

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael Doyle (mailto:mdoyle1000@hotmail.com)
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2004 12:44 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov; sommers_he@leg.wa.gov
Subject: Thinking long-term

I-158-001

The cost difference in the 5 proposed Viaduct options is not that meaningful when viewed over the life of the project. Helen Sommers in her recent newsletter to her constituents has stated support for the Aerial and Rebuild options. This position is short-sighted and unfair to future generations. We have had 40 years to live with the problems and shortcomings of the existing Viaduct design. It has divided the downtown from the waterfront, created an unpleasant cave below and is an eyesore. To suggest that we leave these problems unsolved when given this once in 50-100 year opportunity is irresponsible. Only the surface option makes less sense. It would serve to further cut off the waterfront and make walking from the downtown to the waterfront unpleasant and dangerous.

We must choose one of the tunnel options. They are as little as \$100-300 million more than the aerial and rebuild options. This is not a significant enough difference to make a decision based on. If Boston can make the decision to spend \$15-20 billion improving its transportation network and quality of life by burying its elevated roadway, I would hope that we can scrape together \$4 billion.

The tunnel plans will reconnect the city and waterfront, create a beautiful space for urban parks and recreation as well as offer opportunities for new commercial and civic development. Downtown is in need of schools, grocery stores and additional residences to encourage more people to live in the city and away from traffic-inducing, forest-reducing, ugly suburbs.

I support the tunnel options and any required tax and toll programs needed to fund them. Please don't think short-term.

Regards,
Mike Doyle

I-158-001

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.