

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Robert Berghuis
Address: 4404 28th Pl, W.
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98199
Email:
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

- I-065-001** I am 100% in favor of the Rebuild option. It will handle the highest volume of traffic in the shortest time period, it is least costly, has the least disruption, provides the most parking for those visiting or using the ferries, & provides a beautiful view of the waterfront to those of us who cannot afford to live on the water. I have driven the viaduct daily for the last 32 years & it is one of the special treats that a driver has in downtown Seattle. I enjoy the views (of small boats, large ships, Mt. Rainier, the Olympic mountains, stadiums, buildings, concerts, sunsets, para-sails, the list is endless) the action, & the aromas from the waterfront restaurants. I don't know how many times I've seen something that prompted me to follow up with a visit to the waterfront to participate in shopping, dining or activities. If I were limited to travel through a tunnel my visits to the waterfront & downtown would decrease considerably (out of sight, out of mind). We cannot afford a reduction in capacity since it is virtually impossible to increase the capacity of I-5 the other major alternative to N-S traffic through Seattle. My second choice would be the Aerial Alternative. However I do not understand why it would be proposed that the volume of traffic would be intentionally reduced on SR99 & that parking would be eliminated without increasing the capacity on Alaskan Way. I absolutely am opposed to any of the tunnel alternatives. They are too costly, take too long to build, have less capacity, & I do not want to be traveling below the level of Puget Sound in the event of an earthquake. I find the cost & volume projections to be very suspect & get the distinct impression that they were backed into in an attempt to get initial support when the reality is that they are considerably higher. I definitely do not believe that increasing the number of lanes on the surface streets from 4 to 6 on Alaskan Way will allow an increase in the traffic volume from 10,000 to almost 50,000, especially if as you project there will be more people walking across Alaskan Way to get between the waterfront & downtown. I also find the projection on the tunnel alternative that shows that Alaskan Way volume can be increased from 10,000 to 21,000 without an increase in number of lanes to be extremely dubious. The surface street option is too ludicrous to even consider. There is no way that 6 lanes of traffic will be able to move 74,000 vehicles a day & the travel time will be considerably higher than those projections. Talk about a barrier to pedestrians & a bottleneck for through traffic. The area population cannot afford another costly bill when we cannot handle the costs that we have now. Politicians need to be accountable & limit costs the way that the public must. How much money does the city stand to lose by eliminating the revenue from the parking under the viaduct? I don't see this included with any of the cost projections. Those with the most to gain are the downtown property owners whose views are blocked by the viaduct & stand to benefit at the cost of everyone else. No one I've spoken with has expressed their feeling that this is any more of an eyesore or barrier to the waterfront than the existing railway line that runs along the waterfront & disrupts traffic flow. We cannot decrease the volume of daily traffic moved quickly through the city & all options except the rebuild do exactly that. I firmly believe that selection of an alternative for this issue is too important to be left to agencies that have apparent biases. Ultimate decision making should be with the voters & I will oppose any attempt to railroad the voters. The Port of Seattle is notorious for deciding based upon their own agenda & making up their minds before accepting any citizen input.
- I-065-002**
- I-065-003**
- I-065-004**

Comments apply to:
Overall Project

I-065-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. After studying several retrofitting concepts, the lead agencies found that rebuilding the viaduct would not be a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the risks to public safety and the weakened state of the viaduct. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. The aerial structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report. "Before" and "after" view simulations of the alternatives can be found in Final EIS Appendix E.

I-065-002

We acknowledge your comment stating your concerns and preferences for the alternatives studied.

I-065-003

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. Lost revenue from the removal of parking meters/pay stations associated with the removal of parking spaces is presented in the Final EIS and Appendix L, Economics

Discipline Report.

Adjacent property owners could potentially receive indirect economic benefits associated with increased property values and increased potential for redevelopment. The City of Seattle may consider a Local Improvement District (LID) in the future, but it is not part of the project.

I-065-004

Thank you for stating your preference for the Rebuild Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information. The alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS maintain or improve traffic flow compared to existing conditions. Additional information about travel times and speeds for the preferred alternative is provided in the Final EIS.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle will continue to provide multiple opportunities for public involvement and feedback as we move forward with this project. FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are working with the Port of Seattle on this project, but the Port will not decide which alternative gets built. Thank you for providing your comments.