

From: David Jenkins [mailto:pranddj@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, September 08, 2006 6:37 AM
To: WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct
Subject: Tunnel Option

Hello Kristy,

I-635-001

I am writing you this email because I heard on the local news that the state needs more input on what the citizens of Seattle want regarding the Viaduct. I, as well as about everyone I know, believe that the tunnel option is the best, despite the higher cost. The revitalization it would create for the waterfront, would increase tourism and make the city's waterfront more inviting. Now, I make less than \$25000 a year, and I am willing to front \$100 to get the project going. If I can do that with my current income, anyone can. I think that building the tunnel with toll booths would also be a good idea and would pay for the project not only quicker, but by the people who use it.

One thing that really upsets me is that people have forgotten that the current viaduct is the same (design and architect) as the viaduct in San Francisco that pan caked and killed all of those people. Rebuilding a viaduct would be a mistake, if you ask me. Not only are they ugly, they're dangerous.

Thank you for your time

Paul Racchetta
pranddj@earthlink.net

I-635-001

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.