

-----Original Message-----
From: Sam Blue [mailto:bluea@blueresearch.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2004 3:25 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Cc: sommers_he@leg.wa.gov
Subject: Suggestion

I-075-001 What if:

instead of a two-tiered viaduct as a replacement.

Do a three tiered replacement - where the entire top layer is a major new park. Such an additional layer should add \$200 million for the design/build of the concrete, I have no idea how much the plantings would cost.

This proposal meets many of the objectives of the proponents of the diverse plans.

Pro:

- 1) This plan would be \$200 million more than the cheapest of the five plans.
- 2) The entire ground level would open up for heavy rail or whatever.
- 3) The 'shore' side of the park would be at/near 'ground level' around Pike Place.
- 4) This would open a major through-city bikepath. With an unparalleled view.
- 5) The south end of the park would be near the current south end of the viaduct - right near two major stadiums, an exhibition center, Pioneer Square, and the major transportation hubs at King & Union.
- 6) The sea wall and battery street tunnel aren't affected, and can be done separately if necessary.

Con:

- 1) Added cost.
- 2) Lower two floors of buildings get obstructed view. Drastically offset by the improvement to the other 20 stories of most of those buildings. (All of sound abatement, view, and park access.)

NY's Central Park has enough wildlife to attract Red Hawks. Think if something similar was possible here. We're in the Evergreen State, we have excellent suburban parks, but our downtown parks are studies in concrete and glass. Done right, I can see hawks and eagles as much more likely in a park like this - as one side fronts the bay and is thus not surrounded by buildings.

Sorry if this seems outlandish - but we have done something similar for Mercer Island and the rest of I-90 into Seattle. This would be far more accessible, and would seem an excellent site for many community building activities.

Alan S. Blue
bluea@blueresearch.com

I-075-001

Thank you for providing your ideas to add a third deck to the viaduct as a public open space. The public would be well-served by additional public open space along the waterfront; however, it would be difficult for people to access such an area since it would be located nearly 90 feet (nine stories) above the existing waterfront street level. The additional deck would also severely affect views for owners, residents, and tenants in many downtown buildings, reducing property values for many properties. The third deck would also negatively affect views from downtown to the waterfront. A similar idea was considered during the 2008 Partnership Process. Ultimately, the lead agencies identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative due to its ability to best meet the project's identified purposes and needs and the support it has received from diverse interests. Specifically, compared to the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, it avoids substantial closure of SR 99 during construction and it can be built in a shorter period of time than the other two alternatives. Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) in the Final EIS provide a more in-depth comparison of trade-offs for the three alternatives.