

**From:** [KSM44@aol.com](mailto:KSM44@aol.com)  
**To:** [sally.clark@seattle.gov](mailto:sally.clark@seattle.gov);  
**CC:** [Richard.Conlin@seattle.gov](mailto:Richard.Conlin@seattle.gov); [David.Della@seattle.gov](mailto:David.Della@seattle.gov);  
[Jan.Drago@seattle.gov](mailto:Jan.Drago@seattle.gov); [Jean.Godden@seattle.gov](mailto:Jean.Godden@seattle.gov); [nick.licata@seattle.gov](mailto:nick.licata@seattle.gov); [Peter.Steinbrueck@seattle.gov](mailto:Peter.Steinbrueck@seattle.gov); [Tom.Rasmussen@seattle.gov](mailto:Tom.Rasmussen@seattle.gov); [Richard.McIver@seattle.gov](mailto:Richard.McIver@seattle.gov);  
[AWW SDEIS Comments; mayor@crm.seattle.gov](mailto:AWW_SDEIS_Comments_mayor@crm.seattle.gov);  
**Subject:** NO VOTE  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2006 2:16:30 PM  
**Attachments:**

**I-619-001** Please do not hold a vote at this time on the viaduct alternatives. Neither of the two options is affordable. It is an excessive expenditure of billions of dollars for a very limited amount of roadway, which does NOT include a public transportation system. More roads, inevitably, lead to more automobile congestion. It's a never-ending scenario. We need to identify new alternatives Seattle can afford, and I support a Transit + Streets proposal that invests in transit, improves multiple street interchanges, and reclaims the waterfront. It is affordable and will finally get Seattle 'moving' on the mass transit front. The Viaduct will be closed anyway, for several years, and it will become clearly apparent where that traffic goes, and where new and reconfigured interchanges and transit will be the best solution. In addition, from a broader perspective, a viaduct, or tunnel, does not serve a large enough percentage of the population to justify the expense. Transit and Streets is a more equitable solution for everyone.

Both the tunnel plan and the replacement plan are obscenely costly, and it still leaves Seattle without a viable public transit system. The taxpayers, who will ultimately foot the bill for this, should at least be given the Transit & Streets option in any vote about this issue. Please do NOT put this vote forth with only these two astronomically expensive choices. Streets and Transit MUST be included in the voting options.

Sincerely,  
Karen Merola

#### **I-619-001**

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.