From: Marcela Carson
To: AWV SDEIS Comments;
CC:
Subject: above ground Viaduct plan
Date: Sunday, August 13, 2006 7:55:34 AM
Attachments:

I-560-001

My comment is this. I have at least 10 people that I know personally that use the viaduct daily. In discussing the above ground or underground options, they all have stated that they would rather have the above ground plan. Several factors have influenced their preference, here are some of them. SAFETY- when we have an earthquake, they would rather be above ground and therefore have a chance to get out than be trapped underground. MONEY- it would cost too much to have the underground option. LENGTH OF TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION-The above ground option timeline is considerably shorter than the tunnel. I wonder if the real estate developers are not pushing for the underground plan as they, of course, would be able to build more "condos" and such also. As a life long Seattle resident, homeowner, I feel that the viaduct is a Seattle landmark and it needs to stay that way. I am sending the link to your page to my friends and family that use the viaduct. Hopefully, the Mayor and WSDOT listen to us this time. We did not want a stadium and voted on that, it was built anyways!!!

Sincerely Yours,
Marcela Carson
MRCarson801@msn.com

I-560-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion

Cut-and-Cover – $3.0 to $3.6 billion

Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

Please note that the Elevated Structure Alternative is expected to take longer to construct than the Bored Tunnel and Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives. The construction duration for the Elevated Structure would be about 10 years; 5.4 years for the Bored Tunnel Alternative; and 8.75 years for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative.