

I-165-001

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rob Dunn [mailto:robd@aphrodite.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 21, 2004 10:09 PM

**To:** viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov

**Subject:** no-highway

Hi,

I would like to see a no-highway alternative to the viaduct EIS. The money spent on a new highway could be better served to make improvements to arterial streets and transit.

When San Francisco lost the **Embarcadero** Freeway the traffic moved else where or disappeared and the city was given back it's waterfront. I want Seattle to have the same chance.

Thanks,

Rob Dunn

### I-165-001

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 Draft and 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.