From: Chris Maynard [mailto:chriswm@u.washington.edu]

Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2006 8:11 PM To: WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct S

ubject: Viaduct Replacement

I-618-001

Hi Kristy, I vote for a tunnel. 50 years ago Seattle made a mistake by putting an ugly eyesore on it's waterfront. Now it's our chance to right that wrong, and building a tunnel is the right decision. Although the tunnel option costs about a billion dollars more, it's definitely a wise investment that will reap great returns in the future. I'm 20 years old, and 50 years from now I'd love to be able to say that I was there when Seattle began a new era in city beautification. I'm a conservative who looks for all oppportunities to cut taxes, but this is one project where I wouldn't mind the extra cost if necessary. If we can spend nearly a billion dollars on our stadiums (which was a waste), why can't we spend another billion on a project that will actually benefit every Seattleite?

Thanks, Chris Maynard

I-618-001

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.