----Original Message----

From: Ann Donovan [mailto:ann@elephantsandants.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2004 6:28 PM To: awvdelscomments@wsdot.wa.gov Subject: Viaduct/Seawall DEIS Comments

Hi,

I know that jurisdiction over signage for SR-99 within the City of Seattle falls mostly to the City but I wanted to point out some problems with the current system which I hope will be addressed in the replacement. Some of these comments might fall outside of the scope of your EIS but as transportation mobility issues I think they deserve airing.

## I-155-001

#### Access to ferries

From the north of the Pike Market, prior to the entrance to SR-99 signage indicates on City streets that one should use the viaduct for access to the ferry terminal. This however is neither necessarily a good idea, nor is it supported by the City in other uses of these roadway connections. In addition to the fact that the signs on 99 are unclear as to when one should exit, First Avenue South is not managed well during events at the Safeco Field and this causes much difficulty to one trying to get to the ferry terminal. The City of Seattle police block off most southbound lanes of First Avenue which creates a chokehold on the interchange, through traffic and to the ferry terminal --- all I suppose as a measure of crowd control. I don't know why they think that it makes sense to reduce roadway capacity when demand is highest but this is the current practice. I would like to see that the viaduct replacement adequately addresses and provide direction to the ferry terminals and the waterfront.

## Usability and Signage

Signage on the current viaduct is also so abbreviated that if you are unsure of your exit to Downtown Seattle you are quickly shunted off to the ends of Downtown Seattle and have to travel via surface streets. I know that several of the proposed alternatives anticipate changing access to Downtown Seattle to outside the city center and utilizing surface streets more. It is imperative that the signage both on the SR-99 replacement and on the intended routes on the surface streets be logically and clearly marked so that visitors to our City are comfortable navigating about.

## I-155-002

# Access to Interbay/Magnolia

This is an important transportation for several of Seattle's neighborhoods and providing access to the west side of Queen Anne Hill, Interbay, Magnolia and Ballard needs to be clearly articulated via appropriate interchanges. Any expectation that this can be dealt with from Denny Way isn't realistic, not unless some serious traffic flow reworking is done and this would greatly reduce mobility on Denny Way, an already congested arterial.

#### I-155-003

#### Preferred Alternative

I prefer an all tunnel alternative as it would help open up that area of Seattle to development and help set our City apart in the World. This would likely result in the generation of more tax revenue for the State and could really help anchor the region's waterfront. The by-pass option doesn't improve the pedestrian or commercial environment unless you slowed traffic to a crawl on Alaska Way. I vote for a tunnel,

Thanks,

Ann

6/26/2004

## I-155-001

Thank you for your comments. Clear signage that meets current engineering standards will be provided for this project.

## I-155-002

The lead agencies recognize the importance of maintaining access to Queen Anne, Interbay, Magnolia, and Ballard, and the alternatives have been designed with this consideration in mind. Please see the Final EIS for current project information about access to these neighborhoods.

# I-155-003

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.