

May 27, 2004

Allison Ray  
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator  
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project  
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424  
Seattle, WA 98104

RECEIVED  
JUN 01 2004  
AWWSP Team Office

Dear Ms. Ray:

I-134-001

I have read through the draft EIS for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall project. I have lived in Seattle all of my life, and have used the area's transportation network for the last 25 years. I have taken a keen interest in transportation issues in the area, and particularly the larger ones, such as the SR99, SR520 and I-405 challenges.

All of the options are expensive, and that is to be expected with a project of this nature. Nonetheless, I feel that if it is important to invest the money in a revitalized SR99 corridor, and I feel the most cost-effective, least risky approach is either the Rebuild or Aerial alternatives. While the tunnel option appears attractive, I think it is inherently more risky, and would be more difficult to maintain. The view corridors to be created would not really benefit the average citizen; rather, they would benefit a few property owners in the first few floors of downtown properties. All of our previous experiences with tunneling in the Seattle area suggest that it is problematic, expensive, and presents significant risk of cost overruns.

A surface alternative is entirely unrealistic, and will result in significant negative traffic impacts on the downtown surface streets, but more importantly on I-5. I-5 through the downtown area is already congested during a significant portion of the day, and pretending that all of the traffic that bypasses downtown via the viaduct can be handled with a surface street seems absurd. In addition, the effect of increased through traffic on Alaskan Way itself will prove to be even more of a barrier between the waterfront and downtown than the current viaduct is perceived to be.

The viaduct as it exists today is worn out and obsolete, but the concept is still viable. That is: grade separate the through traffic, limit the on and off ramps, and provide an alternative for freight and vehicular traffic, while allowing easier pedestrian access to the waterfront from downtown. An Aerial or Rebuild alternative would replace the viaduct, built to 21<sup>st</sup> century traffic and seismic standards, would repair the seawall, and be a significant improvement from the current situation.

I look forward to following the continued progress of this important project. I appreciate the effort required to produce the Draft EIS. I would be happy to comment further, so please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Brad Cummings, Seattle  
home phone: 206-525-1160

### I-134-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild or Aerial Alternatives. 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. The lead agencies have 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. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.