 27, 2012 5:59 PM
228	THink about the hills and traffic	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
229	Sounds good so long as it it taking current and future bike use into consideration as I think we can expect bike use to grow exponentially in our area.	Sep 27, 2012 4:56 PM
230	should also include ADA access	Sep 27, 2012 4:49 PM
231	width and limited twists and turns to accommodate a variety of users going a wide variety of speeds. Perhaps look into design elements that will slow cyclists down at congestion spots.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
232	Portage Bay bridge bicycle path, extending a seperate and safe path for cyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 4:34 PM
233	Have multiple paths on the East side and West side to provide for the different user groups. Provide grade separation when ever possibly from motor traffic to help with the noise and wind they generate, the I-90 bridge path is generally not a very pleasant experience. evaluate the railing type and connections, the I-90 rail is pretty spooky the first few times you use it. debris and puddles seem to collect and form next to the guard wall adjacent to traffic which pushes people further to the north.	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
234	Yes -- agree. Don't pay it lip service -- do it right. This is your legacy. Keep in mind: You must build a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 4:11 PM
235	By designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities it will add enduring value to the project.	Sep 27, 2012 3:44 PM
236	Make sure signage is clear the entire way. Once you cross the bridge, make sure a safe connection is made to a safe path to downtown Seattle, UW, Burke Gilman, and downtown Bellevue and Microsoft. Thousands of people work for Microsoft who could bike to work if the path were clear and safe.	Sep 27, 2012 3:08 PM
237	Cutting corners to save a few dollars here and there always makes for	Sep 27, 2012 3:05 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	unsatisfying results. Make clean interfaces into the existing roadways and structures.	
238	It's important to understand that not all nonmotorized users have the same needs. A person commuting to work (or even just on a brisk ride), passing through a park on a bicycle has different needs than a person walking their dog or pushing a stroller around the same park. The needs of both these groups are best served with separate facilities rather than lumping them all together with a shared-use space. Commuting in particular is at odds with the idea of recreation space.	Sep 27, 2012 2:33 PM
239	Make things easy to understand and eliminate grade changes where possible.	Sep 27, 2012 2:24 PM
240	None that I an think of.	Sep 27, 2012 1:59 PM
241	Clearly delineate and divide where possible, cost effective and design appropriate ped from bike as there are arrogant / ignorant walkers as well as bikers...LASTLY do not allow abreast biking only single file except for passing	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
242	No	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
243	Sounds good in general. Keeping bicycle and pedestrian traffic separate to the maximum extent possible.improves both the capacity for exercise, comfort and safety.	Sep 27, 2012 1:15 PM
244	Clear paths, fewer crossings, and separation of peds and bikes (and possibly even slower and faster bikes) would ensure safety.	Sep 27, 2012 1:07 PM
245	easy acess for peds and bike to surface street on either end.	Sep 27, 2012 1:00 PM
246	When space allows, please consider creating dedicated bike paths that are separated from the pedestrians, roller bladers, dogs on leashes, etc. Pedestrians deserve a space where they do not feel threatened by "hooligan cyclists." Likewise, cyclists need to be able to ride at full cruising speed without having to worry about collisions with other users moving at much slower speeds. When cyclists are forced to slow down and weave in and out of other users, it is dangerous to all, and it discourages trail use by all. Bike paths need to be designed more like scaled down highways rather than beefed up sidewalks or pretty, meandering paved hiking trails.	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM
247	An awning to protect from rain? That's probably pushing the limit on budget I think :)	Sep 27, 2012 12:58 PM
248	Gee, let's see. Hmm.. Oh I know! Put a bike path along the entirety of 520 which includes Portage Bay!!	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
249	Are they also easily accessible to mass transit so that one can use a bus if they decide they don't want to continue on foot (or on bike).	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM
250	yes! users of all ages and abilities. commuting, exercise, recreation. safe/comfortable/clear. Let's make sure we build it big enough for the increased	Sep 27, 2012 12:40 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	use that will come after it is built!!	
251	Provide for some commercial space/opportunity on lids to active space.	Sep 27, 2012 12:20 PM
252	use the model on Mercer Island - connections to roadway cycling routes, and connections to parks and "slow" mode users (walkers, kids on bikes, etc.) don't try to mix the two...	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
253	This sounds great!	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
254	Looks good.	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
255	ok	Sep 27, 2012 11:44 AM
256	separate peds and bikes.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
257	This trail will offer excellent benefit to cycle commuters.	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
258	don't know.	Sep 27, 2012 11:29 AM
259	Paths need to have width; on a nice day this will prevent accidents caused by too many people not looking where they are going. Clearly marked directions of travel should be painted on (preventing cyclists from casually overtaking by moving to the left side and causing a head-on collision with someone because they weren't looking ahead). At various points, there should also be pull-over areas where people can rest without disturbing the flow on the main path.	Sep 27, 2012 11:22 AM
260	Nope...that's perfect! Just wide enough for cyclists to comfortably pass in both directions would be great. The I-90 path is just barely wide enough and it would be nice if it were a few feet wider.	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 AM
261	The paths should connect to other bike path/areas to increase its utility and safety.	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
262	Since travelling on foot is done at a different speed than bicycle, it is important to have some separation between the two to avoid safety issues.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
263	Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
264	design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:55 AM
265	toilets, drinking fountains, bike racks, benches	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
266	Yes- Safe, wide, comfortable and clear non-motor paths, designed to meet increased future capacity.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
267	lighting, pull outs for repairs and resting, safe clearly marked lanes.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
268	seperation between bikes and pedestrians. electronics will only continue to be	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	more personal and this is a high tech city.	
269	My main feedback is that the design must (1) include a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) have bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
270	The more pedestrian only crossings from parks over our interstate/highway systems the better.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
271	See above goals	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
272	1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
273	It is critical we have a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 AM
274	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
275	Cross lake travel for pedestrians and cyclists MUST happen.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
276	If the only way to effect gradual grades is to reduce the width of the path, than many of the gains will come with corresponding losses in safety, as folks traveling at different speeds navigate past each other. Maintaining wide pathways is more important than designing for shallower grades, if this either/or is forced on the project.	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
277	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
278	Direct connections to the Burke Gilman Trail seem like an obviously essential design element.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
279	Safety and ease of use.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
280	Really clear way finding and also non-paved surfaces on the lid park for runners and walkers.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
281	seperate pedistrains strolling with dogs and pushing stollers at 2.5 miles an hour from bicycles at 15 miles an hour	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
282	Allow bikes and pedestrians to stay apart, if possible.	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
283	Yes!!!	Sep 27, 2012 9:42 AM
284	Put trail on the South side!!! Are you folks profoundly weak-mined? Do you hate the sun and love car mist? Did you forget that putting the bridge up higher will reduce the old splash and spray storm problem? Do you think that pedestrians like walking next to 6 lanes of 60 mph cars? Lower the trail 5 feet and put it on	Sep 27, 2012 12:49 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	the south side. If you doubt me, then ride the I-90 bridge each day in the rain for one month. I did it for years, and have toured all over the world by bike. I began racing in 1981. I have been discussing this with your various engineers and planners for over 10 years with no solid response. Don't let this trail be the big mistake of the bridge.	
285	People need to be able to get safely and easily from one neighborhood to another, despite the presence of a freeway.	Sep 26, 2012 11:23 AM
286	emphasis should be on keeping structure as compact as possible	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 PM
287	Designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities is critical.	Sep 25, 2012 8:59 AM
288	nothing to add	Sep 25, 2012 8:58 AM
289	I think you have done a good job. Build routes that are safe for people walking and keep bikes out of traffic.	Sep 24, 2012 11:45 PM
290	Apparently motorized vehicle occupants do not quality as I-5 to Medina project users.	Sep 24, 2012 6:38 PM
291	Alas, the majority of the population will probably never use the bike/ped facilities. Recreation seems like a very low priority here. It is key to make the bike/ped facility so that people who aren't especially athletic or experienced bike riders can now travel safely thru this corridor.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
292	Please ensure inclusion of a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge	Sep 24, 2012 12:59 PM
293	A special design for high-speed cyclists (who are often bicycling commuters) to be able to move safely, without impacting slower traffic.	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
294	Eliminate dangerous intersections for pedestrians and cyclists	Sep 23, 2012 2:45 PM
295	The addition of the bicycle/pedestrian shared-use path on the Portage Bay Bridge will be a major enhancement to allow bicyclists of all ages and abilities to take a lower-slope path to make connections between the UW, Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, and downtown.	Sep 22, 2012 4:48 PM
296	The safe north to south connections across 520 at Montlake do not exist with the current design.	Sep 22, 2012 1:01 PM
297	Climbing from Montlake to Capitol Hill on Interlaken or other routes is not an all ages endeavor currently. With a dedicated regional shared-use path that has a gradual incline (much like I-90), users of all ages will be able to easily access Capitol Hill.	Sep 22, 2012 10:32 AM
298	Any way to keep the max distance from the road to maintain better air quality. Perhaps a sound barrier would be a great option.	Sep 22, 2012 2:50 AM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

299	Adequate and clear signage should be added to the new and existing connected paths to clearly indicate to nonmotorized users where to go. Existing paths in Seattle have had this signage added, and it is a huge help; however there is more that could be done - not all signage is added in every possible location that it could be seen from by trail users.	Sep 21, 2012 3:49 PM
300	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
301	I like the idea of tunnels under major roads if they are safe and patrolled, but don't make that an excuse to create an expressway because you think that you've gotten the bikes "out of the way". They still need to access the same grocery stores, retail, schools, and libraries that everyone else needs to get to.	Sep 20, 2012 6:31 PM
302	Anything to improve the quality of a walk or bikeride from Medina to Seattle	Sep 20, 2012 10:41 AM
303	Make it wide enough for slow / fast cyclests, dog walkers, people on headphones. The burk gilman doesn't work for fast cycling. Lets learn from that and make this work.	Sep 19, 2012 3:26 PM
304	We absolutely need to keep ensuring that for every decision that is made, that everyone from families with young children all the way up to senior citizens will feel safe enough to ride their bikes on this route.	Sep 19, 2012 12:34 PM
305	Provide good public restrooms at major trail junctions.	Sep 17, 2012 3:31 PM
306	Do it through montlake and North Capitol Hill...Right past Seattle Prep, over/under 10th Ave E, across Broadway East, and ON TOP of a NEW I5 lid!!! It would be perfect and connect citizens to the city. It would be like an extension of the Burke Gilman trail - which could also connect downtown through Lake View/North Capitol Hill area. Have you thought about that?? A Burke-Gilman like trail going through Montlake, up and over Broadway East (just south of 520) and over I5...spectacular view for all the peds/bikes!!	Sep 17, 2012 10:08 AM
307	Need to study in more detail.	Sep 17, 2012 6:19 AM
308	MAKE SURE THAT MONTLAKE TRANSIT RIDERS, BIKERS AND PEDESTRIANSHAVE SOME NEW FAILITIES PLANNED TO GET THEM THROUGH THIS GRIDLOCKED AREA, EVEN IF AN AUTO LANE IS TAKEN TO ACHIEVE THE IMPROVEMENTS THAT ARE NEEDED.	Sep 16, 2012 4:53 PM
309	Design should be "organic" (creating Olmstead-like park with interesting landscape and parklike elements to enhance the users experience) as well as simply creating paths for access and connectivity.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
310	Extend East Montlake Lid to storm water area to increase pedestrian and visual connection. "NATURE MEETS CITY."	Sep 16, 2012 2:36 AM
311	Is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520? Oops, I guess this is not a NON motorized concern.	Sep 15, 2012 7:53 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

312	There must be continuous bike facilities to support traffic from 10th Ave E to Harvard Ave E. Will there be a continuation of the bike lane on Delmar/Roanoke west of 10th Ave? Unlike separated path on the south side of the street, a bike lane would facilitate traffic heading to the U Bridge via Harvard Ave. This would also optimize for Capitol Hill to U District (common) traffic rather than Eastlake to Capitol Hill traffic (probably less common given the smaller population and alternative of E Pine St). Need more details about the ped/bike connections from the Portage Bay bridge to 10th/Delmar. The merge between the Dawson Trail and Montlake should be a T-intersection to encourage user to stop and check for traffic. The rendering shows it as a Y merge which may cause people to just whiz through without looking (which cyclists love doing on downhills)	Sep 15, 2012 1:44 PM
313	The most important user needs here are the needs of the VAST majority of users who will go through this corridor - i.e. the people in the cars. Adding bikes and HOV lanes and separate lanes for light rail is fine - provided it does not reduce the capacity of the existing four lanes of motor vehicle traffic. If you have to - make the bride wider to accommodate these additional uses of an EXISTING corridor.	Sep 15, 2012 12:40 PM
314	The issue of the west to east connection needs to be dealt with either through a bridge link or improvements to Boyer Ave and Montlake park.	Sep 15, 2012 11:02 AM
315	Advertise your surveys better, hold public hearings for all of Seattle! Think about future generations.	Sep 14, 2012 5:57 PM
316	No opinion	Sep 14, 2012 5:56 PM
317	Adequate space to allow people walking and biking to happily coexist. This means separating users (ped/bikes) to reduce conflicts. And I'm so excited to use it for running and biking!	Sep 14, 2012 5:26 PM
318	several Water fountains and clean, safe, clean, safe, clean, safe nice restrooms.Perhaps an area for a locally-owned food cart to sell convenient foodstuffs to commuters, exercisers, recreationalists (along with the egress needed to accommodate	Sep 14, 2012 4:43 PM
319	Continue the trail all the way, provide plenty of options for connecting via the lids to neighborhoods along the way and allowing plenty of offshoots for younger, slower bicyclists and pedestrians. Also, pay attention to the surface streets affected by design (Delmar, Roanoke, Harvard, etc.) They need to be safe for bicyclists and pedestrians. Intersections also need to be safe for non-motorized traffic too. In other words, we need to learn from the multitude of mistakes made with the existing bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 3:56 PM
320	A second parallel bascule bridge over the Montlake Cut is essential. That bridge assists transit flow. People need to get to the UW in order to enjoy its facilities and amenities.	Sep 14, 2012 3:32 PM
321	I think it's important to provide some kind of bike/ped separation (or	Sep 14, 2012 2:16 PM

Page 7, Q3. Diverse users
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning seeks to provide users of all ages and abilities opportunities for commuting, exercise and recreation by providing safe, comfortable and clear paths that connect important activity centers and destinations. Are there other refinements...

	signage/education) on major commuting paths. The Burke Gillman is a very dangerous place to walk given the volume of bicyclists. I would not want to see that repeated here. The problem is not as big on the I-90 trail, since few peds want to walk that far, right next to traffic. The I-90 shared path feels too close to the cars. It's very loud to ride by the cars, and I often get gravel and dirt in my eyes, kicked up the cars. I would hope there is a better (larger? tree buffer?) kind of separation between the mixed use path and the roads on the new 520.	
322	great	Sep 14, 2012 2:06 PM
323	No additional ideas	Sep 14, 2012 1:56 PM
324	You seem to have totally forgotten about the MAIN USERS: SOVs!	Sep 14, 2012 1:51 PM
325	there must be a more continuous uninterrupted set of facilities for ped/bike to use. I would envision something I like to call 'bicycle roads' similar to the burke, but more substantial with stop lights and treated as real traffic, see The Netherlands and Denmark for real design consideration for this. Either we are serious about this, or we continue lip-service. This is an opportunity to not only remove a hazardous bridge, but to improve safety for all and even be on the forefront of actual urban planning, let's not miss the opportunity	Sep 14, 2012 1:39 PM
326	Make sure to include public restrooms along the trail on either side of the bridge.	Sep 14, 2012 1:26 PM
327	People really need to know their limits and the path should keep in mind the majority of the users needs primarily.	Sep 14, 2012 1:17 PM
328	Keep the modes separated as much as possible.	Sep 14, 2012 12:53 PM
329	not that I can think of	Sep 14, 2012 12:44 PM
330	Not sure	Sep 14, 2012 12:18 PM
331	it looks as if the goal is to keep bicycles and pedestrians out of the Montlake mix as much as possible -- that's a good plan. Wish list: some sort of flyover bicycle bridge from 520 to the B-G Trail	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
332	Think about local neighborhood connections as well as regional connections for people who walk and bike.	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
333	Removing the westbound off ramp on the Montlake lid	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
334	Not every green space needs to have ADA access from "every" direction, as long as a reasonable access is provided from at least one direction. We don't need additional exercise and recreation "equipment" that will need to be maintained and become labilities - leave that to the City. The paths and trails are exercise enough. Don't criss-cross the lid with lots of sidewalks, leave the open green spce "open". We can walk across the grass if we want to, and there will always be sidewalks along the perimiter of the lid. Don't overdue it and waste tax dollars.	Sep 14, 2012 11:27 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

1	Forward looking is key when planning infrastructure that will be around for the next 50 years. We need to give space to all modes - hedge our bets going forward.	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 PM
2	For the bikers: I wouldn't rely just on Cascade. Are there other biking orgs? Seattle Parks has some experience with biking mixes. But my big suggestion would be to look to Amsterdam, Portland, Davis CA and others that have a lot of experience with serious bike usage. Please do this; others have already pioneered solutions to these problems. Thanks.	Oct 5, 2012 11:05 PM
3	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. It feels like mercer island, medina get better treated than montlake residents. Hmm.	Oct 5, 2012 10:05 PM
4	Please make sure you are reaching out to and addressing the needs of students, families with children, seniors, recreational users (joggers, cyclists, etc), people with disabilities, etc.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 PM
5	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 7:47 PM
6	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team? It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you”	Oct 5, 2012 7:22 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

7	Just build more bike paths! Its not rocket science.	Oct 5, 2012 5:18 PM
8	consider as a design vehicle, a bike with kid cart, can it make the corners at a reasonable speed, can it stop and start as needed? Or will the rider be force to get off to make it past restraints	Oct 5, 2012 4:21 PM
9	I appreciate and thank WSDOT for continuing to work with local residents. An important stakeholder to add to the process is Seattle Neighborhood Greenways, which are local residents that really understand and the safe connectivity needs of the surrounding neighborhoods.	Oct 5, 2012 4:16 PM
10	2.6 billion for bike paths while restricting roads and impacting existing roads is a bad idea.	Oct 5, 2012 4:10 PM
11	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 3:36 PM
12	Members of the neighborhood that surrounds Roanoke Park.	Oct 5, 2012 3:33 PM
13	Make elimination of car-pedestrian-bicycle conflict points a priority, especially if through moving this non-motorized traffic off the roadway grade.	Oct 5, 2012 3:25 PM
14	check with people that commute by bicycle and include people that currently go around the north end of the lake or across I-90. Don't just focus on the people that currently take busses across 520 as they're only a small portion of the people that would use the bike facilities on the bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 3:13 PM
15	Drivers--the people PAYING for all of this.	Oct 5, 2012 3:06 PM
16	the seattle bike master plan and pedestrian master plan. also use the ashto and nacto bike facility design guides.	Oct 5, 2012 3:02 PM
17	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 2:58 PM
18	Cascade Bicycle Club.	Oct 5, 2012 2:33 PM
19	You should consider the non-motorized transportation needs of the city as whole. Cascade Bicycle Club advocates for those stakeholders and should actively be included in the process. You should not waste this opportunity to build a critical piece of bicycle infrastructure that would serve the city's needs for decades simply because it might add 10' of width to a more-than-100' bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

20	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 1:57 PM
21	http://centralseattlegreenways.com/2012/10/we-need-your-help-sr520-portage-bay-bridge-trail/	Oct 5, 2012 1:49 PM
22	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts a a multimodal hub. This could be a model world class multi use connection for all users. Cyclists and Pedestrians should be the first and formest concern when designing for this area, not vehicles.	Oct 5, 2012 12:51 PM
23	There are already too many cooks to spoil the broth. Forget about non-motorized planning and make the bridge a usable project for auto users who are the ones paying the tolls for a larger, safer bridge. It all sounds great until one looks at available money. Don't waste money on urban amenities that too few people would use or want, if they realized how much they cost to build and maintain.	Oct 5, 2012 12:44 PM
24	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive	Oct 5, 2012 12:40 PM
25	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM
26	keep it simple - too expensive	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
27	Local pedestrian and cycling organizations could provide valuable feedback and some insight to design that is lacking. Thank you for your hard work!	Oct 5, 2012 12:36 PM
28	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

29	No preference	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
30	Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
31	The primary stake holders are the west side communities and the communities along the west side pathways that would be included in the proposal. Designs should be maximized it incorporate any such path way into lids and Pedestrian and Cyclist pathways in the 520 westside approach planning such and enhanced lids at Montlake Blvd. west of Montlake Blvd, and across Montlake Bridge, lids along Portage Bay and the Roanoke / I5 lids, see comments for each of those options provided in earlier questions.	Oct 5, 2012 12:15 PM
32	The Animals and Wildlife.	Oct 5, 2012 11:54 AM
33	Local bicycling clubs, and neighborhood associations (such as the Montlake Community Center)	Oct 5, 2012 11:48 AM
34	The stakeholders who have will be most directly impacted have the least voice - these are the small number of families who live in the four blocks that make up the Shelby-Hamlin neighborhood. We are the residents who cannot leave our neighborhoods at times because traffic blocks the intersections, lights are poorly timed, and alternative options are non-existent. Our pedestrian options put our children next to major traffic thoroughfares or under dark, massive freeway overpasses. My 2.5 mile commute from dropping my kids at school can sometimes take 45 to travel - IN A CAR. At no point has any planning committee reached out specifically to the Shelby-Hamlin neighborhood to discuss the particular impacts on their daily lives. I believe that is because we are only ~140 families and don't have the political power that Laurelhurst, Roanoke or Portage Bay weilds through sheer numbers. I think a special effort to talk with Shelby-Hamlin neighbors (perhaps a meeting at the SYC or the old MOHAI building) is warranted.	Oct 5, 2012 11:45 AM
35	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 11:25 AM
36	I think you have done a great job of reaching out and your design maturity shows this. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 11:22 AM
37	Please talk with Cascade Bike Club and other regional groups. Also, please talk	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	to Amsterdam and see how they integrate bicyles into their community.	
38	No opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 11:15 AM
39	See uses in Vancouver BC where shared trail and bike lanes are well integrated into planning as good example.	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 AM
40	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
41	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, cars, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists ALONG WITH THE NEEDS OF VEHICLES AND TRANSIT must be a foundation for the entire project. We do not want to put our head in the sand and provide an expensive project like this that will worsen the traffic and hurt the neighborhoods if effects the most. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: VERY VERY NEGATIVE West Approach Bridge Area: positive	Oct 5, 2012 10:46 AM
42	yes	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
43	Look to the leaders in bicycle infrastructure and emulate their best practices. Find out where their shortcomings lay and improve upon them.	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
44	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
45	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
46	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
47	The MPCC supports the recommendations of the Central Seattle Greenways comments	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
48	Sound transit's plans for light rail	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
49	I would like to know if the 520 bridge bike path will connect all the way to exiting 520 bike path.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 AM
50	We have enough stakeholders.	Oct 5, 2012 10:13 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

51	No comment	Oct 5, 2012 10:12 AM
52	The Seattle Family Biking network can provide good feedback on how practical connections might be with the needs of small children and new bicyclists.	Oct 5, 2012 9:50 AM
53	In addition to the University and surrounding neighborhoods, please include Eastside communities, Microsoft, and other large employers input in the process.	Oct 5, 2012 9:45 AM
54	Origin/destination study of bicycle/pedestrian travel that might be served by 520 and related projects	Oct 5, 2012 9:42 AM
55	None.	Oct 5, 2012 9:38 AM
56	I don't work there anymore so I don't know, but you asked everyone who buses and bikes from Seattle over to Microsoft, right? That's like 20,000 people, I would guess.	Oct 5, 2012 9:35 AM
57	Get the planners away from their desks, to come walk the Montlake area with Lionel Job. Then they will get a sense of what is being requested, very rationally and legitimately.	Oct 5, 2012 9:32 AM
58	Ask cyclists to comment on what kind of situation will work best for their travel, take the the "mode" of their responses, and never...ever...imply that there will be a consensus driven solution.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
59	None	Oct 5, 2012 9:26 AM
60	Youth, young adults, and minorities. This bridge is for the future generations. Your planning process over-values the opinions of those >50 and living near the bridge. They will not be the users or neighbors of this bridge for most of its life. Their lifestyles and mobility habits will not be the normal when this bridge becomes operational.	Oct 5, 2012 9:23 AM
61	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team? It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the	Oct 5, 2012 9:05 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you”	
62	keep the fraud and gov't waste to a minimum.	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM
63	Neighborhood and pedestrian input combined with serious creativity is needed.	Oct 5, 2012 9:01 AM
64	No, this seems appropriate.	Oct 5, 2012 8:46 AM
65	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 8:42 AM
66	good as is	Oct 5, 2012 7:34 AM
67	Uh oh... pandering to "stakeholders..." It's a bridge for cars. Make a small bike lane and move on. It will NOT be heavily used.	Oct 5, 2012 7:12 AM
68	If you haven't done so already, suggest reaching out to the major companies on both sides of the lake (Amazon, Microsoft, Boeing) who have significant populations of cyclists who commute regularly on their two wheels.	Oct 5, 2012 6:57 AM
69	yes	Oct 5, 2012 6:54 AM
70	I believe Cascade Bicycle can speak for bike riders and would share best practices	Oct 5, 2012 5:44 AM
71	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 5, 2012 5:39 AM
72	Not sure who's involved now	Oct 5, 2012 5:14 AM
73	The staircase from Montlake Blvd E. to the Bill Dawson tunnel should not connect at the tunnel entrance in order to reduce the risk of collisions. The Bill Dawson trail connection from the Montlake Blvd tunnel should not include 90 and 180 degree blind turns. The Portage Bay shared-use path must be added to the project. The crossing of SR520 for pedestrians and cyclists on the West side of Montlake Blvd must be safe, direct and separated from automobile traffic. The connections to the Montlake Bridge must be widened and made safer to meet the increasing levels of service. The sidewalks of the Montlake Bridge must be widened to meet the level of service. The connections from the SR520 shared-use path to the 25th Ave E and Arboretum routes as well as to the Portage Bay	Oct 5, 2012 12:56 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	shared-use paths must at no point cause pedestrians and cyclists to cross highway ramps on foot. The 25th Ave E. bike route can be merged with the Arboretum bicycle trail and connected at E. Miller. A modern anticipatory sensor activated crossing light should be provided. The Delmar Lid to Boyer path is a good response to a a real neighborhood need for a safer pedestrian connection. It is not a viable bicycle commuting route due to the steepness of the slope, but can be used by people willing to push their bicycles. It is not an alternative to the Portage Bay bridge Shared-use path. Pedestrians and bicyclists should not be routed to dark areas under SR520. Finally, children must be offered Safe Routes To School, and safe routes to public libraries and playfields, and the needs of handicapped commuters need to be met.	
74	Local cycling organizations.	Oct 5, 2012 12:27 AM
75	Better protect bikes from the road spray and noise generated by the traffic. For comparison, the noise of traffic, particularly when the pavement is wet, can be so loud that pedestrians or cyclists traveling side-by-side have to shout to be heard. This is particularly dangerous when cyclists are trying to alert pedestrians as they approach from behind.	Oct 4, 2012 10:36 PM
76	Listen to the diverse stakeholders you have, anticipating use into the future, 20, 30 years from now. This is an opportunity not to be squandered by people wanting a nice view.	Oct 4, 2012 10:22 PM
77	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive There is great concern over the removal of the arboretum exits and how this will decrease route options in the Montlake area creating major traffic backups along 24th Ave. E and Montlake Blvd.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 PM
78	Cascade Bike Club, making meetings in the evenings, since many of us have full time jobs, etc.	Oct 4, 2012 9:53 PM
79	the cycling club named point83!	Oct 4, 2012 9:45 PM
80	unknown	Oct 4, 2012 9:37 PM
81	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 9:23 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

82	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 9:10 PM
83	The Montlake area is one of the Seattle-area's busiest multimodal hubs. This area could and should be developed into a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be foundational for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 9:07 PM
84	Connect to regional bicycle trail network within Seattle in several directions. Puget Sound Regional Council has a new regional bicycle network plan that we should all work towards.	Oct 4, 2012 8:52 PM
85	fewer nimbys	Oct 4, 2012 8:18 PM
86	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence this Alternative is not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:01 PM
87	Should be modeled after Dutch cycling infrastructure, with wide and well-engineered paths. Safe crossings with good visibility for both cyclist and driver at intersections. Separate high motor-vehicle traffic from cycle traffic (eg. by building cycle tracks, by routing bicycles through quiet neighbourhood streets).	Oct 4, 2012 7:53 PM
88	No - more room for cars. Less ped/bike construction.	Oct 4, 2012 6:35 PM
89	Think bikes!	Oct 4, 2012 6:17 PM
90	none you have too many stake holders now that feel their is an entitlement	Oct 4, 2012 6:06 PM
91	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team? It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very	Oct 4, 2012 5:18 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you”	
92	taxpayers only	Oct 4, 2012 5:17 PM
93	N/a	Oct 4, 2012 5:08 PM
94	No comment.	Oct 4, 2012 4:45 PM
95	Don't know. But if you keep with this plan, I will be very happy. The big wins are the Two big parks that span the freeways (1st in Roanoke and 2nd in Montlake). Thank you!	Oct 4, 2012 4:11 PM
96	don't understand	Oct 4, 2012 3:43 PM
97	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 2:49 PM
98	No preference.	Oct 4, 2012 2:26 PM
99	YES! We must have safe pedestrian and bicycle connections	Oct 4, 2012 2:00 PM
100	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 1:44 PM
101	Cascade bicycle club. seattlelikesbikes.org, read bikeportland daily for a month.	Oct 4, 2012 1:38 PM
102	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and	Oct 4, 2012 1:09 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	
103	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive	Oct 4, 2012 12:52 PM
104	Value Engineering.	Oct 4, 2012 12:17 PM
105	I would suggest consulting the NACTO guide for the design of all bike facilities: www.nacto.org	Oct 4, 2012 12:14 PM
106	cascade bike club, Wash Park Arboretum	Oct 4, 2012 12:08 PM
107	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 12:02 PM
108	I don't know, there is a lot to digest in this proposal.	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
109	Cascade Bicycle Club, Seattle Transit Blog, Seattle Bike Blog	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
110	Take your surveys to people actually walking/biking/catching buses in the area - like go out there and stand on the street and poll them. I'm concerned the conversation is going to be dominated by old rich people who drive everywhere and just want a pretty, quiet lid on SR-520.	Oct 4, 2012 11:41 AM
111	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
112	I fear the bike/ped lane on Portage Bay Viaduct will be little used, and we have not had an opportunity to comment on the EIS. While the bicycle clubs are vocal and activist, counts of usage (potential) would aid in deciding on the design, and perhaps help with a lower cost bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 AM
113	UW commuters from south of the canal that use both the Roanoke and Montlake	Oct 4, 2012 10:09 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	crossings.	
114	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
115	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 4, 2012 9:24 AM
116	Why don't you add motorists? The majority of the questions on this form are about bicycle projeects!	Oct 4, 2012 7:08 AM
117	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 3, 2012 9:49 PM
118	All should be available for review	Oct 3, 2012 9:31 PM
119	Hire a competent parks design architect as part of your project delivery process.	Oct 3, 2012 9:17 PM
120	No opinion.	Oct 3, 2012 8:50 PM
121	Seattle city council and the mayor's office. Bill LaBorde and David Hiller.	Oct 3, 2012 8:24 PM
122	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 3, 2012 4:05 PM
123	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive	Oct 3, 2012 3:51 PM
124	Youth sports & recreation bodies (Seattle Parks, Capitol Hill Youth Soccer, McGilvra Soccer Club, Central Seattle Youth Lacrosse, canoe/kayaking clubs, climbers, et al.), local schools (Montlake Elementary in Montlake, TOPS, Seattle Prep, and Bertschi School in Roanoke)	Oct 3, 2012 3:18 PM
125	Targeted interviews with a substantial sample of those who currently use the non-motorized trail on I90. What do they like and dislike about that trail design?	Oct 3, 2012 2:00 PM
126	separated bike lanes from traffic	Oct 3, 2012 1:16 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

127	no comment	Oct 3, 2012 1:10 PM
128	Residents of the neighboorhoods that may be impacted should be primary participants.	Oct 3, 2012 12:34 PM
129	Consider American Red Cross field operation	Oct 3, 2012 12:13 PM
130	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 3, 2012 12:00 PM
131	It's great to involve a lot of folks to get their perspectives. Just don't let the biggest voices rule the day. Use your expertise to develop the best solutions to the issues you hear from all of the stakeholders, and don't let it get too politically driven - for example, removing the second Bascule bridge is a crazy idea! It's like they never got stuck in traffic in Montlake. And now we won't have the Arboretum ramps, so everyone will converge at Montlake. PLEASE let your sound judgment influence the right decision here!	Oct 3, 2012 11:07 AM
132	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 3, 2012 10:50 AM
133	My only suggestion for a project designed to last more than 20 years in the future is to do more to imagine the future of transit--which should include more than just cars.	Oct 3, 2012 10:00 AM
134	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 3, 2012 9:53 AM
135	More time with greenways groups and other groups who actually spend their days going to each of these neighborhoods.	Oct 3, 2012 9:44 AM
136	Focus on local input. I live near the arboretum several blocks from the proposed improvements. My ideas and thoughts are less important than the concerns of those who are closer to the project. Regional interest groups are basically one issue know nothing busybodies whose grand schemes are worthless. I have more trust in your judgement that theirs with regard to regional issues, and more	Oct 3, 2012 9:00 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	trust in my immediate neighbors than you with regard to local issues. You know how to design and build structures, just present your most architecturally pleasing designs, solicit local input, and actually build what you say you will, and people will be happy.	
137	Stakeholders should be each community council in surrounding vacinities	Oct 3, 2012 8:45 AM
138	In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. Generally, my reaction to the current design preferences for each area is: Roanoke area: positive Portage Bay Bridge Area: positive Montlake Area: very negative West Approach Bridge Area: positive	Oct 3, 2012 8:37 AM
139	The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process? In Seattle, the Montlake area acts as a multimodal hub. This could be a world class hub that better connects transit, pedestrian, and bicycle amenities and puts us on the path to a healthy, sustainable, and affordable future. To do this, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project.	Oct 3, 2012 8:02 AM
140	Add the folks who use non-polutting single person transportation like Segways, Wheelchairs, and others that can't be safely operated with cars/trucks/busses on streets.	Oct 3, 2012 7:24 AM
141	cyclists, pedestrians, no one else.	Oct 3, 2012 12:22 AM
142	I have no clue. Transportation (not wandering paths) for bicycles is my priority.	Oct 2, 2012 9:00 PM
143	Cycling and pedestrian groups from Eastside communities, in addition to Cascade and large Seattle groups.	Oct 2, 2012 3:27 PM
144	In Seattle, because of the criticality to Seattle of the Montlake corridor, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists must be a foundation for the entire project. The state cannot act in isolation. This city's government must co-own the project.	Oct 2, 2012 12:14 PM
145	yes	Oct 2, 2012 11:09 AM
146	I would like proof that the designers have physical experience of driving and walking in the areas being discussed -- at rush hour, in the dark, on hillsides, etc. Knowing something on paper is not the same as having to live with how people really drive, pedal, walk. After watching Metro close bus stops in the middle of hills and neighborhoods with old people, I have little faith in planners who go by numbers and theories and usual practices. Seattle is not a flat city, and not on a midwest-type grid.	Oct 2, 2012 10:01 AM
147	Since the Seattle Neighborhood Greenways groups have only formed within the last year, the opportunity to partner with collaboratively minded, supportive local	Oct 2, 2012 9:21 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

	groups representing those who depend on walking and biking through the SR520 project area has not previously existed. Please add representatives from the adjacent Neighborhood Greenway groups to the design conversation. These include Central Seattle Greenways (includes Capitol Hill and North Capitol Hill), Montlake Greenways (includes Portage Bay and Roanoke), Madison Park Greenways (includes Madison Valley), and University Greenways, and Eastlake Greenways. Since Amazon has recently committed to a goal of 75% of it's high-tech employees arriving via walking, biking or transit, supporting their needs via the Portage Bay Trail has the potential of removing many single occupancy cars from SR520.	
148	The best example is the I-90 path which is used extensively and connects very well on both sides.	Oct 2, 2012 8:21 AM
149	Cascade Bicycle Club	Oct 1, 2012 9:26 PM
150	input from cascade bicycle club :-)	Oct 1, 2012 7:25 PM
151	This survey seems focused on Seattle side decisions. It is also important to consider the connection between the existing 520 path from Marymoor park, which now terminates near Northup Way near 120th St. The Northup corridor is dangerous to cyclists, with a minimal shoulder and heavy truck traffic. I would strongly encourage that you involve Cascade Cycling Club and eastside communities and Microsoft cyclists on how to connect this bike path all the way into the 520 bridge bike path. Connecting new bike routes with existing ones expands cyclist range by lowering the high traffic areas we must negotiate. I ride on streets often but much prefer a quiet path when available. It can be frustrating when paths do not connect and require a perilous connection across unfriendly terrain.	Oct 1, 2012 2:46 PM
152	Want to minimize effect (noise etc) on the wetlands	Oct 1, 2012 2:28 PM
153	Think of the future you want our grandchildren to inherit! What is the statement we want to make for future generations where we put community and environment first looking for means that balance all and minimizes the destructive footprint one technology brings down on us.	Oct 1, 2012 1:32 PM
154	Mass transit like Sound Transit. This project needs and demands a rail option across the bridge.	Oct 1, 2012 1:24 PM
155	Cascade bike club	Oct 1, 2012 12:48 PM
156	Please consult with the Cascade Bike Club's advisors.	Oct 1, 2012 10:23 AM
157	Wildlife in the area, bicyclists, UW students, and anyone who commutes by car to or from the Eastside. These are difficult populations to survey (as compared to nearby property owners, business owners, and design contractors) but essential to consider, as they will be the primary users of the completed project. Stakeholders of the future, also difficult to survey, should be considered.	Sep 30, 2012 10:56 AM
158	Keep up the great systems thinking!	Sep 30, 2012 7:29 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

159	It is crucial to get input from retirement-aged constituents and retirement communities at each end of the project to determine exactly how much they'll use the facility, vs how much they'll be forced to pay in.	Sep 29, 2012 11:47 PM
160	I think enough stakeholders are already involved and no more should be involved.	Sep 29, 2012 7:43 PM
161	I would like to note that I live in North Capitol Hill. My wife and I own a house at the intersection of Aloha and Harvard, and have lived in Cap Hill for 12 years. The North Capitol Hill Neighborhood Association claims to represent me. They do not, and I do not agree with their mission. I strongly support a walking/cycling path along the Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 29, 2012 4:38 PM
162	Ask people who commute across the bridge today. Ads on buses, at bus stops, on signs along the road.	Sep 29, 2012 1:22 PM
163	Include the Cascade Bicycle Club and also consider reaching out to partners in Portland, OR who have a wealth of knowledge and experience with integrating bicycle and ped access routes.	Sep 29, 2012 9:37 AM
164	None	Sep 29, 2012 7:00 AM
165	The exact design doesn't matter as long as bikes and peds can use it.	Sep 28, 2012 10:25 PM
166	Please be sure to include the Cascade Cycling Club in your design conversations.	Sep 28, 2012 8:17 PM
167	Those with expertise in how to have the end users contribute to the cost of this facility.	Sep 28, 2012 6:03 PM
168	Cascade Bicycle Club can provide input on bike commute issues.	Sep 28, 2012 5:07 PM
169	It is nice to be asked to contribute without having to travel at night to some far-off meeting location.	Sep 28, 2012 4:24 PM
170	The Dutch and the Danish know a great deal about incorporating non motorized transportation into an urban environment. Forget about Portland.	Sep 28, 2012 2:41 PM
171	Blake Trask and BAW, to temper the zealots at Cascade.	Sep 28, 2012 2:28 PM
172	Community solar projects like Power Bainbridge.	Sep 28, 2012 2:10 PM
173	add cycling, running, stroller-pushing constituencies. ADA compliance, wildlife and view preservation. Do whatever is possible to keep levels of automovile noise down on the trail - its a punishing experience walking across I-90 and being buffetted by winds and noise. Unpleas	Sep 28, 2012 12:15 PM
174	Cascade Bicycle Club; Redmond Cycling Club	Sep 28, 2012 11:16 AM
175	cascade bicycle club	Sep 28, 2012 9:57 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

176	Portland Oregon has great examples and practices.	Sep 28, 2012 9:07 AM
177	Local bicycle clubs	Sep 28, 2012 8:39 AM
178	You are doing it. Keeping community input as well as architects, engineers, landscape architects and planners.	Sep 28, 2012 7:40 AM
179	I'm sure we've had more than enough represenation from all user groups in Seattle.	Sep 27, 2012 11:11 PM
180	Use of bicycle roundabouts for major trail intersections, use of grade separations at Montlake Blvd for bicycle and path users to ensure reduced conflicts, a trail of sufficient width, especially in parks, to allow for mixed-use operations that are safe and efficient; perhaps, even, separated bicycle and walking trails in the Montlake lid area to separate high-speed and low-speed movements.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 PM
181	Charles river bike/recreation paths in Boston/Cambridge - excellent example of encouraging wide range of uses by keeping high-speed cyclists separate from joggers/walkers.	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 PM
182	One group that would be an asset to work with is Cascade Bike Club for one. Large group of cycle enthusiast with diverse backgrounds. But Im sure WDOT, local who grew up in the city and have good ideas to continue to make Seattle a greater city then it already is to live in. Growth is important and needs to be done right. This city has made some big transportation errors in the past and this is a huge opportunity to rectify and create better movement in and out of the city.	Sep 27, 2012 8:13 PM
183	Do everything possible to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout.	Sep 27, 2012 7:05 PM
184	Should have native vegetation and wildlife attention as there are beavers,eagles and ospreys among many smaller animals using this corrider too.	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
185	Wasn't sure how much the proposed greenway plans for Seattle connect with this or not. If they are in similar areas, they should be integrated into the planning.	Sep 27, 2012 5:59 PM
186	Cyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 5:46 PM
187	I think the Cascade Bike Club best represents the views of most bikers as well as the Bike Alliance.	Sep 27, 2012 4:56 PM
188	Regional bicycle planning office in Vancouver, B. C. Great design.	Sep 27, 2012 4:43 PM
189	You should look to other successful projects in Europe and other cities.	Sep 27, 2012 4:12 PM
190	NYC alternative transportation plan.	Sep 27, 2012 4:11 PM
191	Continue to listen to and engage the community.	Sep 27, 2012 3:05 PM
192	The Cascade Bicycle Club is a key stakeholder to this process.	Sep 27, 2012 2:59 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

193	None that I can think of.	Sep 27, 2012 1:59 PM
194	Sounds as though you have included many	Sep 27, 2012 1:38 PM
195	Be sure to involve the Cascade Bicycle Club.	Sep 27, 2012 1:27 PM
196	Cascade Bicycle Club and Bicycle Alliance of Washington	Sep 27, 2012 1:15 PM
197	No opinion.	Sep 27, 2012 1:07 PM
198	Gee, let's see. Hmm.. Oh I know! Put a bike path along the entirety of 520 which includes Portage Bay!!	Sep 27, 2012 12:50 PM
199	It is important to consider funding sources. My understanding is that funding sources have not been agreed upon. Without funding, I would support a smaller project that just replaces the worn-out or seismically unsafe structures, without increasing traffic capacity.	Sep 27, 2012 12:12 PM
200	ok	Sep 27, 2012 11:44 AM
201	I'm not a member, but I have a lot of confidence in the cascade bike club. Making the roads safer for peds and bikes is going to help out everyone, including people who are driving--who often just need to feel like they know what to do/what they're doing.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
202	Alternate commuters will make or break the transportation of this city. Please include all possible forms of commuting in your thoughts -- cycling, running, walking, swimming, kayaking, rowing...	Sep 27, 2012 11:32 AM
203	Don't know.	Sep 27, 2012 11:29 AM
204	I don't know. Have you consulted Cascade Bicycle Club?	Sep 27, 2012 11:22 AM
205	none	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
206	There are a significant number of users who would use nonmotorized transit, often in combination with busses, but whose experiences with the current system have driven them back to cars. Locate these current drivers, and ask them what it would take to bring them back away from personal motorized transport.	Sep 27, 2012 10:59 AM
207	Please consult with workers and students who commute to Bellevue.	Sep 27, 2012 10:50 AM
208	not sure but Cascade Bike Club would be a great partner to help plan this for their members and others who might not forsee the benefits of haveing this resourse.. It can be a huge asset if done right or just a missed opportunity to make this city among the great environmentaly and civically minded cities in the world.	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
209	Cascade bicycle club, safety statistics from use of I90 bridge (learnings), police/fire (enforcement/safety)	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

210	My main feedback is that the design must (1) include a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) have bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
211	I dont care, the term stakeholders to me is a empty term used by jerks who want to sound like they are talking about something important when they are not.	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
212	Cascade Bike Club and Bicycle Alliance of Washington are the best resources for commute stakeholders and should be consulted frequently!	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
213	1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:33 AM
214	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
215	Cyclists and pedestrians.	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
216	Follow Cascade Bike Clubs suggestions	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 AM
217	cascade bike club.	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
218	If the Cascade Bicycle Club is not yet involved, please involve them	Sep 27, 2012 9:56 AM
219	how about users of the trail - actual people that exerice and commute -	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
220	Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
221	dunno	Sep 27, 2012 9:45 AM
222	I think you have them covered	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
223	Perhaps you should listen to cyclists who have commuted across the I-90 bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 12:49 AM
224	The people who will actually be using the facilities!	Sep 26, 2012 11:23 AM
225	those on the west side with more constrained spaces and opinions on impact to their neighborhoods	Sep 25, 2012 8:20 PM
226	none	Sep 25, 2012 8:58 AM
227	I think this web survey is a good idea. I also think the meetings to review the plans have been well publicized. I wish there was some discussion about what is going on on the East side, because for me going across the bridge to Microsoft or Bellevue or just for an enjoyable ride will be important, so knowing how the path will connect on the east side is important to me, and I would like to provide input to that process as a future user.	Sep 24, 2012 11:45 PM
228	How about accounting for vehicle traffic too?	Sep 24, 2012 6:38 PM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

229	no ideas.	Sep 24, 2012 6:25 PM
230	Cascade Bicycle Club	Sep 24, 2012 12:49 PM
231	weigh heavily on Cascade Bicycle Club recommendations.. I know a significant amount of bikers that would use this thoroughfare if created. What keeps you off the bike? Safety most likely. creating accessable bike routes and making it easer to get places will make this happen; if you build it they will come.	Sep 24, 2012 12:25 PM
232	I think you have many of the right stakeholders engaged but I'll reiterate support for the bicycle master plan and CBC.	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
233	If Cascade Bicycle Club hasn't yet been consulted, I would suggest them.	Sep 24, 2012 12:04 PM
234	By excluding the various community councils as team members of the original work groups, the sense of safe connection has not been met. The legislation and the work group designed was clearly in favor of the University of Washington and the Arboretum. These two groups so constrained the design that the sense of connection and improvement in transit time has not been met. The failure to achieve these goals are validated by the studies that show no value in build the second Montlake Bridge.	Sep 22, 2012 1:01 PM
235	Please listen to the suggestions from the Cascade Bicycle Club and Seattle Neighborhood Greenways.	Sep 22, 2012 10:32 AM
236	large employers seeking to get employees to from eastside and downtown.	Sep 22, 2012 10:19 AM
237	All existing organizations and committes should be involved - this would include outside organizations such as the Cascade Bicycle Club, and internal government oversight committes, such as accessiblity committees for Seattle and King County.	Sep 21, 2012 3:49 PM
238	No comments.	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
239	Public school groups such as PTA's and other groups that look out for the needs of children and child mobility.	Sep 20, 2012 6:31 PM
240	Minimize input of Kemper Freeman	Sep 20, 2012 10:41 AM
241	Ride the proposed routes with a large variety of cyclists, including cyclists on tandems, extracycles, towing kid trailers, and riding with a small group of kids. You wouldn't believe what can pose a barrier to a cyclist traveling with an extra long bike or a group of kids that is really no big deal for individual cyclists on a standard bike. In my experience, this also helps build facilities that are easily used by folks in wheelchairs and electric (access) scooters!	Sep 17, 2012 3:31 PM
242	Please include all relevant stakeholders in community meetings. It was frustrating to attend events and be told that Sound Transit or the City of Seattle or some other entity needed to hear the feedback but that party was not present.	Sep 17, 2012 11:20 AM
243	People would built and desgined Burke Gilman trail!!! They did great job.	Sep 17, 2012 10:08 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

244	Ensure bicycle groups and broad neighborhood support (not just so called neighborhood associations)	Sep 17, 2012 6:19 AM
245	TRANSIT RIDERS, PEDESTRIANS AND BIKERS WHO USE MONTLAKE NEED TO BE INVOLVED IN A PROCESS THAT IMPROVES THEIR AT CAPAICTY, GRIDLOCKED ROUTES, PARTICULARLY BEFORE THE ST LRT HUSKY STATION OPENS- THE NELSON NYGARD STUDY WAS TOO NARROW AND LIMITED TO TRIGGERS, AND NOT THE LONG TERM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS CONGESTED AREA	Sep 16, 2012 4:53 PM
246	Keeping Montlake and North Capitol Hill residents in the loop is a good thing. Having a wide range of landscape designers, artists, architects for design review and collaboration.	Sep 16, 2012 10:47 AM
247	NEIGHBORHOOD GREENWAYS GROUPS.	Sep 16, 2012 2:36 AM
248	Might be nice to listen to the citizens that will be most impacted by the project. The feeling to date is that WSDOT moves based on it's own agenda and does not consider the neighborhood impact. All these statements are nice words and well intentioned sounding, but the actions to date make one believe they will never be put into action.	Sep 15, 2012 9:35 PM
249	Make sure to include key individuals and departments at the University of Washington School of Public Health and School of Nursing and Department of Urban Design and Planning. Have you reached out to Senior Centers? Montlake Elementary and TOPS school faculty, students and parents?	Sep 15, 2012 8:48 PM
250	no comment	Sep 15, 2012 7:53 PM
251	I'm curious what data has been used with regard to bike counts, bus usage data, traffic data, etc. has played in this. It could highlight some issues and put some issues to rest.	Sep 15, 2012 1:44 PM
252	Hmm, adding too many more will only delay the project even more. It is a disgrace that we spent so much money on this project before even poring a quart of concrete.Bridge should have been built, and no tolls should be in existence if we would have started 10 years ago.	Sep 15, 2012 1:04 PM
253	Representing the interests of the drivers of motor vehicles who have nothing against bikes but are scared to death of killing or seriously injuring one because they ride in the roadways that were designed for cars only is one group. The most important user needs here are the needs of the VAST majority of users who will go through this corridor - i.e. the people in the cars. Adding bikes and HOV lanes and separate lanes for light rail is fine - provided it does not reduce the capacity of the existing four lanes of motor vehicle traffic. If you have to - make the bride wider to accommodate these additional uses of an EXISTING corridor.	Sep 15, 2012 12:40 PM
254	Seattle Audubon, if they are not already part of the process.	Sep 15, 2012 11:45 AM
255	Clarity and transparency as the top priorities.	Sep 15, 2012 11:02 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

256	Pedestrian / bicycle paths that are separate from motorists	Sep 15, 2012 1:28 AM
257	No opinion	Sep 14, 2012 5:56 PM
258	Seattle Subway, Cascade Bicycle Club	Sep 14, 2012 4:43 PM
259	Bike and Ped advocacy organizations, City of Seattle bike and ped boards.	Sep 14, 2012 3:56 PM
260	See the first comment on goals.	Sep 14, 2012 3:32 PM
261	I think it's really important to listen to cyclists, since I think they will be the primary non-motorized users of this bridge path -given its distance.	Sep 14, 2012 2:16 PM
262	make sure neighbors are fully included	Sep 14, 2012 2:06 PM
263	You seem to have totally forgotten about the MAIN USERS: SOVs!	Sep 14, 2012 1:51 PM
264	I think Montlake people have too much say and are holding this process hostage. Can we diminish their obstructions? I live in this neighborhood and don't understand how they are missing this great opportunity to change our neighborhood. They bring up good points, but for a project with negative $2billion I think we have to make realistic adjustments.	Sep 14, 2012 1:39 PM
265	Generally, I think you are doing a good job and process on this, and resources (examples from Portland, Boulder)	Sep 14, 2012 1:17 PM
266	Have you modeled major-event scenarios to see if we can improve/optimize cross-agency handling of large crowds in the area. Take advantage of having the organizations together for this, beaause it may not be replicable afterwards to discuss the best way to deal with large events.	Sep 14, 2012 12:53 PM
267	none that I can think of that aren't already involved	Sep 14, 2012 12:44 PM
268	Not sure	Sep 14, 2012 12:18 PM
269	A driving organization. Cars, trucks, semis - you know, the ones this road is being built for.	Sep 14, 2012 12:08 PM
270	recreational bike riders who are intimidated by spandex-clad maniacs :-)	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
271	http://centralseattlegreenways.com/2012/09/what10feetgivesus/ www.SeattleGreenways.org (coalition of 18 groups including Montlake Greenways, Madison Greenways, Central Greenways, and University Greenways)	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
272	none that I can think of, adding this survey has been very helpful and all the other activities you are conducting have been great. THANKS	Sep 14, 2012 12:03 PM
273	None. Your process is already encumbered by too many. I am absolutely in favor in makuing sure everyone has their say, but at some point not every person is going to get their way 100%. Yes, there will be some people very	Sep 14, 2012 11:27 AM

Page 7, Q4. Effective planning and broad participation
The I-5 to Medina project nonmotorized planning process has included diverse stakeholders and agencies as part of the design conversation. Which stakeholders, best practices, examples or other planning documents should we add to the process?

upset that the final design did not go their way and they will sue WSDOT. It's going to happen. Let's just get on with it and make a decission and start construction.

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
1	The public understands that this project is a big challenge. Please take the time to re-assess if the proposed solutions will meet the needs of all users, especially those travelling by foot, transit, or bicycle. Continue to work with the staff of the City of Seattle to make connections to the surrounding neighborhoods that make sense for Seattle. Thank you for your continued effort and dedication to a successful project.	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	Bike options need to be strengthened - this bridge needs to be part of a transition to a more efficient, healthy and resilient future - not a continuation of road to ruin auto-only planning...	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 PM
3	Thank you for your hard work. :)	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 PM
4	Bike connections: Let's do it right, looking at this as the major EW portion of bike 'arterials' and have faith that if built to make bike commuting safe and efficient, usage will increase. Get the bike traffic to the west side of I5 and the future connectivity to downtown/Cascade/S Lake Union will fall into place. Montlake area: Bike solution along 24th to the south. Out of box thinking required to solve bike separation heading north over Montlake Bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 PM
5	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you”	Oct 5, 2012 10:07 PM
6	Overall, this is a challenge. My concern for the Montlake area is significant, but I would not say neutral or negative.	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 PM
7	Please include a ped/bike shared path on the Portage Bay bridge.	Oct 5, 2012 9:43 PM
8	1. Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge 2. Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities. 3. Keep the Flyer Bus stops at Montlake so riders can use cross-lake buses (those that do not enter/exit Montlake) to access Montlake and UW and UW Hospital.	Oct 5, 2012 8:37 PM
9	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank	Oct 5, 2012 7:48 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	you”	
10	I have concerns that the current plan for the Montlake area does not fully address what is so bad about it right now, in terms of the amount of motor vehicle traffic and how it interacts with the significant amount of pedestrian and bike access in this area.	Oct 5, 2012 6:27 PM
11	I can't imagine how difficult it is to plan for a project of this size, but I think every member of the project team should go to the area and attempt to commute by every method possible. (Yes, rent a wheelchair and try to make the route across the bridge or around the water work for you.) Try walking, biking, and driving. Bring your child or borrow one, and try to get from point A to point B. Then see whether your plan actually accommodates each user type.	Oct 5, 2012 5:46 PM
12	Portage bay bridge is being constrained too much by rich nimbys, so no bike connection.	Oct 5, 2012 4:24 PM
13	Only a fool decides what to do without seeing if you have the money to finish. Nowhere is cost shown or where the money is coming from therefore any discussion of how much to spend and where is foolish. The tolls on 520 would have to be $21 each way to pay for this all the while not improving roads for cars more than 5%. This plan discourages carpooling as the limit of three per car is the goal. obviously the tolls cannot be $42 a day but that money has to come from somewhere and it will be at the expense of cars. This is great if you are a bus but bad if you are a car.	Oct 5, 2012 4:16 PM
14	Keep plugging away, and you'll end up with a great design.	Oct 5, 2012 3:45 PM
15	I wrote you guys a really angry email yesterday, for which I sincerely apologize! Looking at the draft design, I did get quite angry. As someone who rides through this area almost every day, it is *extremely* important to me. I'm not a young strong bike racer... I just want to be able to commute to work without getting killed. I was hoping for a plan that showed a real commitment to providing for all users, not just drivers. For drivers, you have this project nailed! But for non-drivers, this plan needs a lot more work.	Oct 5, 2012 3:38 PM
16	Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 3:38 PM
17	Wish Delmar could pass underneath the planned park so the park would connect with Roanoke and create a larger area!	Oct 5, 2012 3:34 PM
18	Don't make the design considerations come at the expense of the motorized traffic flow and access.	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
19	Consider alternative name for southbound exit. 24th Ave E suggests one can continue south on the arterial by going straight thru light at Lake Washington Blvd E. Might exits be Montlake Blvd E "north" and Montlake Blvd E "south"? We strongly endorse the option with the Operations and Maintenance Facility under the east end of the lid. We like the Dawson Trail under-crossing to the lid at Montlake Blvd E. We would like to see other modifications that would reduce the amount of traffic that chooses to drive thru the Aboretum. Please increase the number of signs telling traffic stopped because the bridge is open to turn off engines. Consider flashing lights along the 520 exits to indicate open bridge and	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	discourage idling.	
20	Bike path on the Portage Bay Bridge, please.	Oct 5, 2012 3:24 PM
21	Get rid of the 2nd "bascule bridge" across the Montlake Cut. Protect residents of E. Lake WA Blvd by giving them plenty of plant buffer and a loca access road.	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
22	Eliminate all bicycle paths.	Oct 5, 2012 3:08 PM
23	Please make the structures and bridges beautiful. This is a chance to have beautiful architecture. Please, please make it beautiful.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
24	please design the bridge deck and connections for installation of light rail transit.	Oct 5, 2012 3:04 PM
25	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
26	The goals are good but not met by the current design. Don't treat the lid as a fig leaf for this automobile focused highway project.	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
27	I recognize the difficulty of this planning task, and I think the design gets a lot of things right, particularly outside the Montlake lid area.	Oct 5, 2012 2:53 PM
28	I'm very disappointed with the design. We went to the meeting at the Museum of History and Industry, spoke with the designers, and thought they had our safety in mind. What happened? The current plan doesn't provide a good way for bicyclists and pedestrians to move safely, efficiently, and directly through the area.	Oct 5, 2012 2:40 PM
29	I marked the Portage Bay Bridge Area and Bicycle and pedestrian connections as "Very Positive" to the extent that currently include a preference extending the regional trail to Roanoke. If this critical piece of infrastructure were not built, I would view this "Very Negatively."	Oct 5, 2012 2:25 PM
30	There needs to be a bike path crossing lake washington on the 520 bridge	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
31	We really need good bike access and transit with this project. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 2:23 PM
32	I ride my bike for commuting to work, errands, and generally getting around town. I'm very interested in improved connectivity for bicycles, transit, and pedestrians. It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team	Oct 5, 2012 2:00 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adequate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you”	
33	It seems that the views of a few adjacent neighbors have managed to drive the process so that a multi-billion dollar bridge that should serve the region for generations will be relatively unusable for people who walk and bike. Don't let this happen.	Oct 5, 2012 1:51 PM
34	If the design team has anything to do with the second bascule bridge, I'd like to say don't build it. Instead, look into ways to widen it for bicycle and HOV use.	Oct 5, 2012 1:49 PM
35	A bike lane is a must from montlake towards downtown! It will fill a need of more then just riders across the new 520, as it will allow those coming from NE Seattle to have a much better way to get downtown then currently. Getting from the Burke Gillman trail to the this Portage Bay crossing for peds and bikes and then the easy and quick access downtown is a must.	Oct 5, 2012 1:32 PM
36	I'm truly concerned about access by car to the 520 from only the Montlake Bridge interchange. Honestly, I don't drive 520 more than 2 times per month, but I'm concerned that it's going to create a HUGE bottleneck at the Montlake bridge interchange from those of us going North/South or trying to get to I-5. I will probably change my commute to drive over Capitol Hill and avoid that section all together. I know it's easy to be critical, but car traffic is the priority followed by transit and bicycles. I just think the 520 is so important to our traffic issues. I would also like us to re-think the tolls. As I stated, I rarely drive the 520. However, I think +$7 a day is a little steep. Couldn't we normalize them to a flat rate all day like $2 or $2.50? I'm sure a lower rate that's flat will add more volume and the state will get it's money stilll. Just my two cents. Enjoy.	Oct 5, 2012 1:04 PM
37	make visuals beatiful, whether architectural or natural	Oct 5, 2012 1:02 PM
38	It is challenging to currently bike around Montlake (to the UW and other areas). I live on E Miller, near Lake Washington Blvd. Cars now cut through the neighborhoods when traffic backs up; Illegally crossing double lines and the cement dividers of Lake WA to sprint into E Miller St and other streets nearby. Then traveling at high rates of speed. Having safe ways for pedestrians and cyclists to not collide - literally - is extremely important. In both the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans, the Montlake Bridge [and by extension the crossing of SR 520] has been identified as a critical linkage in the non-motorized network with existing deficiencies” (Nelson/Nygaard 2012). 1) The west side of Montlake Blvd. pedestrian/bike LOS is currently failing and getting worse. 2) The east side of Montlake Blvd. pedestrian/bike LOS is poor and will get worse under current design due to the new Bus and Light Rail Stations. 3) Safe and direct pedestrian and bicycle connections to schools, libraries, parks, the UW, regional trails, and hospitals, are non-existent in the current plans and must be re- designed. 4) No safe and direct connection between North and South Montlake especially along the west side of Montlake Blvd. 5) This project area is a critical east-west and north-south junction for citywide and regional bicycle connectivity (as shown in	Oct 5, 2012 12:58 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	Seattle's BMP and PSRC's Regional Bicycle Network). Connections from portage bay are also of paramount importance. Individuals who opt out of traveling by car, need to be able to have easy connection options for them to move through the 520 area.	
39	We just give lip service to the global warming problems and the need to reduce traffic and increase walking and using bikes and public transportation. Let see something that reflects those values rather than most of the piles of concrete to continue the glorification of the auto. It is hard to know what the state has handed to the design team to provide on its narrow minded objective of just moving more traffic through the corridor. I would hope the design team can come up with some solutions that can make our neighborhood one where people can thrive, be healthy, safe from traffic, noise, light and environmental pollution while still being able to meet the basic transportation goals. I am certain that the designers find it difficult to meet the challenges thrown at them, but hope the creative process comes through to make our neighborhood one where property values can be maintained or increased, where people still desire to live and raise their families. Please don't make Montlake, Portage Bay and Roanoke park a victim of further invasive traffic crossings. Thank You for the opportunity to express an opinion.	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 PM
40	The planning process has lost sight of the primary usage of the bridge. It is for commuters and other auto users. It should not be highjacked by pedestrians and/or bicyclists who are too small in number to be included in bridge design projects, nor should it be a Seattle urban renewal project because that is not transportation related. Make the bridge larger, safer and with better access for autos. Forget the rest of the touchy-feely ideas that add nothing to the bridge for toll payers.	Oct 5, 2012 12:46 PM
41	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you"	Oct 5, 2012 12:42 PM
42	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
43	keep it simple - we don't have an unlimited supply of money. everyone can't get everything they want. be fiscally responsible.	Oct 5, 2012 12:37 PM
44	We've been talking about this forever, in typical Seattle-polite fashion. Let's get this built!	Oct 5, 2012 12:31 PM
45	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub.	Oct 5, 2012 12:22 PM
46	Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
47	Generous mitigation for community lids and nonautomotive pathways are essential to the appeal and acceptance of this major transportation corridor improvement. Every effort should be made to maximize the ancillary benefits of improving this corridor.	Oct 5, 2012 12:19 PM
48	My main goal is being able to bike from Bellevue to large parts of Seattle easily without taking a bus or going through traffic / sidewalks around montlake / the stadium. Making this easy will HEAVILY increase bike use in seattle as this is a major commute corridor that is underserved, and would be a gorgeous daily commute.	Oct 5, 2012 11:55 AM
49	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. The whole decision to continue to route UW traffic through the Montlake bridge (which involves no fewer than three signals in a quarter-mile distance) was the first tragic mistake. The 520 exit for north-bound Montlake traffic should have made landfall at Pacific, but Laurelhurst - which isn't impacted by this decision at all except in sight-lines - nixed that plan early on and now we are stuck with a make-do solution. Good luck.	Oct 5, 2012 11:49 AM
50	Until we can see the granularity of shared use paths it is difficult to determine how well the design concepts will work.	Oct 5, 2012 11:46 AM
51	Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team? It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic	Oct 5, 2012 11:26 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
52	Great work. Thank you for rising to the challenge of diverse user requirements. As a carfree cyclist I look forward with relish to cycling here when it is done.	Oct 5, 2012 11:23 AM
53	My paramount concern is the bicycle and pedestrian connections working, and achieving access across Lake Washington via 520.	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 AM
54	Let's get it done!	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
55	Need to include a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail is integrated within the Portage Bay Bridge design.	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
56	We have an opportunity to do something fantastic here for bicycle and foot traffic.	Oct 5, 2012 11:05 AM
57	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 10:52 AM
58	t is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Without more attention to the communities on the west side that are affected by the project the most this will be a world class disaster. No community should be worse off after the bridge is built. No neighborhood should become a traffic nightmare because of this bridge. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
59	Non motorized usage needs to be more highly prioritized and planned for. You are not building roads.	Oct 5, 2012 10:37 AM
60	The project team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous contraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best creat the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 10:25 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
61	more bike/pedestrian integration	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
62	All the consideration of view and connectivity is given to the area on the East side of montlake Blvd and nothing to the immediate West side of Montlake. Do something to make that part of the project nicer too. Drop the road bed and the on ramp level and extend the lid to the west even another 30 ft to the west would help the view.	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
63	t is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 5, 2012 10:21 AM
64	The MPCC has expressed its other thoughts in a seperate comment letter.	Oct 5, 2012 10:20 AM
65	don't take the bridge after you tolled it. never will again. (won't take the tunnel either. good job in that)	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
66	The cable stayed Portage Bay Bridge option is much more aesthetically pleasing and a better solution to preserving and even enhancing the commercial and recreational activities on the bay.	Oct 5, 2012 10:18 AM
67	I think it would be a huge mistake to close the eastbound entrance to 520 from the Arboretum. I also think that any design that relies on one or two drawbridges crossing the Montlake Cut represents a huge missed opportunity to actually improve traffic conditions. Traffic is at the mercy the whims of boaters at present except for very limited hours. Traffic can back up onto the I-5 Ship Canal bridge from all the cars lining up at the Montlake exit when the bridge is open. Likewise, it can take 30 - 40 minutes to get from University Village to Montlake when the bridge is open. A short, deep tunnel under the current drawbridge would totally solve these problems.	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 AM
68	The design of the north side of the montlake lid adjacent to the water treatment area needs far more design attention.	Oct 5, 2012 10:15 AM
69	The format for this survey is a bit odd. I don’t know if my comments will be sliced up. Or what. So I will include these comments in each “preference”. I am a frequent commute from Seattle (in Montlake) to the Eastside/Microsoft. I take the bus many days. I ride my bike when I can (perhaps 10 days a month, more in the summer less in the winter). I drive perhaps 3 days a month. As we face the pollution that single driver cars create as we face energy shortages, as we face crowding and traffic, I feel we need to seriously consider biking and busing as the highest priority for this construction project. We can’t afford to make biking and busing a second class citizen. I ask that you take a serious look at every part of this plan to make sure that biking, pedestrian, and bus efficiency is paramount.	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
70	Please focus on safe, efficient infrastructure for bicycle and pedestrian users, including dedicated/separated bicycle lanes connecting neighborhoods and connections with transit	Oct 5, 2012 9:57 AM
71	please keep the Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board up to date, and check in with them if you have any questions or plans to test.	Oct 5, 2012 9:51 AM
72	Encourage the team to move as rapidly as possible throught the process. We have been discussing this for YEARS and it is not going to get any cheaper the longer we wait. In fact, the longer we put this off the fewer amenities will be incorporated in the project as costs go up and revenues decline.	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
73	It seems that more thought could be given to the ped/bike grid in the area and how the 520 project can support ped/bike mobility. Vehicle miles driven per capita is declining. While the report exhibits a sea change from 1960's thinking, it is time to increase the thought and provisions for ped/bike mobility beyond that seen in the report.	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
74	There are very few examples in the greater Seattle area where cyclists are provided a safe, effective, and convenient option for traveling. Exclusions from that statement include some areas of the Interurban (and connecting) trail system, which unfortunately does not continue and provide safe passage through the city of Seattle. Much like the Monorail and light rail fiascos most bike route solutions are given a platform for input and then either forgotten, dismissed, or implemented poorly. Until there are more examples to celebrate I will remain neutral in my optimism...although I will be the first to be a positive voice heralding any real improvements that are made.	Oct 5, 2012 9:43 AM
75	The bike and pedestrian amenities that got added to the I-90 bridge and lid have made an enormous difference in my life, and I don't live close to there at all. They played a huge part in me becoming a person who rides a bicycle to most places by just being there. They send a message that walking and cycling are normal activities and encouraged activities. I see a huge cross-section of society out enjoying I-90 and it's wonderful. If you ever doubt that these things, which are probably a wee percentage of the budget, are worth it, go out to Jimi Hendrix Park on a nice evening, take a look at all of the people there, and imagine just the freeway there instead. There are always loads of old people out walking, people playing frisbee, people walking dogs, people riding bikes. It's a huge benefit to the community.	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 AM
76	Please strive to encourage transit use, cycling and walking, as the benefits are significant. Thank you.	Oct 5, 2012 9:36 AM
77	We need better connections to other regional trails and bike/pedestrian routes. Don't just dump bikers in the middle of nowhere.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM
78	I appreciate the design team taking the time to gather input from pedestrians and bikers. I only see this community increasing in size in Seattle, and know that any pedestrian and cyclist friendly planning will be put to frequent use. As a family biker I urge you to keep in mind that not all cyclists are fast, healthy, and on a nimble little bike. I look forward to seeing the revised plan, and hope that it will allow me and my children to better access Seattle and Eastside parks, schools, community centers, and businesses.	Oct 5, 2012 9:30 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
79	A chain being only as strong as its weakest link analogy is critical to appreciate here. Great design efforts and a huge financial investment will result in frustration and disappointment if the problems with the Montlake Interchange are not solved. Fitting and expanded SR520 into Montlake poses enormous problems for an efficient commute, safety, and livability. Separating potential bottlenecks by using multi-levels to separate different categories of commuters may be possible will take more work. For generations to come, please make this investment. Thanks.	Oct 5, 2012 9:09 AM
80	I try to avoid voicing my opinion for areas of the project I am less impacted by, preferring to leave those comment areas to the people who live nearer. The area that impacts me the most is the Portage Bay Area. I have felt a lot of frustration in this area, as there are those (primarily recreational bicyclists) who want a wide shared use path at any cost -- to the environment, the taxpayer, or the neighborhood that will be directly impacted. This group has crashed every single one of our neighborhood design meetings, leaving comments that conflicted with most of the comments of actual neighborhood residents. The fact is that there are other ways for bicyclists to get from one point to the other -- the time and distance difference to the bicyclist is not great enough to justify the costs.	Oct 5, 2012 9:00 AM
81	Positive reactions are based on a continuous bike/pedestiran path through the area and no major road crossings, a cable stayed bridge, and lower transit ramps. Your survey does not provide an opportunity for other comments on the next page, so I had to go back to this page to add my other thoughts. In addition to where a person lives, you should also ask where a person works. I work in Seattle and pass through this area on average 10-15 times per week.	Oct 5, 2012 8:50 AM
82	Thanks for all the hrad work!	Oct 5, 2012 8:42 AM
83	That second "very negative" is related to the first. I'd like to see some more thought go into the Montlake lid.	Oct 5, 2012 7:58 AM
84	thank you	Oct 5, 2012 7:34 AM
85	This freeway will be around for fifty years. Try to see it from the point of view of the pedestrian and cyclist using the bridge, most importantly, identifying spots where the built structure inevitably leads to unsafe conflicts with cars.	Oct 5, 2012 7:27 AM
86	Sorry - but this project is ridiculous, overwrought and will be too expensive given the number of users. It's more PR than civic planning. Quit pandering to minute, special interest groups and build a bridge that gets people to WORK.	Oct 5, 2012 7:14 AM
87	on on ramp to eastbound 520 at Roanoke shoud be considered	Oct 5, 2012 7:13 AM
88	Thank you for reaching out and connecting with the community.	Oct 5, 2012 7:00 AM
89	hope the planners realizied there is more than non-motorized items to deal with. maybe not now but in the future. this area seems to only plan for now and take for ever to do anything right. over all your plan looks very good and i wish you luck with it.	Oct 5, 2012 6:56 AM
90	I commend the fact that you are seeking public input, but would ask that you not	Oct 5, 2012 6:20 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	be too stymied by process. This is a regional project that needs to create sound transportation connections for the next 50+ years. Seattle is a city with Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans and stated goals for increasing bicycle and pedestrian use and connectivity. It should be a clear imperative that these uses be accommodated throughout the corridor, at all transitions, and at both ends. Input and decisions should be governed by the overall region and community's needs, rather than those of any one neighborhood. This is a highly regional project that will affect all of Seattle and the region. At this point, it is very difficult to understand what is actually being proposed, as there are so many options and variations. You should take this input, come up with a proposal, and vett that. Thanks again for listening to the community.	
91	By looking at the drawings and all the time and effort put in - you have done a terrific job on a very difficult project. Thank you for your hard work.	Oct 5, 2012 5:45 AM
92	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you”	Oct 5, 2012 5:40 AM
93	The approach from south bound I-5 has not been considered. This is a source of congestion. Improving this on ramp must be included.	Oct 5, 2012 5:27 AM
94	Must have solid non-car (bicycle and pedestrian) access to all routes. As gas gets more expensive, and as the region grows and traffic gets worse, we must have non-car options. Costs to add non-car options are relatively small and the increase in flexibility is enormous. Don't skip this!	Oct 5, 2012 5:20 AM
95	Nice job, but need more consideration of bikes and pedestrians.	Oct 5, 2012 12:57 AM
96	Thanks for the hard work on designing this major, complex project. Having great multi-use paths that connect Medina to I-5, including the neighborhoods along the way (Montlake, Roanoke, and Arboretum), is very important to me and many other people I know who would want to commute or travel to the Eastside by bike. Ensuring a good experience for transit users is also very important.	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 AM
97	Please don't shave any park space from the Montlake Park where it abuts the water. Also, don't put up that really high wall along the park. It blocks light and doesn't fit in with the natural surroundings. When you put up the new exit ramp for Montlake Blvd heading east on 520, be aware there is a beaver dam in that vicinity.	Oct 5, 2012 12:07 AM
98	There's a huge potential for bicycle transportation through this corridor. This will reduce traffic loads if the infrastructure is done right.	Oct 4, 2012 10:39 PM
99	For all the time and expense you have put into this, it is a pretty dismal outcome	Oct 4, 2012 10:38 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	for folks living in Seattle. Great for moving car traffic east/west, but poor for north/south and does little to improve mobility in the Seattle corridor. The lids are particularly bad, especially the one supposedly connecting Montlake. The lid is too far east connecting a few houses to a new storm water facility, with little or no new connection for anyone living West of Montlake Blvd. Many positive ideas have arisen over the last decade in conjunction with this project, but few have been incorporated into your current plan. I wish I could mark positive in the above chart, but unfortunately most of the design elements are less than satisfactory.	
100	What about property that boarders the park at Delmar? Will there be a visual privacy? Can it be a safe community park like Roanoke	Oct 4, 2012 10:34 PM
101	I strongly feel that safe and viable transportation options need to be in place for cyclists and pedestrians. Whatever you build will be utilized; if its designed only for high speed vehicle traffic, that is what you will get.	Oct 4, 2012 10:26 PM
102	More focus should be placed on making the new bridge less intrusive to the community from an noise aspect. Bridge section from Roanoke to Portage Bay should be enclosed (sidewalls, roof), and section across the arboretum/Foster Is. should have at least sound barrier walls.	Oct 4, 2012 10:04 PM
103	Please reconsider the removal of the Arboretum ramps. Thank you very much for your consideration.	Oct 4, 2012 9:55 PM
104	This was very difficult as a user to fill out this form. The wording on questions took was poor and difficult to understand. Several of the images were difficult to understand what I am looking at (the option A vs B as in cable vs. girder were good). The test boxes were too small to easily provide answers. For requesting responses, it was not easy or enjoyable to respond and give my best opinion and thoughts.	Oct 4, 2012 9:55 PM
105	I'm a bit concerned with how this will impact the Montlake neighborhood and haven't seen enough to address these concerns. I'm also concerned that there won't be enough done to help peds and bicycles travel safely.	Oct 4, 2012 9:48 PM
106	next survey you may want to ask some specific questions. It was a bit hard to understand what kind of responses you wanted from me. and a larger more detailed map of the suggested changes would be handy. thanks for all the hard work. please make this happen!	Oct 4, 2012 9:48 PM
107	I think more can be done to provide for bicycle and pedestrian access to the new bridge. A bridge that can accommodate a 14 foot mixed use lane is of primary concern.	Oct 4, 2012 9:47 PM
108	I found this survey to be very difficult to respond to in a meaningful way. More directed questions and explicit alternative choices including drawings would have made the entire process more useful	Oct 4, 2012 9:38 PM
109	I appreciate all the open forums and opportunities for feedback but feel that even though our local Montlake community has well attended these events and made numerous comments, I don't feel like we have been heard. I agree the bridge needs to be rebuilt but I am not sure the project needs to be so massive with six	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 PM

	lanes. In hindsight, I wish they would have just rebuilt the 4 lane bridge in roughly the same footprint. I live and drive in this area and take the bridge often and I can't say it is really that bad. I don't see anything in this plan to improve back ups on Lake Wa Blvd to U. Village. I am happy a second Montlake Bridge is not being built. Thank you for all of your efforts you have put into this. Hopefully the plan will be implemented successfully with the least impact on residents of the beautiful Montlake neighborhood.	
110	Invite me to your lunch parties! You are all overpaid asses	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
111	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adequate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 9:11 PM
112	Thank you for your work on this challenging project. The costs are relatively small to make sure that bicycle and pedestrian needs are well met in the final project design; to not do so would be a terrible lost opportunity that would leave a long and negative legacy.	Oct 4, 2012 9:09 PM
113	PLEASE integrate a multi-use trail into the THE PORTAGE BAY Bridge.	Oct 4, 2012 8:36 PM
114	either put the flyer stops back or put the second shipcanal bridge back - for HOV only.	Oct 4, 2012 8:20 PM
115	1) At the end of construction of the Portage Bay Bridge, the Frolund parcel should become a landscaped park with a wetland area and be re-graded after use as a staging area to become an attractive public park. 2) Restoration of the streets and sidewalks along Fuhrman-Boyer that have been damaged by the haul trucks must occur promptly and completely. 3) Shoreline restoration in South Portage Bay must also take place to protect wildlife forage and habitat, and mitigation of construction impacts is crucial to protect the long-term viability of the bay and surrounding neighborhoods. 4) Purchase the land immediately south of the Portage Bay Bridge owned by Seattle Prep and create a park with bike trail and ADA trail before turning it over to the city . 5) "Ease" the west end of the PB Bridge into its site so that it complements the surrounding vistas and area. 6) No construction should begin on features of the project until detailed drawings of proposed changes or new ideas not vetted by the neighborhood have been provided and feedback collected 7) My negative reaction to the Portage Bay preferences comes largely from my concern about the overall width of both bridge proposals and the number of supports necessary to carry them as they cross our fragile bay. I am a proponent of a four-lane structure and have difficulty embracing any of WSDOT's proposals that are based on the enormous 6-lane bridge that seems unnecessary large and destructive of the bay and surrounding neighborhoods. 8) THANK YOU, however, for providing a response form that was easy to use, clear, and helpful in explaining the proposals.	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
116	I do not favor the expansion of the SR520 Bridge hence these Alternatives are not acceptable.	Oct 4, 2012 8:02 PM
117	I appreciate all that has been done to date regarding bicycle and pedestrian connections. Still I feel that the current proposal is not enough. For a project this large, it is necessary to get it right the first time in terms of connectivity and safety. I very strongly encourage you to study and implement a bike and ped path over Portage Bay. Living in North Capital hill I have been so frustrated at how hard it can be to get to montlake and even the U-district if you are not in a car. Providing access over Portage bay, and good connection onto and off of the lid would be extremely beneficial as more and more peds and bicyclists are using this transit corridor. Thanks!	Oct 4, 2012 7:25 PM
118	Ground-up design for bicycles as daily transportation. Thanks!	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
119	More room for cars. Less money spent on ped/bike/transit/landscaping improvements. Please call me at [redacted] My name is Kerry Thompson, and I hope you pull your heads out of your asses soon. Fuck you.	Oct 4, 2012 6:38 PM
120	Stop groewing the tax payers bills and increasing the tolls for this bridge you should be minimizing the cost growth not looking for additional enhancements	Oct 4, 2012 6:07 PM
121	Just to cake sure you follow through with the share-use path that you had in mind from the beginning. It's important as a city to have this to connect people with their work, neighbor, city, and community!!! Do not leave out the pedestrian/bicycle paths out of your plans!!!	Oct 4, 2012 5:11 PM
122	Thank you for your hard work thus far and allowing the end users to provide input.	Oct 4, 2012 4:41 PM
123	Be sure to provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 4, 2012 4:30 PM
124	Make sure, no matter what, that we keep the plan for the Parks/Lid over the freeway. That is fantastic	Oct 4, 2012 4:13 PM
125	PORTAGE BAY BICYCLE PATH!PORTAGE BAY BICYCLE PATH!PORTAGE BAY BICYCLE PATH!PORTAGE BAY BICYCLE PATH!PORTAGE BAY BICYCLE PATH!PORTAGE BAY BICYCLE PATH!	Oct 4, 2012 4:08 PM
126	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of	Oct 4, 2012 2:40 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	
127	The rating perhaps doesn't gel with some of my hypercritical comments, but I pretty much expect that the departments of transportation around here will screw up bike access. Do you know why cyclists break the law so much? There are two answers. First, we don't do it nearly as much as people think. Second, we do it because the infrastructure is so poorly designed and we get so little regard from drivers that often we're nearly forced to break the law; even when that's not the case, we're so used to having to find our own way that breaking the law is a habit. The roads and the laws and the people that execute them are so stacked against me while I'm biking that I can hardly view the law as a legitimate authority over me. It's a near certainty that intersections between bike paths and roads in this project will be designed with poor sight lines and ambiguous right-of-way rules. Please prove me wrong.	Oct 4, 2012 2:10 PM
128	This survey isn't very good- there was never an option to vote - too many choices and why do the preferences go to different sections of the bridge?	Oct 4, 2012 1:27 PM
129	1.Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. 2.Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. 3.East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 4.24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. 5.Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Oct 4, 2012 1:25 PM
130	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thanks.	Oct 4, 2012 1:10 PM
131	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank	Oct 4, 2012 12:53 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	you	
132	A good portion of the Arboretum and land values were destroyed in 1963. Here is an opportunity to show the permanent residents that there can be restoration, particularly along east lake washington boulevard	Oct 4, 2012 12:53 PM
133	This is our second attempt at this survey as we have had conversations since the first survey submitted and have changed our opinions on the pedestrian/bicycle aspects of the project. However, if funds are limited our first priorities remain noise reduction, large lids and as little disruption from buses and cars to neighorhoods as possible. We also are in favor of a simple bridge design. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this survey	Oct 4, 2012 12:47 PM
134	Frankly, I have little trust in WSDOT to not ignore non-auto users in their projects. This entire project is a great chance to change that, and I sincerely hope WSDOT capatalizes on the oppertunity.	Oct 4, 2012 12:14 PM
135	I have heard that traffic will be discouraged from using Lake Wash BLVD through the Arboretum and into Montlake as a primary path to 520. Exactly how is this going to happen? My house is on LWB. With the removal of the east bound ramp from the Arboretum, I am concerned that for much of the day I literally will not be able to get my car out of my driveway if all the traffic headed to east bound 520 and from westbound is now diverted onto the section of LWB East that I live on.	Oct 4, 2012 12:12 PM
136	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you!	Oct 4, 2012 12:03 PM
137	Don't let the half empty glass people get you down! You all rock!!	Oct 4, 2012 11:54 AM
138	The goals are good. But, the design for the Montlake Lid and the entire Montlake Blvd E. Corridor does not reflect adherence to these goals. It seems that the design for the lid was created without understanding of automobile, transit and most especially pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the adjoining neighborhoods and this sector of the city. Instead of creating a space designed for safe, direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle crossings, reuniting neighborhoods and creating vibrant connections that benefit the entire region, the lid appears to be conceived simply as a way to hide the SR 520. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you /// For a significant amount of background material supporting these preferences as well as a detailed map,	Oct 4, 2012 11:42 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	please see: http://centralseattlegreenways.com/2012/10/we-need-your-help-sr520-portage-bay-bridge-trail/	
139	It seems as though including pedestrians and cyclists was an afterthought in this design process which will impact our city for decades. Please understand addressing only cars and neighborhood land owners only works with 2 of the at least 4 or more major stakeholders in this process. thank you for listening.	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
140	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 11:32 AM
141	please let me bike across the 520 bridge!!	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
142	In general, I applaud the outreach, and the incremental changes incorporated into the designs as you have held the workshops over the last year or so. I fear that we won't have the money, and all this work will be for naught....or, the design and EIS processes will be shortcut to save time and money. The bridge traffic is so low now, and not expected to increase to pre-toll levels until 2032. Why are we not considering a 4-lane west side?	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM
143	This corridor is important to be realized for all potential users in the city. This should not just be a pass though for motorized vehicles. Increasing non-motorized access to the maximum is an important feature that needs to make it into the final design and construction. This should include non-motorized user access along the whole project corridor with connections to Seattle infrastructure at Montlake and Roanoke.	Oct 4, 2012 10:10 AM
144	I don't think this plan does enough to ensure the safety of bicycle commuters.	Oct 4, 2012 10:10 AM
145	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 4, 2012 9:25 AM
146	It's painfully obvious that your so-called bridge committee exists to serve bicyclists.	Oct 4, 2012 7:09 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
147	I am very concerned about the impact on the Arboretum and Foster Island natural areas during construction and after. I want the final product to be less invasive in terms of noise and to allow for easy access.	Oct 4, 2012 6:51 AM
148	Please keep good walking and biking access in your designs	Oct 4, 2012 6:09 AM
149	I appreciate the design team for working through this difficult and enormous task. I live in Montlake and have a young child so of course this is the area that I worry about the most, as well as his access and future access and needs. In most areas it would seem that the design team has put a great deal of energy into refining best practice and use, but I worry that this may not be the case in Montlake and especially in relation to how much traffic of all types (motorized, foot, and pedal) comes through here.	Oct 4, 2012 3:25 AM
150	Portage bay bridge MUST include a continuation of the multi-use path.	Oct 4, 2012 2:29 AM
151	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adequate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 3, 2012 9:50 PM
152	Please work to maintain existing mature trees. Safe bike and pedistrian access is important.	Oct 3, 2012 9:32 PM
153	Hire a competent parks design architect as part of your project delivery process. Ask your staff traffic engineers if the Montlake Boulevard situation they are proposing is a good traffic solution or not. They have told me that it is not but that the politicians have given them no choice. Do we really want a $1,000,000,000 Montlake Mess?	Oct 3, 2012 9:20 PM
154	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities	Oct 3, 2012 9:12 PM
155	Yes, how are you going to mitigate traffic flow from lake Washington on ramp to 520 from the Madrona and Madison park neighborhoods after it is removed? Any changes to Lake Washington /Madison and Madison/23rd? Otherwise people will cut through and jam Interlaken and Boyer...what is the plan?	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 PM
156	worried about the increased traffic and noise (particularly with the viaduct portion). it has always seemed to me (commuting on my bike across the bridge daily) that the impediment is not primarily the Montlake bridge, but 520; I would note that the back up is south bound on the Montlake bridge, both in the morning and evening- suggesting, since presumably the same cars are going in reverse, that it's not Montlake bridge. (the older folks in the neighborhood tell of the lid promises with the first bridge)	Oct 3, 2012 6:27 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
157	I feel like the Montlake portion of this plan needs to be very carefully considered and I'm not sure it has all been well thought out. Perhaps adding several Montlake residents to all future planning would aid in a full comprehension on how to lessen the impact to this important neighborhood. In addition, if you do not receive many comments, it is not because the current plan is a good one, it's because this survey is incredibly daunting to the busy residents of this city.	Oct 3, 2012 4:08 PM
158	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 3, 2012 3:52 PM
159	Thanks for making this survey easily accessible for those who can't come to the public meetings!	Oct 3, 2012 2:01 PM
160	Please include appropriate and safe routes for cyclists and pedestrians in your plans. People need to get out of their cars once in a while! And SDOT needs to acknowledge the needs of these other modes of transportation, planning for increased use in the future.	Oct 3, 2012 1:57 PM
161	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 3, 2012 1:51 PM
162	Need to be willing to back up fine words about non-motorized connections with dollars. I-5 bike/ped crossing and continuation of regional trail across Portage Bay are essential. Montlake lid needs improvement.	Oct 3, 2012 1:24 PM
163	Desing elements illustrated gives plat form base with which we 've seen and add concept of ideas to. Not everyone will be pleased or satisfied regardless of outcome. Go with final draft.	Oct 3, 2012 12:16 PM
164	Pedestrian/bicycle traffic on the 520 bridge is a must. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 3, 2012 12:01 PM
165	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 3, 2012 11:58 AM
166	This 3-D thinking is really complex. Thank you all who are trying to make our	Oct 3, 2012 11:54 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	environment liveable. Since I live in Montlake, walking for pleasure and transportation is most important to me, followed by safe bike routes.	
167	There is an oppportunity to stronger encourage a behavior shift, to move more to bikes, walking and transit and at every step of the way it would be great to see that thinking incorporated into the design, while not disrupting traffic flow.	Oct 3, 2012 11:34 AM
168	Like I said before, don't let the loud-mouths make your decisions. We need a consistent, safe, efficient system. For all modes. Period. keep up the good work.	Oct 3, 2012 11:09 AM
169	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 3, 2012 10:50 AM
170	please provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and desig all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities	Oct 3, 2012 10:32 AM
171	Thanks for asking--when designing this project, please imagine that you are the person living in the neighborhood, not just the person driving through it. Thanks	Oct 3, 2012 10:01 AM
172	Make sure that the bicycle connections are continuous and clear enough to allow serious commuters to use them in a way where they do not decide that riding with traffic is faster and easier than using the bicycle facilities.	Oct 3, 2012 9:55 AM
173	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adaquate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you	Oct 3, 2012 9:54 AM
174	Ambitious goals. Please continue working to make this a world class facility for all users.	Oct 3, 2012 9:45 AM
175	The Portage Bay Bridge structure will have the biggest visual impact on our city and must be a beautiful structure making viewing it from all directions a postive addition to our beautiful city.	Oct 3, 2012 8:47 AM
176	Please ensure that a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail is integrated within the	Oct 3, 2012 8:44 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	Portage Bay Bridge design. Thank you.	
177	It is worth noting that the design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders obtained concessions early on that emphasized using the lid as a screen rather than as a green and multi-modal hub. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. I respect that challenge and want to give the team the credit it deserves for working under some enormous constraints. However, the current plan is not adequate and the team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand multi-modal traffic patterns and how to best create the kind of city and region we all want. Thank you.	Oct 3, 2012 8:39 AM
178	You need to do a traffic micro-simjulation model for all time periods on I-5 between 520 and Mercer Street. It does not make any sense to feed more traffic onto I-5 without addressing this issue. The current single reversible ramp to the I-5 center roadway is only a small part of the solution. Great engineers should be able to come up with some ramps that minimize the Mercer weave. I'm willing to help brainstorm such ideas. And if this is "not in the scope" then you need to ask the legislature to add it to the scope.	Oct 3, 2012 8:29 AM
179	look to the future, in world without such dependence on cars for transportation!	Oct 3, 2012 8:03 AM
180	Integrate charging stations along bike/ped trails so as to allow the use of single ocupancy small E/Vs like Segways, wheelchairs and other forms of transportation that are unsafe to operate on streets with bus/car/truck traffic. All bike trails S/B open to these types of non-poluting devices.	Oct 3, 2012 7:27 AM
181	I want non motorized lane(s) with convenient connections to the neighborhoods on each side of Lake Washington.	Oct 3, 2012 7:17 AM
182	For cycling to be a competitive mode of transportation compared to cars, it has to have fast rights of way. It needs design that will give it priority over other means of transportation when it comes to not having to stop, bei able toget where one wants to fast and safely. That is the opposite of current policy. For example, Burke Gilman intersections, which are local streets, always have the right of way. A car right of way that traverses four cities would always have the right of way over local streets. But when bikes are the only users, car small streets get the right of way. That kind of thinking has to change.	Oct 3, 2012 12:27 AM
183	it is hard to evaluate the current Montlake area plans. if the lid is at the same height as the areas to the north and south it would be good. the off ramps have to be low so they don't get in the way. also, it woudl be nice to see what the area where the current off ramps to nowhere will look like in the new plan.	Oct 2, 2012 10:53 PM
184	I tried to look at the documents but could not see the bicycle plan. My priority is transportation by bicycle. I do not want paths that wander around. Bicycles can be used for transportation. Please try to minimize car use. Cars are unhealthy (exhaust, lack of exercise), expensive, and noisy.	Oct 2, 2012 9:11 PM
185	These proposed bicycle and pedestrian connections will really help to make Seattle a more sustainable and attractive city. We need to ensure these	Oct 2, 2012 9:02 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	improvements are not cut just to save some money. The investment will pay off in the long run.	
186	Pleasure there is a bicycle trail in all the areas, including the Portage Bay Bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 8:05 PM
187	Bike and pedestrain access to bridge very important	Oct 2, 2012 4:51 PM
188	Remember - we need to prioritize bicycling and pedestrian needs in development - this is the flexible moment for us to have a more sustainable and livable city	Oct 2, 2012 4:24 PM
189	Provide 14-foot shared-use trails and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Oct 2, 2012 4:22 PM
190	Neutral because the multi-use trail is still not safely part of the project. This must be included.	Oct 2, 2012 4:01 PM
191	Cycling and pedestrian use will increase when people feel safe doing it. Facilities need to account for predicted use and for growth in the predicted use when people realize they can bike and walk safely. The I-90 bike path is great to give cyclists and pedestrians a way across the lake, but it did not account for the increasing use, and now there are conflicts among cyclists and between cyclists and pedestrians that did not occur five or more years ago. The 520 project should anticipate the success of non-motorized paths and the facilities should be designed with that in mind. That will get cars off the road and reduce the need for further expensive freeway expansion.	Oct 2, 2012 3:31 PM
192	Please add a bicycle and pedestrian lane to the 520 bridge.	Oct 2, 2012 12:25 PM
193	The design process only started collecting input from the pedestrians and the bicycle community at a late stage. Other stakeholders, such the Arboretum, obtained concessions early on that are not necessarily in everyone's interest. As a result, traffic throughout the area may be severely impacted, neighborhood needs are not met in terms of connections, city needs took a back seat. Generally, the design team has been given a very difficult task: fitting a bigger 520 and a massive interchange in Montlake is an enormous challenge. The team needs to be given the time to re-assess the needs of Seattle and to understand all types of traffic patterns and their predictable evolution.	Oct 2, 2012 12:25 PM
194	The 'negatives' above are largely because of the failure, so far, to provide that last crucial piece - a direct bike/ped path on the Portage Bay Bridge. I won't repeat my arguments again. Just don't let this opportunity slip away. Now is the time to complete the BIKE520 system as envisioned over 20 years ago and that was supported by all jurisdictions along the corridor as well as the Seattle Times (see 9/15/1991 editorial).	Oct 2, 2012 10:19 AM
195	The primary focus on cars has many of us cyclists worried. I am very much of the opinion that if the bike portions end before I5, the car portions should also. Clearly you see how idiotic doing this to the car portions is. And it is equally idiotic to make transportation for those of us who prefer to not clog up the freeways more difficult.	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
196	I don't know how to answer these questions because the stated preference is not	Oct 2, 2012 9:25 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	disambiguated with the design of record. I worry about the design of these five questions yielding unintended interpretations. There are many good preferences such as studying better connectivity, but the design graphic clearly shows the lack of good connectivity. Which am I responding to with this question. I expect that most people filling out this page will be in one mindset or the other but not question which.	
197	A bridge without accommodations for pedestrians and bicycles is not a bridge at all. We, the People with two feet and/or two wheels would definitely accrue further health benefits by being able to take a pleasant walk or ride along the proposed I-520 bridge project. Some of us are interested in our long term health, saving our local atmosphere from unnecessary pollution, and inreducing health care costs in general. Exercise for the masses ought to be more than a tertiary concern for our public officials and for the SDOT. Build pedestrian and bicycle lanes and they will come	Oct 2, 2012 8:22 AM
198	Build this! Keep investing in non-motorized and public transit connections. It's awesome!	Oct 1, 2012 9:27 PM
199	you'll not be sorry you planned for bicycles and rapid transit	Oct 1, 2012 7:26 PM
200	Recreational and commuter cycling across the bridge will be enhanced when these decisions include both the consideration of cyclist needs on the new structures, AS WELL AS consideration of pre-existing bike routes and trails nearby. For example, if I want to ride from the east side to downtown on my bike, it is much more desirable for the 520 designs to provide safe passage through to the eastlake neighborhood, rather than a terminus at Montlake. Similarly, be aware of proximity to Burke Gilman, Lake Washington Loop, and east side 520 trail and street connections. Connecting into this network would be brilliant planning and would reflect an elegant and usable community design.	Oct 1, 2012 2:51 PM
201	I am concerned that there is not enough bicycle and pedestrian shared-use path consideration and I do not see any mention to include light-rail which is totally insane and makes me feel the financial backers are controlling the process since having a light-rail may well reduce the vehicle volume which is what we should be striving for. More light-rail, and bicycle and pedestrian shared-use paths, less buses! Less Autos! Less Trucks!	Oct 1, 2012 1:35 PM
202	Overall, for pedestrians, bikes and from an aesthetic approach the plan is taking shape nicely, but there seems to be a huge hole in the plan with no option for commuter rail along the bridge. By not having the rail in the plan, we miss out on a huge opportunity to better serve the communities on the east side of Lake Washington and Seattle.	Oct 1, 2012 1:26 PM
203	Please design with a long-term vision, build something safe and modern that will last for 75 years or more, factoring in the future growth and density of this area.	Oct 1, 2012 10:25 AM
204	I would like to see a more emphatic solution to the I5 crossing at Roanoake. I'm not sure how the Montlake solution addresses current traffic backup issues.	Sep 30, 2012 9:27 PM
205	I commute by bicycle through Fremont to Kirkland. I currently ride 1 day/week on the Burke-Gilman, but that is a very long ride. I look forward to using the bridge, and riding 2-3 times a week. For me, good bicycle connections from	Sep 30, 2012 8:03 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	Fremont to Kirkland are paramount. I'd like either: good connections from the BG across the Montlake Cut to the 520 trail (right now the trail connections are terrible) or a good route from Boyer to the 520 trail, including a bike/ped triail on the Portage Bay Bridge. Thank you.	
206	A 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge is essential to the project.	Sep 30, 2012 7:58 PM
207	Our main interests are simple bridge and lid designs focusing on neighborhood preservation and noise reduction while preserving as much park land as possible. Do not begin construction of the Westside 520 Project until the funds are available.	Sep 30, 2012 3:50 PM
208	Please add a shared-use path to the Portage Bay Bridge. Also please bolster all bicycle and pedestrian connections through this corridor, with a vision of future users.	Sep 30, 2012 10:59 AM
209	Thank you for your efforts....a 50 year problem needs a 50 year vision. Thank you for your diligence and seeking of opinions. The mental model of a public conveyance, "roadway for cars only" is dead. As we build infrastructure to support movement of people, and their goods, it is imperative we expand our definition of a shared public conveyance, and build solutions that allow safe travel for any mode of transport whether it be fossil fuel powered or human powered.	Sep 30, 2012 7:38 AM
210	We have a very bike friendly community. We must keep it so!	Sep 30, 2012 7:15 AM
211	All "positive" marks above because there are improvements over the current situation, but that implies that these improvement will be carried over all the way to reality. Especially the 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and good, bicycle and pedestrian connections allong the way. I hope so...	Sep 30, 2012 3:51 AM
212	If you don't improve flow on I-5, the ability to get more lanes of traffic across 520 will not provide any value to current traffic flows.	Sep 29, 2012 11:49 PM
213	A bridge without accommodations for pedestrians and bicycles is not a bridge at all. We, the People with two feet and/or two wheels would definitely accrue further health benefits by being able to take a pleasant walk or ride along the proposed I-520 bridge project. Some of us are interested in our long term health, saving our local atmosphere from unnecessary pollution, and inreducing health care costs in general. Exercise for the masses ought to be more than a tertiary concern for our public officials and for the SDOT. Do the Right Thing. Build a bridge that will allow pedestrians and cyclist to cross 520. Future and current citizens will applaud your good judgement and forward thinking	Sep 29, 2012 10:26 PM
214	As a cyclist, I want to make sure that we are 1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 29, 2012 7:47 PM
215	Add dedicated bike lanes, and make sure there are 3 lanes of east traveling traffic and 3 lanes of west traveling traffic to support future traffic needs.	Sep 29, 2012 7:44 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
216	I've been physically shrinking because I'm getting old, but I'm still 6'5". Low railings designed for average-sized people make me nervous. For example, my recent experience of bicycling across the lake on I-90 makes made me nervous enough to take this survey to tell you about it. You don't need to accommodate my not-completely-rational anxieties, and I imagine that many cyclists love that path as it is. Make of this what you will.	Sep 29, 2012 6:51 PM
217	I see no improvement on the two traffic bottlenecks; the Roanoke and Montlake interchanges. Very disappointed in the design.	Sep 29, 2012 6:38 PM
218	I will cycle this route frequently for both recreation and errands. As gas prices continue to rise, I suspect others will too, if you make this safe, and connect to popular destinations. Thanks for your efforts!	Sep 29, 2012 4:52 PM
219	Please don't let the North Capitol Hill Neighborhood Association, or Sustainable 520 alter your plans. The bike path along the portage bay bridge is very very important.	Sep 29, 2012 4:39 PM
220	Thank you guys so much for listening to the community, and having such care and compassion for the environment! I'm excited to see this area get even better for those who actually live here (not just speeding through).	Sep 29, 2012 1:52 PM
221	Please make it clearer how bicyclists will transition from the Burke-Gilman trail to the 520 bridge trail: ideally minimize intersections, have dedicated bike lanes, and provide a dedicated overpass across Montlake.	Sep 29, 2012 1:23 PM
222	Pedestrian safety and traffic noise concerns.	Sep 29, 2012 10:11 AM
223	I am glad to see that bicycle and pedestrian access is being carefully considered, please also watch road noise and congestion for those neighborhoods, like mine in Eastlake, that are near Montlake. Also please take care to protect the wonderful bird life and vital city habitat on and around the 520. Please involve the Audubon society to advise on these issues if you haven't already.	Sep 29, 2012 9:42 AM
224	This project is missing one important thing, and that is capacity. Only adding 1 HOV lane is NOT an improvement, and a waste of money. This bridge will end up being another I405 from Renton to Bellevue, a joke. It needs to be an 8 lane bridge. Hopefully with better leadership in the future it can be re-striped and widened to an 8 lane bridge in the future.	Sep 29, 2012 7:57 AM
225	This needs to happen. The sooner the neighborhoods understand that the better. They are getting great improvement from this project. I would keep the lake Washington ramps open to get Madison park an more of the coalition on board with the project.	Sep 29, 2012 7:02 AM
226	Light Rail, I can't say that enough. The HOV lanes need to go the entire distance.	Sep 28, 2012 9:34 PM
227	more work needs to be done getting the multi-use trail across portage bay.	Sep 28, 2012 9:23 PM
228	I can only emphasize how important it is that biking and walking be promoted throughout this project. This is an exciting opportunity to significantly improve	Sep 28, 2012 7:30 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	our enviorment for those who will walk and bike, thank you for including this community in your planning.	
229	The $2 BILLION funding shortfall must be addressed. It is the height of fiscal irresponsibility to continue spending money we don't have, on something we can't afford. This creates expectations that are virtually impossible to meet, and is unfair to all involved (except the paid consultants and dreamers).	Sep 28, 2012 6:05 PM
230	I am very concerned that a bike route accross the 520 bridge be included in the project. Additional provisions for the inclusion of light rail across the bridge should be considered.	Sep 28, 2012 5:09 PM
231	Strong support that the plan includes safe and pedestrian, jogger, biker friendly connections across the north end of Lake washington.	Sep 28, 2012 4:34 PM
232	Eager to see the next phase of the design. Frills may need to be postponed but basic through routes are really important.	Sep 28, 2012 4:26 PM
233	I really want to have pedestrian and bike-friendly ways to get around the city. Please design everything with pedestrians and cyclists in mind. Ideally, they would have their own lane everywhere, or even better-have a bike-only and peds-only lane.	Sep 28, 2012 3:50 PM
234	The first floating bridge was radical and revolutionary in its time. 50 years later, the replacement is merely an evolution of the original concept. Don't be afraid to be bold, and create beautiful legacy public works. Every foot of freeway that is lidded under green space is great. Everything that can be done to protect and restore the arboretum is worth considering.	Sep 28, 2012 2:44 PM
235	Do whatever is possible to keep levels of automobile noise down on the multi-use trails - its a punishing experience walking across I-90 and being buffeted by winds and noise. Unpleasant - we can do better. Make sure portage bay bridge trail is at least 14 ft wide	Sep 28, 2012 2:41 PM
236	Make the bicycle connections your children and their children will long remember you for while toasting your brilliance at every opportunity.	Sep 28, 2012 2:29 PM
237	Still needs work to make sure that there is safe and accessible bicycle and pedestrian access. It shouldn't be an open question as to whether or not the various new bridges and lids contain bicycle and pedestrian friendly access, this should simply be part of the plan.	Sep 28, 2012 2:18 PM
238	As one of the WSDot people admitted, "This is not a democratic process." What an understatement. You've ignored the elements that would have handled traffic, provided an exit from westbound I-5 directly to the UW (a bridge), and destroyed the integrity of the Montlake area. What a dismal show of bureacratic efforts to give no credence to people vs. concrete. Shameful and wasteful, and ultimately futile.	Sep 28, 2012 2:14 PM
239	Plan for extensive bike commuter traffic.	Sep 28, 2012 2:11 PM
240	Get started!!!!! It is maddening to see all the work on the east side but nothing being done on the west end. It is actually rather awkward to navigate through	Sep 28, 2012 1:51 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	all the pdf's and links. I think you could improve the web interface. Perhaps click on a map and that link will show you the proposals and changes.	
241	I participated in a community meeting on this on a Saturday this spring. I appreciated the attitude and cooperative nature and communication of the staff who were present there. The only thing that made the process less accessible was that, except for that meeting, I believe all the others were on Thursday evenings. Those are bad for me, so having staggered meeting days might have allowed a different mix of participants.	Sep 28, 2012 1:33 PM
242	please do not remove access to 520 eastbound from Broadmoor area - we need that on ramp and off ramp !!	Sep 28, 2012 1:26 PM
243	Do whatever is possible to keep levels of automobile noise down on the multi-use trails - its a punishing experience walking across I-90 and being buffetted by winds and noise. Unpleasant - we can do better. Make sure portage bay bridge trail is at least 14 ft wide	Sep 28, 2012 12:16 PM
244	I really want to understand that there is a strong commitment to a COMMUTER bike route from Redmond & Bellevue <-> Downtown as well as UW. It needs to not just be for weekend adventurers.	Sep 28, 2012 11:20 AM
245	Don't miss an opportunity to fix a significant part of the existing commuting challenge by enabling non-motorized options and further enhancing the quality of life for Seattle-area residents.	Sep 28, 2012 11:18 AM
246	Please think about bicyclists in all that you do and give us a great new option to get from the eastside to downtown.	Sep 28, 2012 10:35 AM
247	I would just like to make sure that there are bike lanes on the new SR520 bridge being built.	Sep 28, 2012 10:08 AM
248	I have a very favorable reaction except that I would like a pedestrian/bicycle path on the Portage Bay bridge.	Sep 28, 2012 9:11 AM
249	Not sure what "current design preferences" means the above opinions are based on the designs illustrated in this survey. I like what is proposed in these images.	Sep 28, 2012 7:44 AM
250	IT IS TIME TO MAKE ROOM AND INVESTMENTS FOR PEDESTRIANS, BICYCLES AND SHIFT THE FOCUS FROM CAR ONLY PROJECTS. SAFETY AND ACCESS ARE PARAMOUNT!	Sep 28, 2012 7:11 AM
251	I don't have specific ideas--but I do want to encourage a focus on trees, walking and bike access and safety. The area this will affect is not uniformly attractive currently, but there are beautiful trees and green pockets. Preserving as much of the old trees as possible and makng it safer for walking and cycling will benefit the neighborhoods too.	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 PM
252	Please do not waste money on a bike path over Portage Bay. Provide better connections to existing, good quality alternatives. Cascade Bike Club emailed me to lobby in support of a path but I'm a bike user that sees how funds can be better spend or saved and still provide good access through the area.	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
253	Again, we have to do the right thing - we have an opportunity - that is, optimize this project as much as possible for pedestrian and bicycle traffic - I am tired of Portland getting all of the credit for being the bicycling capital of the PNW... and the number of people that would use a good 14 foot multi use path across the bridge will be impressive.	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 PM
254	I'm glad you're thinking hard about a complex raft of issues. Please be certain to put ped/bike/accessible routes *everywhere* we install new pavement. Building car-only infrastructure was a mistake in the 1950s, and it's still a mistake today. These big projects may be the only opportunity for the *next* 60 years to avoid building another car-only trap like the old 520 bridge. Let's finally learn that lesson, and put paths for people on the Portage Bay Bridge and each other new route we create.	Sep 27, 2012 10:26 PM
255	Because we have a rather lengthy list of recommendations, we want to call attention to our primary recommendation at this point in the State's process: ensuring that a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail is integrated within the Portage Bay Bridge design. This connection is not currently in the Baseline Design and yet has the potential to serve thousands of people wanting to bicycle and walk to destinations across Seattle and the Eastside. The survey is divided into the following focus areas: Roanoke Area, Portage Bay Bridge, Montlake Area, West Approach Bridge, and finally, Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections. We will focus on Roanoke Area, Portage Bay Bridge, Montlake Area, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections. Roanoke Area: For the Roanoke Area, we have the following recommendations, many of which are identified in the survey: Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail. Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the "T" intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E. Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St. Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling. Portage Bay Bridge: Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. This is reflected in "Preference 8" in the online survey. Montlake Area: Our primary recommendations for the Montlake Area, many of which are identified in the survey, include: Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails,	Sep 27, 2012 10:23 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities. Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections: We've articulated our main recommendations above, but if you're filling out the survey, we'd suggest reiterating the importance of (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	
256	I just want seamless bicycle and pedestrian access in all directions!	Sep 27, 2012 10:05 PM
257	Please please please provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge; and (2) please please please design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 9:47 PM
258	We, the people, count on good planning and design by those in charge, considering what a great place we have here and that we all want to maintain the beauty and access to all this area has to offer. Big responsibility with high expectations. Thanks for the survey!	Sep 27, 2012 8:17 PM
259	Provide a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility across I-5 with intuitive connections to Harvard Ave E, 10th Ave E, the 10th and Delmar lidded area, and ultimately a new Portage Bay Bridge Trail. Design key intersections along the Roanoke corridor to facilitate safe transitions for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically 10th and Roanoke, Roanoke and Harvard Ave E, and Boylston and Roanoke St. Specific to the survey, we support the proposal to improve the "T" intersection design at 10th Ave E and Delmar Dr E. Provide bicycle and pedestrian shared-use trails across the 10th and Delmar Lid, including a non-motorized connection to Federal Ave E. Ensure seamless, comfortable and convenient connections between the new Portage Bay Bridge Trail, Delmar Dr E, Interlaken, the 10th and Delmar Lid, 10th Ave E, and the new bicycle connections along E Roanoke St. Upgrade existing bicycle corridors – such as Delmar Dr E – to provide a safe and comfortable experience for people bicycling. Portage Bay Bridge: Our primary recommendation for the Portage Bay Bridge is to integrate a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail with safe and convenient access at both ends. Montlake Blvd E: Improve bicycle and pedestrian access on the east and west sides of Montlake Blvd E – specifically, evaluate the application of separated bicycle facilities to meet the existing and future demand for bicycling along this corridor. Canal Reserve: Lower the westbound off-ramps under 24th Ave E to improve the bicycle and pedestrian experience along 24th Ave E. East Montlake Park: Provide only bicycle and pedestrian access to East Montlake Park from 24th Avenue East. 24th Ave E: Include separated bicycle facilities (possibly bi-directional) along 24th Ave E to retain a high-quality bicycle connection across SR 520, providing access to the new SR 520 trail, the Montlake neighborhood, and points north of SR 520. Montlake Lid: promote bicycling across the Lid through connected trails, wayfinding, and state-of-the-art bicycle parking and amenities.	Sep 27, 2012 7:43 PM
260	Whatever exact designs are used, please make sure to include both pedestrian and bicycle paths in the designs. Preferably the bicycle and pedestrian paths should be separate, unless space does not allow. Any additional costs would be worth the value of investment, unless they are extremely high, for whatever reasons.	Sep 27, 2012 6:52 PM
261	TAKE THAT CONSULTANT THAT SAID YOU DON'T NEED BUS/BICYCLE	Sep 27, 2012 6:38 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	ACCESS ACROSS MOUNTLAKE OUT HIS CAR AND PUT HIM ON A BICYCLE FOR 6 MONTHS STRAIGHT COMMUTING AND SEE IF HE DOESN'T CHANGE HIS MIND	
262	sdot, wdot and king county metro don't give a damn about pedestrian and alternative transportation users. Their stated goal and I quote is "Help cars go faster more safely". Doesn't sound too friendly to me. and just look at the mountlake light rail construction...TOTALLY PEDISTRIAN AND BICYCLE UNFRIENDLY. I've almost been hit by either gravel trucks or employees getting off work at night...DON'T THEY REALIZE IT'S MAJOR SHIFT CHANGE AT THE HOSPITAL	Sep 27, 2012 6:34 PM
263	Need to do everything possible for wide and safe peds and bicycle paths and connections.	Sep 27, 2012 6:20 PM
264	Trains are great and this is a good opportunity to provide rail connections. Why no mention of this? You guys sure are spending a lot of money on a transportation system that has no future.	Sep 27, 2012 6:10 PM
265	Please ensure there are bicycle lanes across the bridge!	Sep 27, 2012 6:02 PM
266	Keep up the good work	Sep 27, 2012 5:36 PM
267	As a biker who moved here from extended living experiences in Louisville, KY, Birmingham, AL and Boston MA, I appreciate the focus our community, especially our planners have for safe and accessible bike trails and access points and think it is important to design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 4:58 PM
268	Roanoke area does not need viewing areas or parking. A small, noisy freeway lid won't be used as a park or a place to relax and enjoy the view.	Sep 27, 2012 4:15 PM
269	Motorcycles should not be paying 520 bridge tolls. There should also be a non-tolled entrance for car pools. As far as promoting what needs to be promoted the 520 tolling structure is a failure.	Sep 27, 2012 3:59 PM
270	Most critical is to provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge, and to design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 3:55 PM
271	The Roanoke area is a disaster, not because what's proposed isn't the best it could be but because the I-5 ramps aren't included in this effort. Until those ramps are moved to the right sides of the freeway or split with both right and left-side access the whole 520 effort can only be partially achieved. I-5 from the Ship Canal Bridge to the West Seattle bridge is perhaps the worst designed piece of freeway in the country. The 520 project is going to reveal where the real problem is - I-5. I'd rate the Portage Bay Bridge and Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections "Very Positive" if the Portage Bay Bridge had bicycle and pedestrian connections.	Sep 27, 2012 3:49 PM
272	I've heard that a shared use path isn't part of the plan, but this survey makes it sound like it is part of the plan. I'd like to make sure that long term public transportation is included. Light Rail should be part of this and I didn't see one	Sep 27, 2012 3:11 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	reference to connecting to light rail. We should be coordinating this all. It would be foolish in the long term to exclude light rail from the bridge expansion.	
273	Let's get it right the first time. There is no benefit to having decisions second guessed for the next hundred years. It will only be more expensive in the future, doing it correctly now saves money in the long run and makes for a more satisfying experience for all. I bicycle commute through this area every day of the week all year long.	Sep 27, 2012 3:06 PM
274	Please include a bike path!!	Sep 27, 2012 3:01 PM
275	Let's make this happen!!	Sep 27, 2012 3:00 PM
276	There should be a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge. Bicycle connections should meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:52 PM
277	I would like to reiterating the importance of (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 2:45 PM
278	I have positive views of some of the general design elements. However, I am worried that North/South connections are not entirely clear at the moment or not entirely feasible. You did not allow opportunity for comment on 520 Bridge trail to the Bill Dawson Trail and the Montlake Playfield. The proposed ramps, steps and tunnel seem like they would result in bicycle, pedestrian and wheelchair conflicts. I would like to see some more thought given to how these conflicts can be mitigated, given the space constraints.	Sep 27, 2012 2:12 PM
279	Have beautiful lighting. Something that draws people in and provides a sense of wonderment. At night parks and the middle of bridges will seem unwelcoming at best, but with an intelligent, tasteful, and wonderful approach towards lighting of paths, people will want to go there to see it and embrace what wonderful engineering we have in the Pacific Northwest.	Sep 27, 2012 2:02 PM
280	My main point is make the lanes/paths as wide as possible, especially if they are shared between bicyclists and pedestrians. If you can separate them, even better. If people (cyclists or peds) dont feel safe, they won't use the area, but this could be such an amazing tool to get people out of the cars, using transit, and their bicycles! Thank you for changing this much needed area.	Sep 27, 2012 1:59 PM
281	I like the idea of a bicycle/pedestrian path on Portage Bay Bridge, connecting into Capital Hill.	Sep 27, 2012 1:28 PM
282	Adding the community requested bicycle path would is a key. Also there is no indication that these paths will be built wide enough to handle the demands placed on them. If the connections are too narrow they become dangerous.	Sep 27, 2012 1:17 PM
283	Ensure that a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail is integrated within the Portage Bay Bridge design. This connection is not currently in the Baseline Design and yet has the potential to serve thousands of people wanting to bicycle and walk to destinations across Seattle and the Eastside.	Sep 27, 2012 1:12 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
284	In my mind, these things are essential to improve the current situation (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 1:09 PM
285	I would just like to repeat my concern that the cross-lake shared use path does not continue to the Roanoke area.	Sep 27, 2012 1:01 PM
286	You are literally idiots to not include a bike path on 520 over Portage Bay. Whoever is responsible for this mistake must be fired and banned from ever practicing in the transportation industry for the rest of their lives. There is no lighter way to state this.	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 PM
287	i did not dig deeper to get more clarification, so i may have missed important details, but all in all, it appears that the design team is considering important issues. i do worry that we tend to build things for today's needs (and often even that is less than realistic). our current pedestrian and bike ways are already crowded with people who are trying to get cars off the roads. let's not underestimate the potential usage for these new paths and the integration with existing paths/streets necessary to support use in the future.	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM
288	Please make sure this bridge can take heavy bicycle traffic.	Sep 27, 2012 12:43 PM
289	Montlake Blvd remains a blight on the neighborhood. Roanoke/10th/Delmar remains a congested traffic nightmare, serving as nothing more than an extension of on/off ramps for I-5. Without a Portage Bay Bridge shared use path and improvements to north/south bicycle access on Montlake Blvd, bicycling in area will remain extremely dangerous. Complete lack of connectivity between Montlake Mobility Hub and UW Multimodal Hub is a reckless dereliction of planning duty. It is beyond belief that we will have two major transportation projects (520 & U-Link) which do not intersect.	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
290	Thank you so much for these efforts to design bicycle and pedestrian access into future bridges and roadways. It's good for the environment, the economy, and for the health of thousands of residents who choose to walk or travel by bicycle. It would be great to see Seattle ascend the ranks of bicycle-friendly cities around the world.	Sep 27, 2012 12:36 PM
291	I support the most cycling friendly and pedestrian friendly concepts. non-motorized transportation is good citizenship!	Sep 27, 2012 12:24 PM
292	The entire project is over-designed and not even needed. SR520 traffic volumes can be better managed with improved transit, higher tolls, carpool incentives.	Sep 27, 2012 12:21 PM
293	Be sure that bike routes, for faster cyclists and runners exist, and are seperarted when possible from parks and leisure users.	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
294	Please ensure that new infrastructure provides for non-motorized usage including accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Sep 27, 2012 12:12 PM
295	It is really important to (1) provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 12:10 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
296	In general, I don't get a strong impression that bicycling is taken seriously, but in most cases, the right words are being used. Give emphasis to alternate modes of transportation such as cycling and buses to get people out of their cars.	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
297	What about the east side connections to Lake Washington BLVD and the potential trail on the old railroad right of way that runs north and south from Woodinville to Renton? Are you planning a bike lane along 520 that connects to the Bike Lane farther East from Redmond?	Sep 27, 2012 11:52 AM
298	Seattle leads the country to me in quality of life, lets be sure we keep raising the bar. I would rather a city like Vancouver BC look to Seattle as leading the way as the beautiful city every one talks about.	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
299	The designs look good. walkability, bikeability are really important to everyone I know. It's great to live in a place whose planners seem to be thinking about the future and making conscious decisions to make the area better.	Sep 27, 2012 11:43 AM
300	Design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
301	There is too much emphasis on bike and pedestrian pathways through a heavily congested traffic area. Traffic ease should take precedence. I don't want to see a lot of money being spent on parks, bike paths or walk ways for an area that is mostly a freeway intersection.	Sep 27, 2012 11:39 AM
302	PLEASE consider: (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
303	I wasn't clear that bikes would have a path across the 520 and Portage Bay bridge. If the plan could make these more obvious then I could check positive on that area.	Sep 27, 2012 11:30 AM
304	I would strongly support all of your efforts to accommodate non-motorized access and especially designating bicycle/pedestrian trails that are separated and protected from motorized traffic. Getting more commuters on bikes will benefit both our environment and our resident's overall health.	Sep 27, 2012 11:24 AM
305	As you can tell from my responses, I feel strongly that adding cycling/multi-use paths to the new 520 corridor are CRITICAL. This is a unique opportunity to provide improved mobility to non drivers across the water and improve the health of our community that won't occur again for many, many years! The benefits that will acrue over that time, I believe, are immeasurable.	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
306	It is important to design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities. And this includes providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge.	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 AM
307	Please make the bridge bike/ped friendly. (1) Please provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge (2) Please design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
308	The diagrams you presented are not clear enough to provide useful input	Sep 27, 2012 11:08 AM
309	Just reiterating the importance of (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
310	We can't have a new 520 bridge without bike / walk access. Please, show Seattle is a city of the future which values alternative and healthy commute choices.	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
311	Please, please, please take pedestrians and bicycles into account when planning this bridge, specifically (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle/ped connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 11:04 AM
312	To give you an idea of the extent to which the 520 bike path is needed: I, and several people I know, have turned down job offers because connecting via bus over 520 is too slow, and a car would be too expensive; the current design is hobbling our economic recovery, and an EFFICIENT bike path across this route (and EVERY road we build from now on) is an absolute must-have.	Sep 27, 2012 11:02 AM
313	I'd hate to see a critical link - the Portage Bay Bridge - not take into account pedestrian/bicyclist needs. Please ensure that a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail is integrated within the Portage Bay Bridge design. This connection is not currently in the Baseline Design and yet has the potential to serve thousands of people wanting to bicycle and walk to destinations across Seattle and the Eastside.	Sep 27, 2012 11:00 AM
314	A bridge without accommodations for pedestrians and bicycles is not a bridge at all. We, the People with two feet and/or two wheels would definitely accrue further health benefits by being able to take a pleasant walk or ride along the proposed I-520 bridge project. Some of us are interested in our long term health, saving our local atmosphere from unnecessary pollution, and inreducing health care costs in general. Exercise for the masses ought to be more than a tertiary concern for our public officials and for the SDOT. Build pedestrian and bicycle lanes and they will come.	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
315	Consider that in the future, use of bicycles will probably increase dramatically.	Sep 27, 2012 10:52 AM
316	I think there has been a lot of positive planning on this that takes into account the many bicyclists and pedestrians who will use the route. I would just like to reiterate the Cascade Bicycle Club's concerns that the new work needs to include full safe pathways for cyclists to reach their destination. Namely, these concerns include: (1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
317	It seems we are going in the right direction just dont miss the opportunity to make it great. Esthetics are important but don't trump usefulness and efficiency.. The biker commuting to or from bellevue in the middle of November needs to get there in an efficient way. dead ends not a good option, bad transition, a deterrrent. There are those who will use this resource year round, others only on a sunny day. build for the year round and all will enjoy it on a sunny day.	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
318	Please include a bike/ped lane on the new Portage Bay Bridge. We can't afford to miss this opportunity to improve healthy transportation access for all!	Sep 27, 2012 10:46 AM
319	My main feedback is that the design must (1) include a shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge to accommodate bicycles and walkers and (2) have bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
320	When doing a project, care more about the end product than the potential expenses, if we limit ourselves by finances instead of goals, we will suffer from a crumbling infrastructure.	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
321	1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
322	It is critical we have a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
323	You MUST add cross lake access for pedestrians and bicycles. Other west coast cities like Portland and San Francisco are excelling past us with their non motorized infrastructure. This plan is a disgrace if all the bicycle access stops at the waters edge. Please reconsider the entire span for pedestrian and bicycle access.	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
324	Emphasize and prioritize "human powered" transportation, such as bicycles, pedestrian, etc.	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
325	Your questions, as they are posed, are too vague and would require much more comparison and analysis than the average citizen has time for. As long as your are forward thinking and agree to build something we will be proud of 50 years from now - go for it!	Sep 27, 2012 10:13 AM
326	You MUST have bike/ped crossing on this new bridge. When gas hits 8.00 a gallon and more and more people are walking/biking to work or go get around you will need many trails and paths. You can pay not or pay more later with a faulty design. As far as access to neighborhoods goes with pathes treat bike/walkers as cars and give a path to each area. More and more and more people are dumping the pump.	Sep 27, 2012 10:08 AM
327	(1) providing a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and (2) designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
328	Ease of biking access and minimal stopping required for bicycling is paramount to have a system that will work and enhance alternate transportation via biking. Sharrows don't count!!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:00 AM
329	you need to do a much better job for bicycles and pedestrian	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
330	NMT, public transport (plus HOV lanes), and bicycle infrastructure/connectivity should be central to the design. This is the only way Seattle can move toward a	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	less car-dependent existence. To ignore these on this project would be a huge missed opportunity.	
331	Please make sure to provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge and designing all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities. This is a great project and now is the time to plan for the future. Thank you for making this project bicycly friendly.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
332	I think it would be a really good idea to have the Medina/Kirkland side to offer a dog park as there are a shortage of dog parks on the Kirkland side. The closest one is Totem Lake which is too small and really out of the way for a lot of people. The next closest one is in Redmond. I think that commercial real estate for Subways/Starbucks etc... would really benefit the park areas. I ride my bike around Lake Washington all of the time and one must pull way out of their way in order to get a coffee or a bite to eat. Seattle has a lot of cyclists and they will take advantage of this sort of possibility. Also it will bring in revenue for park/bridge upkeep.	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
333	Please include a 14-foot bicycle and pedestrian trail as part of the Portage Bay Bridge design. It’s only a half-mile connection, and if built would connect the Eastside of Lake Washington to North Capitol Hill in Seattle by a completely separated trail that is safe, convenient, and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities to ride and walk on.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
334	1. Please provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge. 2. Please design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities. 3. Bike lanes on roads with cars should have a physical barrier, not just a white line. It's too easy for cars to encroach on that space.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
335	A bicycle on-ramp connection to the bridge bicycle path at the north end of the Arboretum (as opposed to having to bike west to Montlake or the Roanoke area would be amazing.	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
336	It is great that bicycle and pedestrian are in the plan. How does this connect with trails at either end. I would sad if the trail ends with no where to go. Trails need to be wide in transition areas like 14' otherwise it is to congested and collisions are likely.	Sep 27, 2012 9:47 AM
337	I'm very excited to see this project completed as designed. Don't cut corners, projects like these can enhance a city's livability significantly.	Sep 27, 2012 9:46 AM
338	I know that you folks have worked very hard on this. I have seen a lot of good stuff come out. Just remember, that more lanes = more capacity = more cars.	Sep 27, 2012 12:52 AM
339	If we build this without provide facilties for mass transit and non-motorized uses we will have failed and wasted the entire budget.	Sep 26, 2012 11:24 AM
340	Its critical that we allow walkers and bikers to go from Montlake to Eastlake via new bridge.....	Sep 26, 2012 11:21 AM
341	the idea of a second bascule bridge is a very bad one. this will not serve to	Sep 25, 2012 8:22 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	alleviate the traffic bottleneck that currently exists because on the other side (north side) of the existing bridge footprint, the roadway is not going to be widened, nor is there room to. the lidded portion of montlake should connect montlake similar to the way the lid over i-90 does - in an effort to create as much green space as possible and make the community contiguous. the concrete and asphalt in the montlake area should be minimized so as to preserve the transition into the portage bay and arboretum communities. the preferred alternative is looking to add considerable infrastructure, in the form of concrete, metal and non-natural elements and will detract from the overall natural beauty of the surrounding areas.	
342	I want to thank you for reaching out for public comment using the Internet.	Sep 25, 2012 9:34 AM
343	no	Sep 25, 2012 8:59 AM
344	Keep up the good work! Simple explanations like this are helpful. How long will it take for this to be done? 2 decades?	Sep 25, 2012 8:22 AM
345	You are doing a great job getting input from people and you are coming up with a great design / designs. Please keep up the good work, many many people with thank you and enjoy the work you are designing.	Sep 24, 2012 11:46 PM
346	I want to underscore the importance of being able to transfer from east / west buses like the 545 to north / south buses like the 43 and the 48. I cannot tell from the images whether this ability is preserved. If it is no preserved it will result in a major reduction in transit options and I would strongly urge you to ensure that whatever option is selected preserves this connectivity.	Sep 24, 2012 9:56 PM
347	The URL printed on the postcard requesting public feedback is dead, and the main WSDOT search engine returns no results for "SR 520 public comment". MAJOR public relations snafu there...	Sep 24, 2012 6:40 PM
348	The photos in the survey are small and hard to figure out, and so I don't really see how the design integrates with existing bike routes. I also admit that I'm not happy with many of the bike routes the city is promoting..they have too many cars on them. So when I say integration, I'm referring only the routes that have very low traffic. Integration is really important. To get a feel for how pedestrians and bike don't mix, just ride down the burke gilman trail any sunny day. I hear people complaining/yelling at each other frequently and often see near accidents...admittedly both bikes and pedestrians are guilty of not sharing well. I don't think the 520 routes needs to solve all bike/ped problems in the corridor. The are potentially surface streets that could work, particularly in the montlake to roanoke connection.	Sep 24, 2012 6:36 PM
349	Above all, please: (1) provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge, and (2) design all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities. Pedestrian and bicycle access ought to be more than a tertiary concern for our public officials and for the SDOT. Build pedestrian and bicycle lanes and they will come. I personally would use this often, and I know many, many other cyclists would, as well.	Sep 24, 2012 5:57 PM
350	Please reconsider providing a 14 ft shared use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge this will encourage more riding and will allow for longer rides of those of	Sep 24, 2012 1:14 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	us who already ride long distances. This will also help get people of all ages out on their bikes when they know they will feel safe in riding, My favorite thing to do is ride over bridges and this will give me another bridge to ride across!	
351	Continue the shared use path across the Portage Bay bridge! Going around the south end of Portage Bay, Montlake to Lynn is a good ways out of the way, and then leaves the cyclist with the nasty choice of fighting uphill on Delmar or lugging their bike up the stairs from Boyer. Also, the preferred option of integrating the tunnel maintenance and operations facility into the portal structure at the east end of Montlake is a really good design.	Sep 24, 2012 1:03 PM
352	Make Bicyclists a priority! This is our future!	Sep 24, 2012 12:26 PM
353	You're doing a great job. Thank you for all your hard work balancing competing concerns and engaging the right stakeholders.	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
354	Provide a 14-foot shared-use trail along the future Portage Bay Bridge. Designe all bicycle connections to meet future demand and encourage use by people of all ages and abilities.	Sep 24, 2012 12:20 PM
355	Cable Stayed bridge design for the artistic architecture approach gateway to the City of Seattle.	Sep 24, 2012 12:10 PM
356	Thank you for allowing this space to comment. Please continue to involve cyclists and pedestrians in the planning process. Shared use paths will see an increase if the paths are usable by all.	Sep 24, 2012 12:06 PM
357	Nice work, this sounds like it will be a huge improvement over the existing infrastructure. Next question - when are we (Seattle) going to do something about the downtown I5 problem? Can we fix the merge problem with the junction between I5 and 520? Surely that does not help our traffic at all. In the same way, funneling four lanes down to two as you come Northbound into Seattle does not seem like a recipe for slowdowns. I'd personally be very happy to see some tax increases to support fixing this area of our infrastructure. Thanks!	Sep 24, 2012 12:05 PM
358	Save the money we can't afford this	Sep 24, 2012 10:08 AM
359	If the west side is not funded, how will the bike ped facility be connected between the western high rise and Montlake?	Sep 23, 2012 6:55 PM
360	It is too confusing conceptually to have an opinion. I wish you could minimize the traffic on 24th Ave. E., especially the noisy, articulated buses that vibrate through my house.	Sep 23, 2012 6:44 PM
361	Please keep the impact on the residents who will be impacted by this project at the forefront. We live here because we love this area and all that it has to offer. Residents walk, bike and drive every day and enjoy the natural blue-green beauty. Please do all that you can to raise the bar and make this project the benchmark for future projects! And thank you for your hard work to make this project successful.	Sep 23, 2012 8:23 AM
362	The Portage Bay Bridge MUST include a bicycle/pedestrian shared use trail!	Sep 22, 2012 4:50 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
363	Widening 520 without increasing the size of I-5 will simply add to the traffic and noise. The project removes homes and parkland from Montlake. We need allocation to the Montlake neighborhood of land currently owned by WSDOT with transfer of ownership to the city, so that additional park/wet/green land can be added to help to replace some of the land lost to this project, which will include McCurdy Park, Half of E Montlake Park and parts of the Arboretum. Montlake Playfield and MOntlake Blvd. What is in place to maintain and protect the shorlands, wetlands and lagoon between Foster Island Drive on the East, Lake Washington Blvd on the West and 52O on the North? These areas are important wildlife habitats and offer noise abatement and quality of life to residents in the areas, as well. There is no specific language in these proposed plans to address habitat impact, noise, traffic and loss of parkland.	Sep 22, 2012 1:56 PM
364	A shared use pathway across portage bay is critical for providing an efficient and safe non-motorized connection through this part of the city and will serve as a critical enhancement to the City's growing bicycle network that is seeing a steady increase in use by cyclists of all skill levels.	Sep 22, 2012 12:41 PM
365	I am very concerned that a bike path over Portage Bay will not be included in the final design. This omission would be a significant design flaw as our region attempts to promote more environmentally friendly (and less auto-centric) modes of travel. Thanks for your consideration.	Sep 22, 2012 10:35 AM
366	A nonmotorized priority over motorized vehicle design is best. Think outside the box and be revolutionary. Be an example nationally and everyone will reward you.	Sep 22, 2012 2:53 AM
367	Please concentrate on improving pedestrian and bicycle connections. We have allowed motor vehicles and roads take away from the natural beauty of our landscapes.	Sep 22, 2012 2:49 AM
368	As a Seattle area native I would support a bridge that is built to last for a long time. I like the idea of pedestrains and bicycles being able to use the bridge and I like the lid/park idea. I live in Sammamish and commute via the bus to seattle. I am a RN and I try to take the bus as much as possible as parking in Seattle is at least $10/day + 7.18 for toll + 8 dollars for gas. That is $25 Ipay in taxes and tolls just to get to Seattle. PLEASE do not charge any more in tolls. If you have to cut back on the unnessary cosmetics such as a design issue please do it because it is hard enough to make a living with all of the fees to pass the bridge now. Also please do not charge for Park & Ride. We need a solid Toyota aproach not an expensive Lexus. Not all of us make $100,000/year!	Sep 20, 2012 9:24 PM
369	The number of people who would use the bike/pedestrian bridge on 520 will dwarf the number of people who complain about the width of the Portage Bay bridge. Those who complain about the width of the bridge are concerned about there being 6 lanes, not a bike lane. Even people I've met at the public meetings who are negatively disposed toward cyclists and cycling and complain about every aspect of the bridge are surprisingly supportive of completing the bike path all the way. In their mind, it's fair, impactive, and frankly from their perspective, gets the cyclists off Boyer.	Sep 20, 2012 6:35 PM
370	You have done a lot of heavy lifting -- although we seem cranky, we are extremely grateful. Good luck as we enter the final stretch.	Sep 20, 2012 10:43 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
371	I feel the current design for the Montlake interchange was chosen primarily because it was the lowest in cost and politically the easiest to sell. I'm afraid that it will ultimately be inadequate in handling traffic flows.	Sep 19, 2012 9:36 PM
372	We absolutely need to have completely separated bicycle/ped facilities all the way from downtown Redmond to at least the West side of the I-5.	Sep 19, 2012 12:36 PM
373	Cycle and Ped across whole project and all bridges!!	Sep 19, 2012 12:21 PM
374	I am very concerned about the loss of public park spaces which will be taken away from the Montlake community by the 520 project without fair exchange in kind by WSDOT. There will be a significant negative impact on the natural areas of Portage Ban and the Arboretum that should not be mitigated by the sale of WSDOT land to the City for cash. Any adjustment should be made with the exchange of land that will benefit the community as park/natural spaces.	Sep 18, 2012 12:30 PM
375	No work on any aspect of this project should be allowed to start unless funding is secured for all aspects of this project (including lids and all amelioration). Secured means sequestered in such a way that politicians cannot change their minds or take it back after some aspects of the project have been completed. The design involves compromises from all parties. Allowing some of the project to be completed but not all of it would violate these compromises.	Sep 18, 2012 11:56 AM
376	I would like the new bridge to be a Box Girder bridge, as narrow as possible no bicyle roadway. quite pavment. high sound walls, no planting strip down middle, 45 mile speed limit. and use all means to lessen the impact of this project	Sep 17, 2012 9:35 PM
377	I'm having trouble visualizing what the different (high vs. lowered transit ramps) designs for the Montlake Area would actually be like to negotiate on bike or as a pedestrian. I would love it if as part of the design process you could offer a public walking tour & a public cycle tour of the area where we actually stopped and looked at the design pictures "on location, on foot, on bike."	Sep 17, 2012 3:33 PM
378	I'm concerned that comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian access is at risk. That is the single most important improvement that can come from all this work as far as I am concerned.	Sep 17, 2012 11:22 AM
379	Just wish this redesign would address the Mercer weave issue. All the pedestrian stuff is nice. I know this is a whole different issue but at a price tag of a couple billion it would be nice to at least address the possibility of extending the flyover from 520 to southbound I-5 to the far west lanes of I-5.	Sep 17, 2012 10:50 AM
380	Keep an eye on bikes/press and keep road width sufficient to support these modes	Sep 17, 2012 6:20 AM
381	I WILL BE SUBMITTING ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS AND MORE TIME ON THE WESTSIDE DESIGN FEATURES LATER, WHEN I HAVE RECEIVED AND ABSORBED THE DRAFT REPORT	Sep 16, 2012 4:56 PM
382	Although the potential for additional green space is fine, assuming it's designed well, the connectivity doesn't seem to be that much better than currently for traffic getting on and off the highway and the connections for bikes and pedestrians is not particularly clear. I'm not a fan of more traffic coming in and	Sep 16, 2012 10:59 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	out of our neighborhood and any additional built structures with added traffic and congestion. The traffic and impact to neighbors during construction is also a negative.	
383	Sound levels for crossing Portage Bay are a great concern.	Sep 16, 2012 9:50 AM
384	Bridge designs need work.	Sep 16, 2012 7:28 AM
385	Another round of Community Design Process is needed with greater input from SDOT, city officials, consultants Nelson/Nygaard and a nationally recognized landscape/urban design and architecture firm.	Sep 16, 2012 2:39 AM
386	Providing pedestrian and bicycle access to the Portage Bay Bridge is essential to the success of this entire project for improving nonmotorized mobility across this corridor.	Sep 15, 2012 8:49 PM
387	Please preserve as much of the wetlands and urban parks as you can, and is there ONLY one lane to get from 520 to I5 northbound? and ONLY one lane to get from I5 southbound to 520?	Sep 15, 2012 7:54 PM
388	Transit, pedestrians, bicycles first. Automobiles a long way second.	Sep 15, 2012 6:15 PM
389	Don't eliminate access to 520 from the Arboretum, you are really going to create a bigger mess than you can imagine.	Sep 15, 2012 2:57 PM
390	Thanks for the outreach. Montlake is a mess and it's tough to get perfect given the space.	Sep 15, 2012 1:46 PM
391	Make and EXTRA lane WESTBOUND/UPHILL. Eliminate ALL trafic lights.	Sep 15, 2012 1:43 PM
392	Stop discussing and start building. We will soon have a great (and expensive) bridge that ends in the same bottleneck over Montlake. And PLEASE, plan for LightRail as much as possible already now. It is inevitable that it will come across SR-520 as well.	Sep 15, 2012 1:06 PM
393	The most important user needs here are the needs of the VAST majority of users who will go through this corridor - i.e. the people in the cars. Adding bikes and HOV lanes and separate lanes for light rail is fine - provided it does not reduce the capacity of the existing lanes of motor vehicle traffic. If you have to - make the bride wider to accommodate these additional uses of an EXISTING corridor. Provide for permanent, designed, physical separation and everyone will be safer and better off. If the neighborhood must lose a bit of space to a bigger transportation infrastructure, that is a cost it will need to bear.	Sep 15, 2012 12:41 PM
394	You are building a monster and this new Where Natute meets the city" is a real PR joke	Sep 15, 2012 11:31 AM
395	I am a resident of Madison Park. I spend a lot of time in Bellevue and the Eastside. After experiencing the closure of Lake Washington Blvd through the Arboretum this past summer I STRONGLY want to oppose the elimination of the Lake Washington on/off ramps onto the new 520 bridge. The closure created massive traffic on Madison St., John St., 23rd Ave and Boyer St. Driving every day through the Arboretum is a Joy! It is one more way to appreciate and enjoy	Sep 15, 2012 8:54 AM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
	our beautiful park. So many people will not even know about it if the on/off ramps are eliminated!!! Without access to Businesses in Madison Park and Madison Valley they will be negatively impacted with the inconvenience and lack of access.	
396	Many residents of Madison Park area depend on the Lake Washington boulevard ramp to 520 for daily commute to Bellevue. The elimination of this exit ramp would be devastating to the area and increase congestion through Montlake, which will always be congested no matter what improvements are made. The traffic through montlake includes University district, Laurelhurst, Windermere and the UW. Redirecting all of the traffic to Madison Park area through Montlake would be a disaster. Please do not overlook this important consideration (traffic and congestion) which outweighs all other considerations.	Sep 15, 2012 12:20 AM
397	Do NOT take away the lake wa boulevard ramp!!!	Sep 15, 2012 12:11 AM
398	I am very upset about the proposed elimination of the entrance and exit through the arboretum from 520. Just because you are in a car, it does not mean you can't appreciate the beauty of the arboretum. Its the best part of my commute. To take it away will make a huge impact on the other streets, adding more congestion and pollution to city streets, when the greenery of the arboretum would help with carbon dioxide uptake. This is very poor planning!!!	Sep 14, 2012 6:47 PM
399	Classic designers should be brought into the team. They understand design that have lasted and done with respect to nature, the elements, and materials. Rather then have the uneducated public provide input that you would explore sit with a Classicist...Christian Menn or Andrea Deplazes.	Sep 14, 2012 6:03 PM
400	Minimize traffic disruption! Currently the bridge closures are a huge problem for many.	Sep 14, 2012 5:57 PM
401	Please use this opportunity to really and truly elevate infrastructure for cyclists, pads, busses and rail as this is a once in a lifetime (or two) opportunity to get it right. Be visionary and exercise courage to do what's right, not what's expedient and popular with suburban commuters who don't necessarily care about the environment of those who actually live here.	Sep 14, 2012 4:46 PM
402	My ideal project would emphasize light rail and park space, and a separation between the two. I realize you're stuck dealing with cars and the design so far is a reasonable compromise.	Sep 14, 2012 4:29 PM
403	Continue the shared use trail along the Portage Bay Bridge to the Roanoke Lid and beyond	Sep 14, 2012 3:57 PM
404	The return of the WSDOT Peninsula to Arboretum uise need to be a top priority. It should be an essential element of the plan. Neighborhood associations in North East Seattle, Democratic District Clubs, the late State Senator Scott White and others have called for it. The plans should show it as potential subject to agreement of Seattle City officials. That would drive the message to those seeking its return to persuade City officials to actively seek it. Currently, Montlake residents assume that it will happen because Hizzoner McGinn says "Be Patient" "It will happen" "Wait and See" and the like at his open houses, but nothing seems to be happening.	Sep 14, 2012 3:37 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
405	since each of the above 5 categories included multiple elements, I don't see how one can answer this--don't think it is a good question	Sep 14, 2012 2:08 PM
406	Please make the new project bike and pedestrian friendly. I would love to commute via bike from my Seattle home to Redmond, and this could finally make it possible.	Sep 14, 2012 1:57 PM
407	You seem to have totally forgotten about the MAIN USERS: SOVs!	Sep 14, 2012 1:52 PM
408	MY GOD! FIX THE ON RAMP WESTBOUND 520 TO SOUTHBOUND I-5 AND SOUTHBOUND I-5 TO EASTBOUND 520. ARE YOU KIDDING ME??? STOP THIS POOR AND UNSAFE DESIGN OF CENTER ON-OFF-RAMPS! THIS IS COMPLETE INSANITY THIS IS NOT BEING ADDRESSED AND FIXED PROPERLY AS PART OF THIS PROJECT. I CANNOT BE THE ONLY ONE WHO FINDS THIS ABSURD!!!	Sep 14, 2012 1:42 PM
409	You haven't done anything with the junction between I-5 and 520. This area is a continual bottleneck for those who commute either way. Please reconsider expanding these areas so the new bridge's increased capacity can actually be used.	Sep 14, 2012 1:28 PM
410	looking forward to seeing this completed before I croak in 30 years.	Sep 14, 2012 1:18 PM
411	The Montlake area is a key node for many transit operations. With multi-seat transit trips being the standard, having the design characteristics of the facility optimize for the expected transfers is imperative for daytime and late evening student access in and out of the area.	Sep 14, 2012 12:58 PM
412	considerations for adding light rail in the future must be taken into account with any design elements	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
413	There needs to be a bike/pedestrian path across the 520 bridge. Please don't let a group of residents with their best interests in mind affect a decision that will last decades into the future.	Sep 14, 2012 12:28 PM
414	The only reason I marked negative is that it looks like it's still 2 lanes at Roanoke and still has the blind merging spots.	Sep 14, 2012 12:09 PM
415	Designing a bridge is a lifetime achievement. Please make the 520 bridge useful for generations to come and provide excellent public space, places for people to walk and ride bicycles, and seamlessly get to and use the bridge from their neighborhoods by car, bicycle or on foot.	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
416	I know I am focused on the westbound off ramp on the Montlake lid but I am absolutely against the westbound off-ramp for 2 reasons 1) it will break up the green space on the lid and 2) it increasing the vehicular traffic ultimately preventing the space from becoming a viable park area safe for children to play and connecting the north and south sides of 520. I live very close to the lid at [redacted] and I would use that ramp to exit 520 when traveling westbound but I would gladly give up that convenience and exit at Montlake Blvd. in exchange for a more useable lid space.	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
417	WE NEED LIGHT RAIL!	Sep 14, 2012 12:01 PM

Page 8, Q2. Do you have other thoughts you would like to share with the project team?		
418	This survey doesn't ask the right questions--it's all about how to make the project pretty, but fails to address function. Fail.	Sep 14, 2012 11:57 AM
419	Find a way to split the giant Montlake lid into too smaller lids so you don't need the very wasteful and expensive exhaust and emergency systems. You might save hundreds of millions of dollars.	Sep 14, 2012 11:29 AM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

1	Greenlake	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
2	Wallingford	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 PM
3	wedgwood	Oct 5, 2012 11:11 PM
4	fremont, work in redmond	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 PM
5	Greenwood	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 PM
6	Beacon Hill	Oct 5, 2012 7:23 PM
7	Arboretum	Oct 5, 2012 6:29 PM
8	West Seattle (but I work in the area)	Oct 5, 2012 5:47 PM
9	Wedgwood	Oct 5, 2012 4:46 PM
10	Everett	Oct 5, 2012 4:26 PM
11	Capitol Hill	Oct 5, 2012 4:18 PM
12	Washington state	Oct 5, 2012 4:17 PM
13	Ballard (I sometimes commute through Montlake/Portage Bay)	Oct 5, 2012 3:47 PM
14	Wallingford	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
15	Bryant-Assumption neighborhood	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
16	Uptown/Lower Queen Anne	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
17	First Hill	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
18	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:10 PM
19	Capitol Hill	Oct 5, 2012 3:01 PM
20	Mann	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
21	Hawthorne Hills / Bryant area	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
22	Fremont	Oct 5, 2012 2:36 PM
23	woodinville but commute to UW daily	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
24	Madison Valley	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
25	Bryant	Oct 5, 2012 2:16 PM
26	Wallingford	Oct 5, 2012 2:09 PM
27	Sandpoint/Magnuson Park	Oct 5, 2012 2:04 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

28	NE Seattle - Mattews Beach	Oct 5, 2012 1:33 PM
29	NE Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 1:18 PM
30	Phinney Ridge / Greenlake	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
31	First Hill	Oct 5, 2012 12:32 PM
32	Central District	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
33	Woodinville	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
34	South Lake Union	Oct 5, 2012 12:07 PM
35	Green Lake	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM
36	Ballard	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
37	Ballard	Oct 5, 2012 11:36 AM
38	Central District	Oct 5, 2012 11:24 AM
39	Queen Anne	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
40	West Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:06 AM
41	Central district	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
42	Bryant but commute to Lower Queen Anne	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
43	ballard	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
44	Wallingford	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
45	Phinney Ridge	Oct 5, 2012 10:13 AM
46	Capitol Hill	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
47	Wallingford/Greenlake	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 AM
48	Belltown	Oct 5, 2012 9:41 AM
49	ravenna.	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
50	Ballard	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
51	Ravenna/Bryant	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
52	Bryant	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
53	Madison Valley -	Oct 5, 2012 9:24 AM
54	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.		
55	ballard	Oct 5, 2012 8:56 AM
56	Capitol Hill	Oct 5, 2012 8:53 AM
57	Ballard	Oct 5, 2012 8:18 AM
58	Ballard	Oct 5, 2012 8:08 AM
59	I live in Montlake and my mother lives along 520 on Yarrow Point where we grew up. I have seen incredible devastation from the design on the Eastside with no thought of height on sound walls, danger to pedestrians etc. I am alarmed at the plans going through and concerned for the health and well being of communities effected on both sides of the bridge. Have some common sense and try to envision the future repercusions of these designs.	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
60	Magnolia	Oct 5, 2012 7:56 AM
61	Central District	Oct 5, 2012 7:46 AM
62	Leschi	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
63	Capitol Hill	Oct 5, 2012 7:28 AM
64	Marysville, WA	Oct 5, 2012 6:59 AM
65	Ravenna	Oct 5, 2012 6:20 AM
66	Mapleleaf	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 AM
67	Broadview	Oct 5, 2012 5:27 AM
68	Wallingford	Oct 5, 2012 5:20 AM
69	View Ridge	Oct 5, 2012 4:05 AM
70	Capitol Hill	Oct 5, 2012 12:34 AM
71	ballard	Oct 4, 2012 11:42 PM
72	Capitol Hill	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 PM
73	Beacon Hill	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 PM
74	Central District	Oct 4, 2012 10:48 PM
75	Woodinville	Oct 4, 2012 10:41 PM
76	Central District	Oct 4, 2012 10:40 PM
77	wedgwood	Oct 4, 2012 10:28 PM
78	queen anne	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

79	Leschi	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 PM
80	mars	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
81	Roosevelt	Oct 4, 2012 9:10 PM
82	Phinney/Greenwood/Green Lake and frequent traveler to U District and Montlake.	Oct 4, 2012 8:53 PM
83	beacon hill	Oct 4, 2012 8:21 PM
84	neither here nor there	Oct 4, 2012 8:03 PM
85	Capitol Hill	Oct 4, 2012 7:55 PM
86	Capitol Hill	Oct 4, 2012 7:50 PM
87	Ballard	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
88	Fremont	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM
89	Magnolia, and fuck you	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
90	Wallingford	Oct 4, 2012 6:18 PM
91	Green Lake, but considering moving to North Capitol Hill	Oct 4, 2012 5:28 PM
92	Ravenna	Oct 4, 2012 5:22 PM
93	Queen Anne	Oct 4, 2012 5:19 PM
94	Ballard	Oct 4, 2012 5:11 PM
95	Maple Leaf/Roosevelt	Oct 4, 2012 4:37 PM
96	Wallingford	Oct 4, 2012 4:09 PM
97	Central District	Oct 4, 2012 3:22 PM
98	Magnuson Park	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 PM
99	Fremont	Oct 4, 2012 3:04 PM
100	West Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 2:46 PM
101	Kenmore	Oct 4, 2012 2:46 PM
102	Des Moines	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
103	Fremont	Oct 4, 2012 2:11 PM
104	Greenwood	Oct 4, 2012 2:02 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

105	Ballard	Oct 4, 2012 2:02 PM
106	Maple Leaf	Oct 4, 2012 2:00 PM
107	Capitol Hill	Oct 4, 2012 1:58 PM
108	Ballard	Oct 4, 2012 1:28 PM
109	West Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 1:05 PM
110	Beacon Hill	Oct 4, 2012 1:05 PM
111	Green Lake	Oct 4, 2012 12:42 PM
112	Greenwood, commuting to the east side	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
113	Wallingford	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
114	central district	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
115	Crown Hill	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
116	fremont	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
117	Seward Park	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
118	Ballard.	Oct 4, 2012 12:06 PM
119	Central District	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
120	Fremont	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
121	beacon hill	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
122	Central Area	Oct 4, 2012 11:50 AM
123	South Capitol Hill	Oct 4, 2012 11:42 AM
124	ballard	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
125	Queen Anne	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
126	Queen Anne	Oct 4, 2012 11:20 AM
127	Wallingford	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
128	Madrona	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
129	Wallingford	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 AM
130	Arboretum	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 AM
131	Lake Forest Park	Oct 4, 2012 6:10 AM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

132	Arboretum, Montlake	Oct 3, 2012 8:48 PM
133	S. Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 1:59 PM
134	ravenna	Oct 3, 2012 1:58 PM
135	Magnolia	Oct 3, 2012 1:52 PM
136	Greenlake	Oct 3, 2012 1:24 PM
137	Madison Valley	Oct 3, 2012 1:17 PM
138	Beacon Hill	Oct 3, 2012 11:59 AM
139	Ballard, but I used to live in Ravenna and commute to Madison Park	Oct 3, 2012 11:09 AM
140	Home in SW Seattle area, work in Redmond	Oct 3, 2012 10:08 AM
141	Bothell	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
142	Bothell, WA	Oct 3, 2012 9:41 AM
143	Bothell	Oct 3, 2012 7:49 AM
144	98198	Oct 3, 2012 7:28 AM
145	Ballard	Oct 3, 2012 7:18 AM
146	Phinney Ridge	Oct 3, 2012 12:29 AM
147	Wedgwood, Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 9:12 PM
148	Greenwood	Oct 2, 2012 9:03 PM
149	woodinville	Oct 2, 2012 8:29 PM
150	First Hill	Oct 2, 2012 8:06 PM
151	Ravenna	Oct 2, 2012 7:58 PM
152	Roosevelt	Oct 2, 2012 7:01 PM
153	lake city / work in redmond	Oct 2, 2012 6:24 PM
154	Bryant / Sand Point	Oct 2, 2012 6:19 PM
155	Greenwood	Oct 2, 2012 5:52 PM
156	Wallingford	Oct 2, 2012 5:39 PM
157	Wallingford	Oct 2, 2012 4:52 PM
158	Fremont	Oct 2, 2012 4:25 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

159	Central District	Oct 2, 2012 11:50 AM
160	west Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 AM
161	Wallingford	Oct 1, 2012 9:28 PM
162	maple leaf	Oct 1, 2012 7:27 PM
163	Wallingford	Oct 1, 2012 4:10 PM
164	west seattle; would use for bicycle commuting to job in Bothell	Oct 1, 2012 2:29 PM
165	West Seattle! We are part of Seattle!	Oct 1, 2012 1:36 PM
166	west seattle	Oct 1, 2012 1:27 PM
167	Ballard, commuter to Bellevue	Oct 1, 2012 10:25 AM
168	Magnolia	Sep 30, 2012 8:04 PM
169	Wallingford	Sep 30, 2012 7:59 PM
170	Leschi	Sep 30, 2012 5:00 PM
171	Capitol Hill	Sep 30, 2012 11:00 AM
172	Wallingford	Sep 30, 2012 7:17 AM
173	Roosevelt	Sep 29, 2012 6:39 PM
174	Green Lake	Sep 29, 2012 2:38 PM
175	Upper Queen Anne	Sep 29, 2012 1:24 PM
176	Shoreline	Sep 29, 2012 6:41 AM
177	Matthews Beach	Sep 28, 2012 11:01 PM
178	Snohomish, but I do ride my bicyle alot in both Seattle as well as the East Side	Sep 28, 2012 9:37 PM
179	Southeast Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 9:24 PM
180	Shoreline	Sep 28, 2012 5:10 PM
181	Greenlake - commute to work Mercer Is	Sep 28, 2012 4:36 PM
182	SeaTac	Sep 28, 2012 4:29 PM
183	Ballard	Sep 28, 2012 3:58 PM
184	Tangletown	Sep 28, 2012 3:51 PM
185	Wallingford	Sep 28, 2012 2:42 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

186	North Queen Anne	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM
187	South Capitol Hill. North Central Area	Sep 28, 2012 1:34 PM
188	Lake City	Sep 28, 2012 12:54 PM
189	Northgate, but work at UW	Sep 28, 2012 12:17 PM
190	Maple Leaf	Sep 28, 2012 11:57 AM
191	Ravenna	Sep 28, 2012 10:03 AM
192	Woodinville	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 AM
193	Ballard	Sep 28, 2012 7:45 AM
194	Edmonds	Sep 28, 2012 7:12 AM
195	maple leaf	Sep 28, 2012 6:29 AM
196	Pinehurst (north of Northgate)	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 PM
197	West Seattle, 30 years prior on Capitol Hill	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 PM
198	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM
199	Broadview	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 PM
200	Beacon Hill	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 PM
201	Phinney Ridge	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
202	Broadview	Sep 27, 2012 10:06 PM
203	Wedgwood	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 PM
204	Maple Leaf	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 PM
205	Renton	Sep 27, 2012 9:25 PM
206	Madrona	Sep 27, 2012 9:09 PM
207	Maple Leaf	Sep 27, 2012 8:38 PM
208	Ballard	Sep 27, 2012 8:20 PM
209	Ballard	Sep 27, 2012 8:18 PM
210	northgate/haller lake	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
211	Bellevue by Crossroads	Sep 27, 2012 6:53 PM
212	Lake Forest Park bicycle commuter to Capital Hill	Sep 27, 2012 6:35 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

213	Greenlake	Sep 27, 2012 6:31 PM
214	West Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
215	Shoreline, but bicycle commute to Downtown Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 5:37 PM
216	Ballard (Seattle), but work in Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
217	Central Area	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
218	Queen Ann	Sep 27, 2012 4:59 PM
219	Ballard but I work at NOAA and South Lake Union	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
220	Woodinville	Sep 27, 2012 4:00 PM
221	Wedgewood	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
222	Shoreline	Sep 27, 2012 3:25 PM
223	West Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 3:12 PM
224	Bike commute between Cherry Hill and Crown Hill	Sep 27, 2012 3:07 PM
225	Kenmore	Sep 27, 2012 2:52 PM
226	fremont/ballard	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
227	S. Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 2:39 PM
228	Mercer Island but work in downtown Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 2:15 PM
229	South Capitol Hill/Central area	Sep 27, 2012 2:13 PM
230	Capitol Hill	Sep 27, 2012 2:10 PM
231	Wallingford	Sep 27, 2012 2:00 PM
232	Queen Anne	Sep 27, 2012 1:49 PM
233	Northgate	Sep 27, 2012 1:43 PM
234	Broadview	Sep 27, 2012 1:40 PM
235	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
236	Bryant	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
237	Portland, OR. My alma matter is UW.	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
238	View Ridge	Sep 27, 2012 12:45 PM
239	Fremont	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

240	Central District	Sep 27, 2012 12:38 PM
241	Kenmore	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
242	Central District	Sep 27, 2012 12:25 PM
243	Capitol Hill	Sep 27, 2012 12:21 PM
244	Central District	Sep 27, 2012 12:18 PM
245	Crown Hill, commute through Roanake, N. Capitol Hill, Eastlake	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
246	Snohomish...work in Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
247	Wedgewood/Ravenna	Sep 27, 2012 11:44 AM
248	Wallingford	Sep 27, 2012 11:41 AM
249	Magnolia	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
250	Duvall	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
251	View Ridge	Sep 27, 2012 11:33 AM
252	Ballard	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
253	Bothell	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
254	Beacon Hill	Sep 27, 2012 11:16 AM
255	Mount Baker	Sep 27, 2012 11:14 AM
256	southpark	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
257	Bryant	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
258	Phinney Ridge	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
259	Madrona	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
260	Nort Seattle with connections in U District and Downtown	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
261	Wallingford	Sep 27, 2012 10:57 AM
262	Queen Anne	Sep 27, 2012 10:55 AM
263	phinney ridge	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
264	Greenwood but work in Overlake would love to bike commute!!	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
265	Ravenna	Sep 27, 2012 10:48 AM
266	Queen Anne	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

267	Wedgwood	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
268	Shoreline	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
269	Bryant	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
270	Lake Forest Park	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
271	Mercer Island.	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
272	Shoreline	Sep 27, 2012 10:22 AM
273	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
274	Squire Park	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
275	Wallingford	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
276	Queen Anne	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
277	Wallingford	Sep 27, 2012 10:03 AM
278	Beacon Hill	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
279	Ravenna	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
280	Queen Anne	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
281	Wallingford	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
282	Fremont	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
283	Phinney Ridge	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
284	Wallingford	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
285	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
286	West Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
287	Bryant	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
288	madison valley	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 AM
289	Madison Valley	Sep 25, 2012 9:00 AM
290	Wallingford, but commute to Redmond	Sep 24, 2012 9:22 PM
291	Ravenna/Bryant/Hawthorn Hills	Sep 24, 2012 6:37 PM
292	Rainier Valley	Sep 24, 2012 1:03 PM
293	Capitol Hill	Sep 24, 2012 1:00 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

294	North Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 12:43 PM
295	West Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
296	Wedgwood	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
297	South Seattle (Rainier Beach)	Sep 24, 2012 12:06 PM
298	Sandpoint	Sep 24, 2012 11:58 AM
299	Ballard	Sep 23, 2012 6:57 PM
300	Central District	Sep 22, 2012 12:42 PM
301	Green Lake, Seattle	Sep 22, 2012 10:36 AM
302	Central District. The one close in neighborhood the city continues to ignore.	Sep 22, 2012 10:35 AM
303	Wallingford	Sep 22, 2012 10:20 AM
304	Capitol Hill	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM
305	North Seattle (Haller Lake)	Sep 21, 2012 3:52 PM
306	Kent	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
307	Sammamish	Sep 20, 2012 9:26 PM
308	Vashon	Sep 19, 2012 3:26 PM
309	Beacon Hill, Seattle	Sep 19, 2012 12:22 PM
310	Queen Anne	Sep 17, 2012 5:21 PM
311	View Ridge (this is University District, I suppose)	Sep 17, 2012 3:34 PM
312	Ballard	Sep 17, 2012 10:51 AM
313	RAVENNA/WEDGWOOD	Sep 16, 2012 4:59 PM
314	East Capitol Hill/Madison Valley	Sep 15, 2012 8:51 PM
315	Fremont	Sep 15, 2012 7:55 PM
316	Capitol Hill	Sep 15, 2012 1:46 PM
317	Capitol Hill	Sep 15, 2012 11:46 AM
318	In between Portage Bay and Montlake on Boyer Ave E.	Sep 15, 2012 11:04 AM
319	Ravenna	Sep 14, 2012 7:36 PM
320	Live in Wallingford, work in Redmond. Where I live is not the only question you	Sep 14, 2012 5:28 PM

Page 9, Q1. Please provide the neighborhood you live in. Knowing where you live helps us gain a better understanding of community preferences in each geographic area.

	should ask. Though I live outside of the above list, I commute daily over the 520 and care very much about the project.	
321	Mid Beacon Hill	Sep 14, 2012 4:30 PM
322	Central District	Sep 14, 2012 2:18 PM
323	First Hill	Sep 14, 2012 1:58 PM
324	Greenwood, commuting to Redmond	Sep 14, 2012 1:29 PM
325	drtdr	Sep 14, 2012 12:58 PM
326	First Hill	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
327	North Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 12:29 PM
328	Crown Hill	Sep 14, 2012 9:46 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

	1	
Name:	Jonathan Kamrath	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
State:	WA	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 6, 2012 12:38 AM
	2	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 PM
ZIP:	98103	Oct 5, 2012 11:17 PM
	3	
Name:	Kim Gould	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:10 PM
	4	
Name:	stephanie cooper	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:08 PM
	5	
Name:	jill eikenhorst	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:01 PM
	6	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Julie Severson	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:46 PM
	7	
Name:	Justin Martin	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 PM
	8	
Name:	jennie mao	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:15 PM
	9	
Name:	Richard Korry	Oct 5, 2012 8:38 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 8:38 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 8:38 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 8:38 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 8:38 PM
	10	
Name:	j Coliz	Oct 5, 2012 7:48 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:48 PM
City/Town:	bellevue	Oct 5, 2012 7:48 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 7:48 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:48 PM
	11	
Name:	Carol White	Oct 5, 2012 7:25 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:25 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:25 PM
City/Town:	Sea	Oct 5, 2012 7:25 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 7:25 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:25 PM
	12	
Name:	Sean Riley	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:24 PM
	13	
Name:	Lilith Lysistrata	Oct 5, 2012 5:47 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:47 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 5:47 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 5:47 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:47 PM
	14	
Name:	Mark Sawyer	Oct 5, 2012 4:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 4:26 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 4:26 PM
City/Town:	Everett	Oct 5, 2012 4:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 4:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 4:26 PM
	15	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Michael Archambault	Oct 5, 2012 4:18 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 4:18 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 4:18 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 4:18 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 4:18 PM
	16	
Name:	Jim	Oct 5, 2012 4:17 PM
Address:	McGraw	Oct 5, 2012 4:17 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 4:17 PM
	17	
Name:	Ed Pottharst	Oct 5, 2012 3:47 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:47 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:47 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:47 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:47 PM
	18	
Name:	Jeffrey Linn	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
	19	
Name:	Richard Edwards	Oct 5, 2012 3:39 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:39 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:39 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:39 PM
	20	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Lynn Plummer	Oct 5, 2012 3:38 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:38 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:38 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:38 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:38 PM
	21	
Name:	Sarah Bruemmer	Oct 5, 2012 3:35 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:35 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:35 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:35 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:35 PM
	22	
Name:	Margery Moogk	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
	23	
Name:	Brandt Scanlan	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:26 PM
	24	
Name:	John Sindell	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:14 PM
	25	
Name:	Donald Suppner	Oct 5, 2012 3:10 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:10 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:10 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:10 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:10 PM
	26	
Name:	LOVEDAY CONQUEST	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
City/Town:	SEATTLE	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
	27	
Name:	Phillip Burger	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:05 PM
	28	
Name:	Carol Troup	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:59 PM
	29	
Name:	lee colleton	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
	30	
Name:	Jason Lunz	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:54 PM
	31	
Name:	Theresa Edwards	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:42 PM
	32	
Name:	Charles Vaughan	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
City/Town:	Woodinville	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:34 PM
	33	
Name:	Antoine McNamara	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:26 PM
	34	
Name:	James Burkman	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
	35	
Name:	Richard Dunn	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
	36	
Name:	Gary Longton	Oct 5, 2012 1:18 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:18 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 1:18 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 1:18 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:18 PM
	37	
Name:	Wesley McCullough	Oct 5, 2012 1:11 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:11 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 1:11 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 1:11 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:11 PM
	38	
Name:	Lori Dennis	Oct 5, 2012 1:00 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:00 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 1:00 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 1:00 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:00 PM
	39	
Name:	karen wood	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:54 PM
	40	
Name:	Bob Owen	Oct 5, 2012 12:43 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:43 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:43 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:43 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:43 PM
	41	
Name:	Pat Flanagan	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
	42	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
ZIP:	98112	Oct 5, 2012 12:38 PM
	43	
Name:	Stanislaw Chalicki	Oct 5, 2012 12:32 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:32 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:32 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:32 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:32 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:32 PM
	44	
Name:	Desiree	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
	45	
Name:	LeAna Alvarado-Smith	Oct 5, 2012 12:23 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:23 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:23 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:23 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:23 PM
	46	
Name:	Lee Pyne-Mercier	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
	47	
Name:	Rob Younger	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
City/Town:	Woodinville	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
	48	
Name:	Larry Stokke	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:21 PM
	49	
Name:	Shalini Adams	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
	50	
Name:	Bridget Backschies	Oct 5, 2012 12:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:04 PM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:04 PM
	51	
Name:	Todd	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
Address:	Lassila	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
	52	
Name:	Mike Gaffney	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM
	53	
Name:	Jasmine Bryant	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
	54	
Name:	Robert West	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
	55	
Name:	John Eickelberg	Oct 5, 2012 11:24 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:24 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:24 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:24 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:24 AM
	56	
Name:	Joe Harbine	Oct 5, 2012 11:23 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:23 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:23 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:23 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:23 AM
	57	
Name:	D Guth	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:12 AM
	58	
Name:	Bill Gobie	Oct 5, 2012 11:06 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:06 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:06 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:06 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:06 AM
	59	
Name:	Shaune DeMers	Oct 5, 2012 11:01 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:01 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 11:01 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 11:01 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:01 AM
	60	
Name:	Tasha Irvine	Oct 5, 2012 10:53 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:53 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:53 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:53 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:53 AM
	61	
Name:	Heather Lavin	Oct 5, 2012 10:50 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:50 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:50 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:50 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:50 AM
	62	
Name:	Christian Seifert	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:49 AM
	63	
Name:	Jeffrey Chang	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:47 AM
	64	
Name:	Paula and Tony Oppermann	Oct 5, 2012 10:23 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:23 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:23 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:23 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:23 AM
	65	
Name:	shelley buhler	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
	66	
Name:	Patrick Monteith	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:22 AM
	67	
Name:	Garrett Poshusta	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
	68	
Name:	Bryan Yates	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:17 AM
	69	
Name:	Lyle Bicknell	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:16 AM
	70	
Name:	Paul Viola	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:14 AM
	71	
Name:	Griffin Wesler	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:54 AM
	72	
Name:	Margaret McCauley	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:52 AM
	73	
Name:	Mark L. Nelson	Oct 5, 2012 9:48 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:48 AM
City/Town:	Medina	Oct 5, 2012 9:48 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:48 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:48 AM
	74	
Name:	Carl Stixrood	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
	75	
Name:	Mark Hofer	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:44 AM
	76	
Name:	brent starace	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
	77	
Name:	Arthur Lee Jacobson	Oct 5, 2012 9:37 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:37 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:37 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:37 AM
	78	
Name:	Olivia Arakawa	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
	79	
Name:	Matthew Snyder	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
	80	
Name:	Jennifer Goldman	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM
	81	
Name:	Joe Lambert	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:27 AM
	82	
Name:	Peter Polivka	Oct 5, 2012 9:07 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:07 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:07 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:07 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:07 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:07 AM
	83	
Name:	bike rider	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
Address:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
ZIP:	98108	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
	84	
Name:	Amanda Lee	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
	85	
City/Town:	Redmond	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
ZIP:	98052	Oct 5, 2012 8:51 AM
	86	
Name:	Jennifer Lundgren	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:57 AM
	87	
Name:	Jason Shirk	Oct 5, 2012 7:37 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:37 AM
	88	
Name:	Gary Kelsberg	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
	89	
Name:	brent reid	Oct 5, 2012 7:16 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:16 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 7:16 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 7:16 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:16 AM
	90	
Name:	Neil Wechsler	Oct 5, 2012 7:15 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:15 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 7:15 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 7:15 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:15 AM
	91	
Name:	Jerome Marable	Oct 5, 2012 6:59 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:59 AM
City/Town:	Marysville	Oct 5, 2012 6:59 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 6:59 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:59 AM
	92	
Name:	Charles Robison	Oct 5, 2012 6:27 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:27 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 6:27 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 6:27 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:27 AM
	93	
Name:	Tracey Gianelli	Oct 5, 2012 5:46 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:46 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 5, 2012 5:46 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 5:46 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:46 AM
	94	
Name:	tim	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 AM
Address:	tapping	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:41 AM
	95	
Name:	Scott Gellock	Oct 5, 2012 5:26 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:26 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 5:26 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 5:26 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 5:26 AM
	96	
Name:	Bob Brumfield	Oct 5, 2012 5:01 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Oct 5, 2012 5:01 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 5:01 AM
	97	
ZIP:	98103	Oct 5, 2012 12:28 AM
	98	
Name:	Michelle Brot	Oct 5, 2012 12:08 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:08 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 5, 2012 12:08 AM
State:	WA	Oct 5, 2012 12:08 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:08 AM
	99	
Name:	Vadim Meleshuk	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
	100	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 PM
	101	
Name:	John Dempsey	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 PM
	102	
Name:	David Hablewitz	Oct 4, 2012 10:41 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:41 PM
City/Town:	Bothell	Oct 4, 2012 10:41 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 10:41 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:41 PM
	103	
Name:	Rich Knox	Oct 4, 2012 10:40 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:40 PM
	104	
Name:	Robert Hayden	Oct 4, 2012 10:39 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:39 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 10:39 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 10:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:39 PM
	105	
Name:	Conrad Kornmann	Oct 4, 2012 10:28 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 10:28 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 10:28 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:28 PM
	106	
Name:	Suzanne Perin	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
	107	
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:08 PM
	108	
Name:	Jamie Schoenborn	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:58 PM
	109	
Name:	Ginny & Jay Richards	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 PM
	110	
ZIP:	98102	Oct 4, 2012 9:56 PM
	111	
Name:	Ben Greening	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:50 PM
	112	
Name:	Mark	Oct 4, 2012 9:39 PM
Address:	Orr	Oct 4, 2012 9:39 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:39 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:39 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:39 PM
	113	
Name:	Mary	Oct 4, 2012 9:33 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:33 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:33 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:33 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:33 PM
	114	
Name:	Jerry Raitzer	Oct 4, 2012 9:29 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:29 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:29 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:29 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:29 PM
	115	
Name:	Steve Stone	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:26 PM
	116	
Name:	Mike Durand	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
	117	
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:00 PM
	118	
Name:	Barbara Gordon	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:37 PM
	119	
Name:	shane foster	Oct 4, 2012 8:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:21 PM
City/Town:	seattl	Oct 4, 2012 8:21 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 8:21 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:21 PM
	120	
Name:	Diana Forman	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:14 PM
	121	
Name:	martha sinkler	Oct 4, 2012 8:10 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:10 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 4, 2012 8:10 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 8:10 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:10 PM
	122	
Name:	Stuart Robinson	Oct 4, 2012 7:55 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:55 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 7:55 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 7:55 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:55 PM
	123	
Name:	Andrew Sheridan	Oct 4, 2012 7:25 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:25 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 7:25 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 7:25 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:25 PM
	124	
Name:	Denny Trimble	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
	125	
Name:	Skylar Thompson	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM
	126	
Name:	Kerry Thompson	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
Address 2:	Fucked up city we call	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
	127	
Name:	Cory	Oct 4, 2012 6:25 PM
Address:	Albright	Oct 4, 2012 6:25 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:25 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 6:25 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 6:25 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:25 PM
	128	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 6:18 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:18 PM
	129	
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 6:08 PM
	130	
ZIP:	98112	Oct 4, 2012 5:37 PM
	131	
Name:	Kate Gentry	Oct 4, 2012 5:28 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 5:28 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 5:28 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 5:28 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 5:28 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

	132	
Name:	Mike Waggoner	Oct 4, 2012 5:22 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 5:22 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 5:22 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 5:22 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 5:22 PM
	133	
ZIP:	98119	Oct 4, 2012 5:19 PM
	134	
Name:	Constance Bain	Oct 4, 2012 4:47 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:47 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 4:47 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 4:47 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:47 PM
	135	
Name:	Austin Palmer	Oct 4, 2012 4:37 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:37 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 4:37 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 4:37 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:37 PM
	136	
Name:	Mike Bruemmer	Oct 4, 2012 4:13 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:13 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 4:13 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 4:13 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:13 PM
	137	
Name:	Doug Peterson	Oct 4, 2012 4:09 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:09 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 4:09 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 4:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:09 PM
	138	
Name:	Julie High	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
	139	
Name:	Dave Sanderson	Oct 4, 2012 3:32 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:32 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Oct 4, 2012 3:32 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:32 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:32 PM
	140	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 3:22 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:22 PM
ZIP:	98122	Oct 4, 2012 3:22 PM
	141	
Name:	Josh Miller	Oct 4, 2012 3:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:21 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 3:21 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:21 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:21 PM
	142	
Name:	Ints luters	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:11 PM
	143	
Name:	Sybil Huang-Johnson	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
	144	
Name:	Zach WIlliams	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:07 PM
	145	
Name:	Wayne JOHNSON	Oct 4, 2012 3:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 3:04 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 3:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:04 PM
	146	
Name:	Cary Westerbeck	Oct 4, 2012 2:46 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:46 PM
City/Town:	Kenmore	Oct 4, 2012 2:46 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 2:46 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:46 PM
	147	
Name:	Tim Lloyd	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
City/Town:	Des Moines	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:24 PM
	148	
Name:	Al Dimond	Oct 4, 2012 2:11 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:11 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 2:11 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 2:11 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:11 PM
	149	
Name:	Jacob Ellul-Blake	Oct 4, 2012 1:05 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 1:05 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 1:05 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 1:05 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 1:05 PM
	150	
Name:	scot merrick	Oct 4, 2012 12:53 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:53 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:53 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:53 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:53 PM
	151	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Frances/John Williams	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:49 PM
	152	
Name:	Katie Kazmier	Oct 4, 2012 12:42 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:42 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:42 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:42 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:42 PM
	153	
Name:	Greg Edvenson	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM
	154	
Name:	Josh Cowgill	Oct 4, 2012 12:23 PM
	155	
Name:	Claudia Lewis	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:22 PM
	156	
Name:	fred young	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

	157	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
ZIP:	98118	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
	158	
Name:	LeRoi Smith	Oct 4, 2012 12:13 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:13 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:13 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:13 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:13 PM
	159	
Name:	Michael Nossal	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
	160	
Name:	Stephen	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:04 PM
	161	
Name:	Andy Sodt	Oct 4, 2012 11:58 AM
	162	
Name:	Trent Steffen	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:55 AM
	163	
Name:	Rob Johnson	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:49 AM
	164	
Name:	Greg	Oct 4, 2012 11:43 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:43 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:43 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:43 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:43 AM
	165	
Name:	eric broeren	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
	166	
Name:	Andrew DiPietro	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
	167	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	98102	Oct 4, 2012 11:31 AM
	168	
Name:	erik turner	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:28 AM
	169	
Name:	Kiva Oken	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
	170	
Name:	Amy Taylor	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:13 AM
	171	
Name:	Tuan Lim	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:05 AM
	172	
Name:	Barbara Krieger	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM
	173	
Name:	Rachel Stampfer	Oct 4, 2012 10:11 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:11 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 10:11 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 10:11 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:11 AM
	174	
Name:	Craig Soper	Oct 4, 2012 9:36 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:36 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:36 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:36 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:36 AM
	175	
Name:	Mary Ross	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:34 AM
	176	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 7:09 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 7:09 AM
	177	
Name:	Penny Bolton	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	seattleHelenSeattle	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 AM
	178	
Name:	Forrest Murphy	Oct 4, 2012 2:29 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:29 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 4, 2012 2:29 AM
State:	WA	Oct 4, 2012 2:29 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:29 AM
	179	
Name:	Noah Tratt	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:51 PM
	180	
Name:	Art Haug	Oct 3, 2012 9:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:21 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 9:21 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 9:21 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:21 PM
	181	
Name:	Duncan MacLean	Oct 3, 2012 9:13 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:13 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Oct 3, 2012 9:13 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 9:13 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:13 PM
	182	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Ronald Stenkamp	Oct 3, 2012 8:51 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:51 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 8:51 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 8:51 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:51 PM
	183	
Name:	Justine Kennelly	Oct 3, 2012 8:48 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:48 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 8:48 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 8:48 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:48 PM
	184	
Name:	Carol Gown	Oct 3, 2012 7:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 7:04 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 7:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:04 PM
	185	
Name:	Dennis Shaw	Oct 3, 2012 6:28 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 6:28 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 6:28 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 6:28 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 6:28 PM
	186	
Name:	Erin Baebler	Oct 3, 2012 4:09 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 4:09 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 4:09 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 4:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 4:09 PM
	187	
Name:	Pauline Smidt	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 3:58 PM
	188	
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
ZIP:	98112	Oct 3, 2012 3:53 PM
	189	
Name:	Aaron Jacobs	Oct 3, 2012 3:09 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 3:09 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 3:09 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 3:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 3:09 PM
	190	
Name:	Bruce Nourish	Oct 3, 2012 1:25 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 1:25 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 1:25 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 1:25 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 1:25 PM
	191	
Name:	Gregory S. Hinckley	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 1:12 PM
	192	
Name:	Kari Olson	Oct 3, 2012 12:16 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 12:16 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 12:16 PM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 12:16 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 12:16 PM
	193	
Name:	Frank Huster	Oct 3, 2012 12:02 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 12:02 PM
	194	
Name:	Peter Litwin	Oct 3, 2012 11:59 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:59 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 11:59 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 11:59 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:59 AM
	195	
Name:	Beth Gibson	Oct 3, 2012 11:54 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:54 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 11:54 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 11:54 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:54 AM
	196	
Name:	Patti Brooke	Oct 3, 2012 11:34 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:34 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 11:34 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 11:34 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:34 AM
	197	
Name:	Alex Trzyna	Oct 3, 2012 11:03 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:03 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 11:03 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 11:03 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:03 AM
	198	
Name:	Lynn Plummer	Oct 3, 2012 10:55 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:55 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 10:55 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 10:55 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:55 AM
	199	
Name:	Joanne Harvey	Oct 3, 2012 10:51 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:51 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 10:51 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 10:51 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:51 AM
	200	
Name:	Guy Haycock	Oct 3, 2012 10:33 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:33 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 10:33 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 10:33 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:33 AM
	201	
Name:	Sean	Oct 3, 2012 10:02 AM
Address:	Walsh	Oct 3, 2012 10:02 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:02 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 10:02 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 10:02 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:02 AM
	202	
Name:	Roger Burton	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
City/Town:	Bothell	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
	203	
ZIP:	98104	Oct 3, 2012 9:55 AM
	204	
Name:	kerrilyn vander heyden	Oct 3, 2012 9:07 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:07 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 3, 2012 9:07 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 9:07 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:07 AM
	205	
Name:	James Phillips	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:02 AM
	206	
Name:	Leon Preston	Oct 3, 2012 8:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:49 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 8:49 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 8:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:49 AM
	207	
Name:	JOHN	Oct 3, 2012 8:44 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:44 AM
City/Town:	SEATTLE	Oct 3, 2012 8:44 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 8:44 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:44 AM
	208	
Name:	Mark Craemer	Oct 3, 2012 8:40 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:40 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 8:40 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 8:40 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:40 AM
	209	
Name:	Eldon Jacobson	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
	210	
Name:	Amy Recker	Oct 3, 2012 8:04 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:04 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 8:04 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 8:04 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:04 AM
	211	
Name:	John McKibbin	Oct 3, 2012 7:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:49 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Kenmore	Oct 3, 2012 7:49 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 7:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:49 AM
	212	
Name:	Brian McDaniel	Oct 3, 2012 7:28 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:28 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 7:28 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 7:28 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:28 AM
	213	
Name:	Sandy McCrae	Oct 3, 2012 7:18 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:18 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 7:18 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 7:18 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:18 AM
	214	
Name:	Oscar Brain	Oct 3, 2012 12:29 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 12:29 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 3, 2012 12:29 AM
State:	WA	Oct 3, 2012 12:29 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 12:29 AM
	215	
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 11:59 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 11:59 PM
ZIP:	98112	Oct 2, 2012 11:59 PM
	216	
Name:	david baker	Oct 2, 2012 10:54 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:54 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

City/Town:	seattle	Oct 2, 2012 10:54 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 10:54 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:54 PM
	217	
Name:	Matt Carpenter	Oct 2, 2012 9:03 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 9:03 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 9:03 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 9:03 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 9:03 PM
	218	
Name:	Alex Pope	Oct 2, 2012 7:01 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 7:01 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 7:01 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 7:01 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 7:01 PM
	219	
Name:	John Butler	Oct 2, 2012 5:52 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 5:52 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 5:52 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 5:52 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 5:52 PM
	220	
Name:	Patrice Demombynes	Oct 2, 2012 4:52 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 4:52 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 2, 2012 4:52 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 4:52 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 4:52 PM
	221	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Matt Handley	Oct 2, 2012 4:25 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 4:25 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 4:25 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 4:25 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 4:25 PM
	222	
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 4:23 PM
	223	
Name:	Lionel Job	Oct 2, 2012 12:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 12:26 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 12:26 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 12:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 12:26 PM
	224	
Name:	Ryan Carreras	Oct 2, 2012 12:11 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 12:11 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 12:11 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 12:11 PM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 12:11 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 12:11 PM
	225	
Name:	Joseph Goldberg	Oct 2, 2012 11:50 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 11:50 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 11:50 AM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 11:50 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 11:50 AM
	226	
Name:	Nathan Smith	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 AM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 11:10 AM
	227	
Name:	Bill Moritz	Oct 2, 2012 10:20 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:20 AM
City/Town:	Bothell	Oct 2, 2012 10:20 AM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 10:20 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:20 AM
	228	
Name:	Alton Earle	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
	229	
Name:	Maggie Nowakowska	Oct 2, 2012 10:03 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:03 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 10:03 AM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 10:03 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:03 AM
	230	
Name:	Bob Edmiston	Oct 2, 2012 9:26 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 9:26 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 2, 2012 9:26 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 9:26 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 9:26 AM
	231	
Name:	Juan Medina	Oct 2, 2012 8:23 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 8:23 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 8:23 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Oct 2, 2012 8:23 AM
State:	WA	Oct 2, 2012 8:23 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 8:23 AM
	232	
Name:	Neal Freeland	Oct 1, 2012 9:28 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 9:28 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 1, 2012 9:28 PM
State:	WA	Oct 1, 2012 9:28 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 9:28 PM
	233	
Name:	Mike Leary	Oct 1, 2012 7:27 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 7:27 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 1, 2012 7:27 PM
State:	WA	Oct 1, 2012 7:27 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 7:27 PM
	234	
ZIP:	98164	Oct 1, 2012 4:08 PM
	235	
Name:	John Dex	Oct 1, 2012 2:52 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 2:52 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Oct 1, 2012 2:52 PM
State:	WA	Oct 1, 2012 2:52 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 2:52 PM
	236	
Name:	Peter Nazaroff	Oct 1, 2012 2:29 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 2:29 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 1, 2012 2:29 PM
State:	WA	Oct 1, 2012 2:29 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 2:29 PM
	237	
Name:	Gary deBoer	Oct 1, 2012 1:36 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 1:36 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 1, 2012 1:36 PM
State:	WA	Oct 1, 2012 1:36 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 1:36 PM
	238	
Name:	Matthew Clark	Oct 1, 2012 1:27 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 1:27 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 1, 2012 1:27 PM
State:	WA	Oct 1, 2012 1:27 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 1:27 PM
	239	
ZIP:	98112	Oct 1, 2012 12:49 PM
	240	
Name:	Allison Kelsey	Oct 1, 2012 10:25 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 10:25 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Oct 1, 2012 10:25 AM
State:	WA	Oct 1, 2012 10:25 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 10:25 AM
	241	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Ben Humphrey	Sep 30, 2012 9:27 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 9:27 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 30, 2012 9:27 PM
State:	WA	Sep 30, 2012 9:27 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 9:27 PM
	242	
Name:	Tim Hesterberg	Sep 30, 2012 8:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 8:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 30, 2012 8:04 PM
State:	WA	Sep 30, 2012 8:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 8:04 PM
	243	
Name:	Aaron Erkenswick	Sep 30, 2012 7:59 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:59 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 30, 2012 7:59 PM
State:	WA	Sep 30, 2012 7:59 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:59 PM
	244	
Name:	John and Frances Williams	Sep 30, 2012 3:43 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 3:43 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 30, 2012 3:43 PM
State:	WA	Sep 30, 2012 3:43 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 3:43 PM
	245	
Name:	Leonard Smith	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
	246	
Name:	pete seyl	Sep 30, 2012 7:17 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:17 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 30, 2012 7:17 AM
State:	WA	Sep 30, 2012 7:17 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:17 AM
	247	
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 3:53 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 30, 2012 3:53 AM
State:	WA	Sep 30, 2012 3:53 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 3:53 AM
	248	
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 10:27 PM
ZIP:	98034	Sep 29, 2012 10:27 PM
	249	
Name:	Sander Lazar	Sep 29, 2012 7:48 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 7:48 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 29, 2012 7:48 PM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 7:48 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 7:48 PM
	250	
Name:	Tim Ambre	Sep 29, 2012 7:46 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 7:46 PM
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 29, 2012 7:46 PM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 7:46 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 7:46 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

	251	
Name:	Walter Sholund	Sep 29, 2012 6:39 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 6:39 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 6:39 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 29, 2012 6:39 PM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 6:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 6:39 PM
	252	
Name:	Steven and Ashley Greenberg	Sep 29, 2012 4:39 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 4:39 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 29, 2012 4:39 PM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 4:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 4:39 PM
	253	
Name:	Rebeckah Johnson	Sep 29, 2012 1:52 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 1:52 PM
City/Town:	SEATTLE	Sep 29, 2012 1:52 PM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 1:52 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 1:52 PM
	254	
Name:	Chetan Chandrashekhar	Sep 29, 2012 1:39 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 1:39 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 29, 2012 1:39 PM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 1:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 1:39 PM
	255	
Name:	Matthew Kerner	Sep 29, 2012 1:24 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 1:24 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 29, 2012 1:24 PM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 1:24 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 1:24 PM
	256	
Name:	Clark Frazier	Sep 29, 2012 10:11 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 10:11 AM
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 29, 2012 10:11 AM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 10:11 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 10:11 AM
	257	
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 29, 2012 9:44 AM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 9:44 AM
ZIP:	98102	Sep 29, 2012 9:44 AM
	258	
Name:	Jeff Lykken	Sep 29, 2012 7:58 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 7:58 AM
City/Town:	Renton	Sep 29, 2012 7:58 AM
State:	WA	Sep 29, 2012 7:58 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 7:58 AM
	259	
Name:	D Norman	Sep 28, 2012 11:01 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:01 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 11:01 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 11:01 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:01 PM
	260	
Name:	Dan Vogel	Sep 28, 2012 9:37 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 9:37 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Snohomish	Sep 28, 2012 9:37 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 9:37 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 9:37 PM
	261	
Name:	William Durbin	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 PM
	262	
Name:	Lauri DeVore	Sep 28, 2012 5:10 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 5:10 PM
City/Town:	Shoreline	Sep 28, 2012 5:10 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 5:10 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 5:10 PM
	263	
Name:	Alden Chace	Sep 28, 2012 4:29 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 4:29 PM
City/Town:	SeaTac	Sep 28, 2012 4:29 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 4:29 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 4:29 PM
	264	
Name:	Carol Nussbaum	Sep 28, 2012 3:58 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 3:58 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 3:58 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 3:58 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 3:58 PM
	265	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	John Rochford	Sep 28, 2012 3:08 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 3:08 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 3:08 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 3:08 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 3:08 PM
	266	
Name:	Anthony Charlton	Sep 28, 2012 2:45 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:45 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 2:45 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 2:45 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:45 PM
	267	
Name:	Ryan S Dean	Sep 28, 2012 2:30 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:30 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:30 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 2:30 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 2:30 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:30 PM
	268	
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM
ZIP:	98109	Sep 28, 2012 2:19 PM
	269	
Name:	Kelli Dean	Sep 28, 2012 2:11 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:11 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 2:11 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 2:11 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:11 PM
	270	
Name:	Tina Yamagiwa	Sep 28, 2012 2:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 2:04 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 2:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 2:04 PM
	271	
Name:	Doug Calvert	Sep 28, 2012 1:52 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 1:52 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 1:52 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 1:52 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 1:52 PM
	272	
Name:	Brie Gyncild	Sep 28, 2012 1:34 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 1:34 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 1:34 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 1:34 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 1:34 PM
	273	
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 28, 2012 1:27 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 1:27 PM
ZIP:	98112	Sep 28, 2012 1:27 PM
	274	
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 12:54 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 12:54 PM
ZIP:	98125	Sep 28, 2012 12:54 PM
	275	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Matt Weatherford	Sep 28, 2012 12:17 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 12:17 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 12:17 PM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 12:17 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 12:17 PM
	276	
Name:	Kevin Henderson	Sep 28, 2012 11:57 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:57 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 11:57 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 11:57 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:57 AM
	277	
Name:	Rolland Waters	Sep 28, 2012 11:21 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:21 AM
City/Town:	Clyde Hill	Sep 28, 2012 11:21 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 11:21 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:21 AM
	278	
Name:	Rew Adams	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM
Address 2:	Tutta Cana	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:19 AM
	279	
Name:	Paul Batig	Sep 28, 2012 10:36 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 10:36 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 28, 2012 10:36 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 10:36 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 10:36 AM
	280	
Name:	Leah Pistorius	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 10:21 AM
	281	
Name:	Bill Baxter	Sep 28, 2012 10:09 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 10:09 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 28, 2012 10:09 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 10:09 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 10:09 AM
	282	
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 28, 2012 9:58 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 9:58 AM
ZIP:	98004	Sep 28, 2012 9:58 AM
	283	
Name:	Dave McDonald	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 AM
City/Town:	Woodinville	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 9:12 AM
	284	
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 8:41 AM
	285	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Mat Lipps	Sep 28, 2012 7:45 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 7:45 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 7:45 AM
	286	
Name:	Michelle Baillet	Sep 28, 2012 7:12 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 7:12 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 7:12 AM
	287	
Name:	Scott Andrews	Sep 28, 2012 6:29 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 6:29 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 28, 2012 6:29 AM
State:	WA	Sep 28, 2012 6:29 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 6:29 AM
	288	
Name:	Ellen Hale	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 PM
	289	
Name:	Jason Little	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 PM
	290	
Name:	Scott O Kuznicki	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM
City/Town:	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM
	291	
Name:	Tiffany Carabello	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 PM
	292	
Name:	Jon Howell	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:27 PM
	293	
Name:	Maryellen Hearn	Sep 27, 2012 10:24 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:24 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:24 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:24 PM
	294	
Name:	Eric Dee	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
	295	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

Name:	John Ruhl	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 PM
	296	
City/Town:	Renton	Sep 27, 2012 9:25 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:25 PM
ZIP:	98056	Sep 27, 2012 9:25 PM
	297	
Name:	Albert Foster	Sep 27, 2012 9:09 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:09 PM
	298	
Name:	Mike Harnden	Sep 27, 2012 8:18 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 8:18 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 8:18 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 8:18 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 8:18 PM
	299	
Name:	chris fingar	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
	300	
Name:	Jeremy	Sep 27, 2012 6:53 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:53 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 6:53 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 6:53 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:53 PM
	301	
Name:	Wayne W Methner	Sep 27, 2012 6:35 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:35 PM
City/Town:	Lake Forest Park	Sep 27, 2012 6:35 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 6:35 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:35 PM
	302	
Name:	Scot Soares	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:19 PM
	303	
Name:	Alex Moskwa	Sep 27, 2012 6:00 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:00 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 6:00 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 6:00 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:00 PM
	304	
Name:	Ben L Howe	Sep 27, 2012 5:37 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 5:37 PM
City/Town:	Shoreline	Sep 27, 2012 5:37 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 5:37 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 5:37 PM
	305	
Name:	Andrew	Sep 27, 2012 5:16 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 5:16 PM
	306	
Name:	Katie Beck	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
	307	
Name:	Mike Nelson	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
	308	
Name:	Paul Soreff	Sep 27, 2012 4:59 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:59 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 4:59 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 4:59 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:59 PM
	309	
Name:	david hamm	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:45 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

	310	
Name:	Joel Glass	Sep 27, 2012 4:17 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:17 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 4:17 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 4:17 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:17 PM
	311	
Name:	Scott	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
Address:	Buchanan	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
City/Town:	Clyde Hill	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
	312	
Name:	Ric Cochrane	Sep 27, 2012 4:13 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:13 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 4:13 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 4:13 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:13 PM
	313	
Name:	larry tseng	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
City/Town:	redmond	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:09 PM
	314	
Name:	Jeff Felbeck	Sep 27, 2012 3:55 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:55 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 3:55 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:55 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:55 PM
	315	
Name:	Luke Rogers	Sep 27, 2012 3:50 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:50 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 3:50 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:50 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:50 PM
	316	
Name:	Joe Delaney	Sep 27, 2012 3:49 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:49 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 3:49 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:49 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:49 PM
	317	
Name:	Graham Hunter	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
	318	
Name:	Bradley Lightfoot	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:39 PM
	319	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Jason Bennett	Sep 27, 2012 3:25 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:25 PM
City/Town:	Shoreline	Sep 27, 2012 3:25 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:25 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:25 PM
	320	
Name:	G. Schmidt	Sep 27, 2012 3:12 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:12 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:12 PM
	321	
Name:	Steve Grappo	Sep 27, 2012 3:07 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 3:07 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:07 PM
	322	
Name:	Robert Wicklein	Sep 27, 2012 3:01 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:01 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 3:01 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 3:01 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:01 PM
	323	
Name:	holly	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
Address:	bays	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
	324	
Name:	tim tarte	Sep 27, 2012 2:38 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:38 PM
City/Town:	kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 2:38 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 2:38 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:38 PM
	325	
Name:	Clinton Ingram	Sep 27, 2012 2:34 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:34 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:34 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 2:34 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 2:34 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:34 PM
	326	
Name:	Eric Holtz	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:20 PM
	327	
Name:	John Space	Sep 27, 2012 2:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 2:04 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 2:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:04 PM
	328	
Name:	Erin Kelly	Sep 27, 2012 2:00 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:00 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 2:00 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 2:00 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:00 PM
	329	
Name:	Tom Easthope	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:51 PM
	330	
Name:	Manlio Vecchiet	Sep 27, 2012 1:43 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:43 PM
	331	
Name:	Tony Dodson	Sep 27, 2012 1:40 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:40 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 1:40 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 1:40 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:40 PM
	332	
Name:	Evan McDonald	Sep 27, 2012 1:29 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:29 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 1:29 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 1:29 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:29 PM
	333	
Name:	Jim Stanton	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
	334	
Name:	uryah messemr	Sep 27, 2012 1:10 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:10 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:10 PM
City/Town:	kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 1:10 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 1:10 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:10 PM
	335	
Name:	Christopher Fast	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:03 PM
	336	
Name:	Travis Dougan	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM
	337	
Name:	Evan Siroky	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
City/Town:	Portland	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
State:	OR	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:54 PM
	338	
Name:	Shawn Jezerinac	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM
	339	
Name:	Betty Greene	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
	340	
Name:	Erik Anderson	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:42 PM
	341	
Name:	Nathan Seney	Sep 27, 2012 12:38 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:38 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:38 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:38 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:38 PM
	342	
Name:	William French	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
City/Town:	Kenmore	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
	343	
Name:	Michele Conrad	Sep 27, 2012 12:18 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:18 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:18 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:18 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:18 PM
	344	
Name:	Kelvin Wing	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:17 PM
	345	
Name:	Kurt Springman	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
	346	
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
ZIP:	98115	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
	347	
Name:	Jonathan Mark	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
	348	
Name:	Scott Emmons	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:04 PM
	349	
Name:	Reid Stell	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:02 PM
	350	
Name:	Michael Flakus	Sep 27, 2012 11:53 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:53 AM
City/Town:	KIRKLAND	Sep 27, 2012 11:53 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:53 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:53 AM
	351	
Name:	Mark Dunphy	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:47 AM
	352	
Name:	tracy dale-thiebout	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
Address 2:	snohomish	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
City/Town:	snohomish	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
	353	
Name:	Tiffany Bowie	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:40 AM
	354	
Name:	Sylvia	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
Address:	Schweinberger	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:31 AM
	355	
Name:	Gordon Morris	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:23 AM
	356	
Name:	John Cherrie	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
City/Town:	REDMOND	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:20 AM
	357	
Name:	nicole coddington	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
	358	
Name:	Matt Quest	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
City/Town:	Bothell	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:19 AM
	359	
Name:	christopher gay	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:10 AM
	360	
Name:	Steve Malone	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:09 AM
	361	
Name:	Alida	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
Address:	Griffith	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
City/Town:	Woodinville	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
	362	
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	98115	Sep 27, 2012 11:07 AM
	363	
Name:	Celso Gomes	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:06 AM
	364	
Name:	Kevin Timmermans	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:05 AM
	365	
Name:	Jon Peck	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
	366	
Name:	John Bennitt	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 AM
	367	
Name:	Barbara Dick	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
	368	
Name:	Al Vetrovs	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
	369	
Name:	Brian Burton	Sep 27, 2012 10:48 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:48 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:48 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:48 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:48 AM
	370	
Name:	Hanscom	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:47 AM
	371	
Name:	Blake Feist	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
	372	
Name:	Stephen R. DeMont	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
	373	
Name:	Paul	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
City/Town:	bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
	374	
Name:	Vincent T Litchard	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
	375	
Name:	Gabriel Grant	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
	376	
Name:	Dale Schiffler	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
City/Town:	Lake Forest Park	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:35 AM
	377	
Name:	Steve Doucette	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

City/Town:	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
	378	
Name:	Rich Neves	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
	379	
Name:	Steve Hasegawa	Sep 27, 2012 10:22 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:22 AM
City/Town:	Shoreline	Sep 27, 2012 10:22 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:22 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:22 AM
	380	
Name:	Bill Koonce	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
	381	
Name:	Robin Sayed	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
City/Town:	Woodinville	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:16 AM
	382	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Tim Wettack	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
City/Town:	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
	383	
Name:	Gary Fogal	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
City/Town:	Renton	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
	384	
Name:	Dennis Montgomery	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
	385	
Name:	Conor Morrison	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
	386	
Name:	Lawrence Kuracina	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
	387	
Name:	Karl Hillstrom	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
City/Town:	SEATTLE	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM
	388	
Name:	Elisa Esper	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:10 AM
	389	
Name:	carl conn	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:09 AM
	390	
Name:	Bryan Urakawa	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
	391	
Name:	Kaylin Besmer	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
City/Town:	Woodinville	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
	392	
Name:	Ian Luttrell	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
	393	
Name:	Richard Ward	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
	394	
Name:	Dave Tamasi	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
	395	
Name:	joe goeke	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
	396	
Name:	Ryan Ceurvorst	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
	397	
Name:	Chris Wheaton	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
	398	
Name:	Paul Litwin	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
	399	
Name:	Marcin Porwit	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:57 AM
	400	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	kathleen mcmonigal	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
	401	
Name:	Joseph Swain	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
	402	
Name:	John	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
	403	
Name:	Sean Henderson	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
City/Town:	bothell	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:54 AM
	404	
Name:	Mark	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
Address:	Keithly	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:50 AM
	405	
Name:	JP Brastad	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
City/Town:	Mercer Island	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
	406	
Name:	Dan Adelman	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
	407	
Name:	Mark	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
	408	
Name:	Paul Reid	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
City/Town:	Woodinville	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:48 AM
	409	
Name:	Brent Curran	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
	410	
Name:	Michael Alotis	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:41 AM
	411	
Name:	Liam M Stacey	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 AM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 AM
State:	WA	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 AM
	412	
Name:	Providence Worley	Sep 26, 2012 6:02 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 26, 2012 6:02 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 26, 2012 6:02 PM
State:	WA	Sep 26, 2012 6:02 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 26, 2012 6:02 PM
	413	
Name:	Ben Magnano	Sep 25, 2012 8:23 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 25, 2012 8:23 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 25, 2012 8:23 PM
State:	WA	Sep 25, 2012 8:23 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 25, 2012 8:23 PM
	414	
Name:	Rad Roberts	Sep 25, 2012 8:24 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 25, 2012 8:24 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 25, 2012 8:24 AM
State:	WA	Sep 25, 2012 8:24 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 25, 2012 8:24 AM
	415	
Name:	Chuck Mader	Sep 24, 2012 11:47 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 11:47 PM
City/Town:	Redmond	Sep 24, 2012 11:47 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 11:47 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 11:47 PM
	416	
ZIP:	98112	Sep 24, 2012 9:56 PM
	417	
Name:	Kimberly Christensen	Sep 24, 2012 9:22 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 9:22 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 9:22 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 9:22 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 9:22 PM
	418	
Name:	Bob Scheulen	Sep 24, 2012 6:37 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 6:37 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 6:37 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 6:37 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 6:37 PM
	419	
Name:	Terry Stella	Sep 24, 2012 5:58 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 5:58 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 5:58 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 5:58 PM
	420	
Name:	Theresa Beaulieu	Sep 24, 2012 1:15 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 1:15 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 1:15 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 1:15 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 1:15 PM
	421	
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
ZIP:	98168	Sep 24, 2012 12:33 PM
	422	
Name:	mike wayte	Sep 24, 2012 12:27 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:27 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 24, 2012 12:27 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 12:27 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:27 PM
	423	
ZIP:	98112	Sep 24, 2012 12:23 PM
	424	
Name:	Jeroen Bet	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
	425	
Name:	James Durkin	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
	426	
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 24, 2012 12:06 PM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 12:06 PM
ZIP:	98178	Sep 24, 2012 12:06 PM
	427	
Name:	John Van Duzor`	Sep 24, 2012 10:09 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 10:09 AM
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 24, 2012 10:09 AM
State:	WA	Sep 24, 2012 10:09 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 10:09 AM
	428	
Name:	jack whisner	Sep 23, 2012 6:57 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 6:57 PM
City/Town:	seattle	Sep 23, 2012 6:57 PM
State:	WA	Sep 23, 2012 6:57 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 6:57 PM
	429	
Name:	Eldan Goldenberg	Sep 23, 2012 6:54 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 6:54 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 23, 2012 6:54 PM
State:	WA	Sep 23, 2012 6:54 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 6:54 PM
	430	
Name:	Dolores Mirabella	Sep 23, 2012 6:45 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 6:45 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 23, 2012 6:45 PM
State:	WA	Sep 23, 2012 6:45 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 6:45 PM
	431	
Name:	Tia Johnson	Sep 23, 2012 2:46 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 2:46 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 23, 2012 2:46 PM
State:	WA	Sep 23, 2012 2:46 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 2:46 PM
	432	
Name:	Cathy MacLeod	Sep 23, 2012 8:23 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 8:23 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 23, 2012 8:23 AM
State:	WA	Sep 23, 2012 8:23 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 8:23 AM
	433	
Name:	Catherine Hennings	Sep 22, 2012 4:51 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 4:51 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 22, 2012 4:51 PM
State:	WA	Sep 22, 2012 4:51 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 4:51 PM
	434	
Name:	Melissa Cyders	Sep 22, 2012 1:57 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 1:57 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 22, 2012 1:57 PM
State:	WA	Sep 22, 2012 1:57 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 1:57 PM
	435	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Sep 22, 2012 1:04 PM
	436	
Name:	Michael Hintze	Sep 22, 2012 12:42 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 12:42 PM
	437	
Name:	Jon Gunther	Sep 22, 2012 10:36 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 10:36 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 22, 2012 10:36 AM
State:	WA	Sep 22, 2012 10:36 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 10:36 AM
	438	
Name:	Erik Saganic	Sep 22, 2012 2:53 AM
	439	
Name:	Mark Jeffery	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM
State:	WA	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM
	440	
Name:	Michael Taylor	Sep 21, 2012 3:52 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 21, 2012 3:52 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 21, 2012 3:52 PM
State:	WA	Sep 21, 2012 3:52 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 21, 2012 3:52 PM
	441	
Name:	Gareth Campbell	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

City/Town:	Kent	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
State:	WA	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 21, 2012 12:26 PM
	442	
Name:	Ann Wahl	Sep 20, 2012 9:26 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 20, 2012 9:26 PM
City/Town:	Sammamish	Sep 20, 2012 9:26 PM
State:	WA	Sep 20, 2012 9:26 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 20, 2012 9:26 PM
	443	
Name:	Brad Hawkins	Sep 20, 2012 6:36 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 20, 2012 6:36 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 20, 2012 6:36 PM
State:	WA	Sep 20, 2012 6:36 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 20, 2012 6:36 PM
	444	
ZIP:	98070	Sep 19, 2012 3:26 PM
	445	
Name:	Jim Kearnes	Sep 19, 2012 1:46 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 19, 2012 1:46 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 19, 2012 1:46 PM
State:	WA	Sep 19, 2012 1:46 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 19, 2012 1:46 PM
	446	
Name:	Glen Buhlmann	Sep 19, 2012 12:36 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 19, 2012 12:36 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 19, 2012 12:36 PM
State:	WA	Sep 19, 2012 12:36 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 19, 2012 12:36 PM
	447	
Name:	Cyndi Cross	Sep 19, 2012 12:22 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 19, 2012 12:22 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 19, 2012 12:22 PM
State:	WA	Sep 19, 2012 12:22 PM
	448	
Name:	David Kremers	Sep 18, 2012 12:32 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 18, 2012 12:32 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 18, 2012 12:32 PM
State:	WA	Sep 18, 2012 12:32 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 18, 2012 12:32 PM
	449	
Name:	Robert Breskovich	Sep 18, 2012 6:40 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 18, 2012 6:40 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 18, 2012 6:40 AM
State:	WA	Sep 18, 2012 6:40 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 18, 2012 6:40 AM
	450	
Name:	Frank Buono	Sep 17, 2012 9:38 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 9:38 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 17, 2012 9:38 PM
State:	WA	Sep 17, 2012 9:38 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 9:38 PM
	451	
Name:	Jonathan Weinstein	Sep 17, 2012 5:34 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 5:34 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 17, 2012 5:34 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Sep 17, 2012 5:34 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 5:34 PM
	452	
Name:	Todd Black	Sep 17, 2012 5:21 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 5:21 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 17, 2012 5:21 PM
State:	WA	Sep 17, 2012 5:21 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 5:21 PM
	453	
Name:	Ellen Aagaard	Sep 17, 2012 3:34 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 3:34 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 17, 2012 3:34 PM
State:	WA	Sep 17, 2012 3:34 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 3:34 PM
	454	
Name:	Melinda De Lanoy	Sep 17, 2012 11:22 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 11:22 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 17, 2012 11:22 AM
State:	WA	Sep 17, 2012 11:22 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 11:22 AM
	455	
Name:	Bryson Tillinghast	Sep 17, 2012 10:10 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 10:10 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 17, 2012 10:10 AM
State:	WA	Sep 17, 2012 10:10 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 10:10 AM
	456	
Name:	Peter Alspach	Sep 17, 2012 6:22 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 6:22 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 17, 2012 6:22 AM
State:	WA	Sep 17, 2012 6:22 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 6:22 AM
	457	
Name:	VIRGINIA GUNBY	Sep 16, 2012 4:59 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 4:59 PM
City/Town:	SEATTLE	Sep 16, 2012 4:59 PM
State:	WA	Sep 16, 2012 4:59 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 4:59 PM
	458	
Name:	Mike Scully	Sep 16, 2012 10:08 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 10:08 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 16, 2012 10:08 AM
State:	WA	Sep 16, 2012 10:08 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 10:08 AM
	459	
Name:	Sean Pody	Sep 16, 2012 9:51 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 9:51 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 16, 2012 9:51 AM
State:	WA	Sep 16, 2012 9:51 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 9:51 AM
	460	
Name:	Tamara Engel	Sep 16, 2012 9:22 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 9:22 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 16, 2012 9:22 AM
State:	WA	Sep 16, 2012 9:22 AM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 9:22 AM
	461	
Name:	LAURA GARDNER	Sep 16, 2012 7:29 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 7:29 AM
City/Town:	SEATTLE	Sep 16, 2012 7:29 AM
State:	WA	Sep 16, 2012 7:29 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 7:29 AM
	462	
Name:	Rainer Metzger	Sep 16, 2012 2:40 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 16, 2012 2:40 AM
State:	WA	Sep 16, 2012 2:40 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 2:40 AM
	463	
Name:	Merlin Rainwater	Sep 15, 2012 8:51 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 8:51 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 15, 2012 8:51 PM
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 8:51 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 8:51 PM
	464	
Name:	Carolyn Heberlein	Sep 15, 2012 7:55 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 7:55 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 15, 2012 7:55 PM
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 7:55 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 7:55 PM
	465	
Name:	Paul Ip	Sep 15, 2012 1:46 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 1:46 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 15, 2012 1:46 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 1:46 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 1:46 PM
	466	
Name:	ken whelan	Sep 15, 2012 1:43 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 1:43 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 15, 2012 1:43 PM
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 1:43 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 1:43 PM
	467	
Name:	Per-Ola Selander	Sep 15, 2012 1:07 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 1:07 PM
City/Town:	Kirkland	Sep 15, 2012 1:07 PM
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 1:07 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 1:07 PM
	468	
Name:	William Pickard	Sep 15, 2012 12:44 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 12:44 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 12:44 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 15, 2012 12:44 PM
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 12:44 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 12:44 PM
	469	
Name:	Lisa A Brooks	Sep 15, 2012 8:55 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 8:55 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 15, 2012 8:55 AM
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 8:55 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 8:55 AM
	470	

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Name:	Sharon Lin	Sep 15, 2012 12:21 AM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 12:21 AM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 15, 2012 12:21 AM
State:	WA	Sep 15, 2012 12:21 AM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 12:21 AM
	471	
Address:	McGilvra Blvd East	Sep 14, 2012 6:48 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 6:48 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 6:48 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 6:48 PM
	472	
Name:	Milton Huertas	Sep 14, 2012 6:04 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 6:04 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 6:04 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 6:04 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 6:04 PM
	473	
Name:	Xtian	Sep 14, 2012 4:47 PM
Address:	Gunther	Sep 14, 2012 4:47 PM
Address 2:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 4:47 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 4:47 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 4:47 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 4:47 PM
	474	
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 4:30 PM
ZIP:	98108	Sep 14, 2012 4:30 PM
	475	
Name:	Bill	Sep 14, 2012 3:59 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information		
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 3:59 PM
City/Town:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 3:59 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 3:59 PM
	476	
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 2:18 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 2:18 PM
ZIP:	98144	Sep 14, 2012 2:18 PM
	477	
Name:	Art Kerr	Sep 14, 2012 1:53 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 1:53 PM
City/Town:	Sammamish	Sep 14, 2012 1:53 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 1:53 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 1:53 PM
	478	
Name:	Steve Savage	Sep 14, 2012 1:43 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 1:43 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 1:43 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 1:43 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 1:43 PM
	479	
Name:	Jeff Stein	Sep 14, 2012 1:29 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 1:29 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 1:29 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 1:29 PM
	480	
City/Town:	Bellevue	Sep 14, 2012 1:20 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 1:20 PM
ZIP:	98005	Sep 14, 2012 1:20 PM

Page 9, Q2. Personal information

	481	
Name:	Gordon Werner	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
	482	
ZIP:	98102	Sep 14, 2012 12:10 PM
	483	
Name:	Cathy Tuttle	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:06 PM
	484	
Name:	Elizabeth McAuley	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:05 PM
	485	
Name:	Kelly Wardle	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
Address:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
City/Town:	Seattle	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
State:	WA	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM
ZIP:	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:02 PM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

1	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:47 PM
2	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:42 PM
3	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:35 PM
4	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:27 PM
5	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:10 PM
6	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 3:09 PM
7	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:55 PM
8	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:24 PM
9	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 2:16 PM
10	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:50 PM
11	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 1:18 PM
12	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:41 PM
13	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:26 PM
14	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 12:20 PM
15	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:58 AM
16	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:56 AM
17	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:50 AM
18	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:47 AM
19	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:16 AM
20	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 11:06 AM
21	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:23 AM
22	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 10:19 AM
23	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:57 AM
24	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:48 AM
25	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:47 AM
26	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:40 AM
27	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:31 AM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

28	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:02 AM
29	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 9:00 AM
30	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:35 AM
31	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 7:15 AM
32	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:59 AM
33	[redacted]	Oct 5, 2012 6:27 AM
34	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:26 PM
35	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:40 PM
36	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:39 PM
37	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:28 PM
38	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:24 PM
39	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:39 PM
40	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:29 PM
41	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:12 PM
42	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:05 PM
43	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:21 PM
44	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 8:10 PM
45	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:55 PM
46	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 7:24 PM
47	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:59 PM
48	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:40 PM
49	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:47 PM
50	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 4:13 PM
51	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:39 PM
52	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:09 PM
53	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 1:25 PM
54	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:26 PM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

55	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:19 PM
56	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:15 PM
57	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 12:09 PM
58	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:43 AM
59	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:38 AM
60	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 11:33 AM
61	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 10:51 AM
62	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 9:51 AM
63	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 6:53 AM
64	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 3:25 AM
65	[redacted]	Oct 4, 2012 2:29 AM
66	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:13 PM
67	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 2:02 PM
68	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 1:25 PM
69	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:59 AM
70	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 11:34 AM
71	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 10:02 AM
72	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:56 AM
73	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:55 AM
74	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:41 AM
75	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 9:07 AM
76	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 8:31 AM
77	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 7:49 AM
78	[redacted]	Oct 3, 2012 12:29 AM
79	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 8:06 PM
80	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 4:52 PM
81	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 4:25 PM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

82	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 4:23 PM
83	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 3:32 PM
84	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:14 AM
85	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 10:03 AM
86	[redacted]	Oct 2, 2012 9:05 AM
87	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 9:28 PM
88	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 7:27 PM
89	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 2:52 PM
90	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 1:36 PM
91	[redacted]	Oct 1, 2012 1:27 PM
92	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 9:27 PM
93	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:59 PM
94	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 3:43 PM
95	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 11:00 AM
96	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:39 AM
97	[redacted]	Sep 30, 2012 7:19 AM
98	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 10:27 PM
99	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 7:46 PM
100	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 1:52 PM
101	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 10:11 AM
102	[redacted]	Sep 29, 2012 9:44 AM
103	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 7:31 PM
104	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 4:36 PM
105	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 4:29 PM
106	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 3:58 PM
107	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 12:17 PM
108	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:57 AM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

109	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:45 AM
110	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 11:21 AM
111	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 10:36 AM
112	[redacted]	Sep 28, 2012 6:29 AM
113	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:15 PM
114	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:01 PM
115	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:44 PM
116	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:07 PM
117	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:25 PM
118	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 8:18 PM
119	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 7:44 PM
120	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 7:06 PM
121	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 6:00 PM
122	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 5:03 PM
123	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:50 PM
124	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:17 PM
125	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 4:16 PM
126	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:55 PM
127	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:50 PM
128	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:48 PM
129	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 3:25 PM
130	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:46 PM
131	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:38 PM
132	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:10 PM
133	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:04 PM
134	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 2:00 PM
135	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:43 PM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

136	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:40 PM
137	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:29 PM
138	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:18 PM
139	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 1:10 PM
140	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:59 PM
141	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:44 PM
142	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:37 PM
143	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:18 PM
144	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:14 PM
145	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:13 PM
146	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:53 AM
147	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:46 AM
148	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:12 AM
149	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 11:03 AM
150	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:49 AM
151	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:43 AM
152	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:41 AM
153	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:37 AM
154	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:36 AM
155	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:34 AM
156	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:28 AM
157	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:17 AM
158	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:15 AM
159	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
160	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:14 AM
161	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:12 AM
162	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:11 AM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

163	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
164	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:02 AM
165	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
166	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 10:01 AM
167	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:59 AM
168	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
169	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:58 AM
170	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:55 AM
171	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:49 AM
172	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:44 AM
173	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 9:43 AM
174	[redacted]	Sep 27, 2012 12:53 AM
175	[redacted]	Sep 26, 2012 6:02 PM
176	[redacted]	Sep 25, 2012 8:23 PM
177	[redacted]	Sep 25, 2012 8:24 AM
178	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 11:47 PM
179	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 6:37 PM
180	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:27 PM
181	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:23 PM
182	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:21 PM
183	[redacted]	Sep 24, 2012 12:13 PM
184	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 6:57 PM
185	[redacted]	Sep 23, 2012 8:23 AM
186	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 4:51 PM
187	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 1:57 PM
188	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 10:36 AM
189	[redacted]	Sep 22, 2012 2:51 AM

Page 9, Q3. Would you like to receive regular SR 520 program email updates?

190	[redacted]	Sep 20, 2012 9:26 PM
191	[redacted]	Sep 20, 2012 6:36 PM
192	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 9:38 PM
193	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 5:34 PM
194	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 5:21 PM
195	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 3:34 PM
196	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 10:10 AM
197	[redacted]	Sep 17, 2012 6:22 AM
198	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 4:59 PM
199	[redacted]	Sep 16, 2012 9:22 AM
200	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 8:51 PM
201	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 7:55 PM
202	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 1:43 PM
203	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 12:44 PM
204	[redacted]	Sep 15, 2012 8:55 AM
205	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 6:04 PM
206	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 5:58 PM
207	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 4:47 PM
208	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:45 PM
209	[redacted]	Sep 14, 2012 12:19 PM