

1 What are the affects of the constant exposure to the fumes
2 from the ventilation building? What type of particulate
3 matter will be released, and what are the health risks?

4 The E.I.S. should also address the change in
5 character of the ambient noise resulting from the frequency
6 and steady sound of the fans. These concerns should affect
7 a location for the building to a non-residential area. We
8 ask that you limit construction noise that exceeds the City
9 of Seattle Residential Nighttime Noise Regulation to
10 nonresidential areas of the project site. Appendix F
11 states that City noise levels are expected to be exceeded
12 in the nighttime, and this is not acceptable in a
13 residential area.

14 Phase the construction adjacent to
15 Hill Time Court to maintain parking garage access onto
16 Alaskan Way, integrate safe access into the final design,
17 provide adequate dust control during demolition, and
18 develop programs to keep the area businesses alive during
19 the project period. Having people continue to access the
20 area shops and restaurant will enhance the safety of the
21 adjacent neighborhoods. Thank you.

22 **ARTHUR M. SKOLNIK:** My name is Arthur M. Skolnik.
23 I'm a fellow of the American Institute of Action. I'm a
24 land use consultant. I live at 2515 Fourth Avenue,
25 Apartment 2702, Seattle, Washington 98121.

H-006-001

1 I'm here to provide comments regarding the adequacy
2 of the Draft Environmental Impact for the Alaskan Way
3 Viaduct Seawall Project.

4 First I want to express my deep concern and
5 opposition to the way this public hearing open house is
6 being conducted in contrast to historical examples of
7 public hearings and the ability for citizens to comment and
8 have other citizens be able to hear and acknowledge or
9 refute in their comments other comments from their fellow
10 community members. I strongly request that the comment
11 period be extended and that the State D.O.T. set three
12 additional public hearing dates that are not open houses
13 whereby the public can comment in the traditional form,
14 with an open mic, with a sign-up sheet, with limited times,
15 and the general public and media is allowed to hear those
16 comments. I feel this is a breach of the State and
17 National Environmental Policy Act, the way this is being
18 carried out.

H-006-002

19 Now to my comments about the Draft E.I.S. I feel
20 there is a bias in the Draft E.I.S. that has created
21 alternatives that reflect the most expensive options. They
22 are trying to come up with designs that deal with both the
23 replacement of the infrastructure, as well as dealing with
24 the construction phase. Most examples in the Draft E.I.S.
25 deal with keeping traffic flowing during construction.

H-006-001

We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.

H-006-002

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

H-006-002

1 That aspect of the designs extends the length of the
2 construction project by two times, which leaves this mega
3 project open to cost overruns and construction
4 interruptions that go on for 9 to 11 years. The options
5 that are being proposed need to be addressed in terms of
6 their possible shortest construction period, and that does
7 include not keeping traffic flowing in that corridor during
8 the construction period. We need to have a more adequate
9 discussion of creating the best preferred alternative in
10 the shortest period of time, and still allow the flow of
11 vehicular traffic within the City of Seattle during
12 construction, not necessarily in the construction
13 corridor.

H-006-003

14 Specifically, I feel that the Draft E.I.S. does not
15 adequately allow for an intelligent discussion of the
16 impacts that will be felt by the businesses and residences
17 and the tourist industry along the Alaskan Way, during
18 construction and even before construction. We need to
19 understand what the economic impacts will be, what the
20 business interruption costs will be, and how to develop
21 mitigation compensation so that we don't "throw the baby
22 out with the bath water."

23 The State D.O.T. must adequately address all the
24 aspects of this project to a level of specificity that
25 allows the public to understand the project and then make

H-006-003

Economic impacts are discussed in the Final EIS and Appendix L, Economics Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information regarding permanent project effects and temporary construction effects. The content and level of analysis conducted for this document is consistent with the level of design and more than adequate to inform the public and decision-makers of the probable consequences resulting from the project or from inaction.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies' decision to

1 decisions, whether it means selling your home, closing your
2 business, deciding not to take a cruise ship, or not attend
3 the Seattle Aquarium, because of the disruption. That is
4 not discussed in the Draft, and it is a serious omission.

5 I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

6 ROBERT NOKES: My name is Robert Nokes. I am a
7 homeowner in the Alaskan Way neighborhood, and you don't
8 need my address. I have read the E.I.S. Statement and I
9 think there are some deficiencies in the Statement that
10 need to be talked about.

11 But before I go into that, I would like to, for the
12 record, say that I think this kind of a forum is not an
13 appropriate way in which to hear all of the public's
14 comments with respect to the E.I.S. I think the State
15 Department of Transportation should reconsider having more
16 public meetings and having true public testimony, because I
17 think the fair bid can be gained by people speaking in
18 public and feeding on each others ideas, and flushing out
19 the full issues that are in front of the D.O.T. I see this
20 kind of a process, the open house process, as a way to kind
21 of divide and conquer the neighborhood, by isolating people
22 and having them only put their information directly to
23 either a court reporter or through a computer process. It
24 denies everyone the possibility of hearing others' opinions
25 and having actual hearing examiners, with some authority,

identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.