

1 adequately addresses how to compensate for disruption of
2 residential privacy, and I don't feel that the
3 Environmental Impact Study adequately addresses improving
4 the current infrastructure through the downtown area.

5 I was also disappointed that the hearing today was
6 not a public hearing, that residents did not get a chance
7 to hear what everyone else was saying, and to be heard by
8 their fellow Downtown residents.

9 I also don't think the Environmental Impact Study
10 adequately addressed public safety, during the construction
11 project and after. Thank you.

12 ROBIN ATLAS: I just wanted to say that this is
13 probably the biggest project that this city has undertaken
14 in decades, and the City's only got one chance to really
15 make it right. And I think that, in my opinion, as someone
16 who lives on the waterfront, I'd like to see the waterfront
17 and the downtown area reconnected, with lots of open, green
18 space. And I think in order to accomplish that the best
19 alternative is the tunnel. It doesn't seem to me that in
20 terms of time and inconvenience, if it takes, you know, one
21 year or six months, here or there, it doesn't seem to make
22 a lot of difference, and I'd like the City to really think
23 very carefully about what impact this is going to have to
24 all of us that live in the waterfront area and play in the
25 waterfront area, and spend your dollars wisely. That's

H-018-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

H-018-002

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.

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

H-018-002

1 it.

2 As far as the impact on the quality of life for the
3 people who live on the waterfront, we're going to be
4 decimated in terms of our quality of life if you decide to
5 build the fly-over, when you do the aerial, you know,
6 replacement of the aerial proposal, I suppose. We'll be
7 affected by the construction of the fly-over, we'll be
8 affected by the noise that's generated by all the cars that
9 are whizzing by in front of our windows, essentially, and
10 we'll be affected adversely by all of the pollution that's
11 going to be produced by all of the cars whizzing by our
12 windows, and I just don't think that that's a very viable
13 idea.

H-018-003

14 One of the things that I'd like to see is you just
15 knock the darned thing down and do an experiment for a year
16 and see how people maneuver and how they get into the city,
17 and see if doing nothing is actually a good alternative.
18 If the City steps up and they build Park and Ride, and they
19 help people with alternatives, and encourage them to leave
20 their cars at home, better yet for all of us.

21 So, there's a lot for you all to consider, and in
22 the end, I'd like to see a tunnel get built down on the
23 waterfront. Thank you.

24 SUZAN NETTLESHIP: My name is Suzan Nettleship, and
25 I've been a resident on the waterfront for approximately —

EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies' decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

H-018-003

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the 2004 Draft EIS and 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.