

From: [Winn Cody](#)
To: [AWV SDEIS Comments](#);
CC:
Subject: Viaduct Comment
Date: Friday, September 22, 2006 11:44:38 AM
Attachments:

To Whom It May Concern,

I-566-001 While I realize I am no expert, I have (briefly) reviewed most of the documents on your website regarding the viaduct and I would at least like to voice my opinion. To me, the tunnel option represents the best choice for both transportation and our city. We get to keep a vital piece of the transportation puzzle while reconnecting Seattle to its waterfront, something that is often overlooked in the discussion. As for construction, the intermediate option makes the most sense, as it's a compromise between down-time for SR 99 and cost.

As an aside, I grew up near Boston and lived with the city divided from its waterfront. I visited this summer and now that the Big Dig is (mostly) complete the change is amazing. It's an easy and pleasant walk to the waterfront, not a loud, noisy one. I hope to see this for Seattle. Also, I realize that mentioning the Big Dig is sometimes taboo these days, but the reality is that the Big Dig's goal was achieved, it just leaves something to be desired with regards to its execution. This is a problem that I don't see happening in Seattle.

Thanks for your consideration,

Winn Cody

I-566-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 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 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.