

From: Jacob
To: AWV SDEIS Comments;

I-665-001

Hello, We need real transportation options for this area which is high speed rail, sidewalks that connect to all of the streets and to the water front. In all of the plans there is no transit plans or trains that need to be there. Neither the tunnel plan nor the elevated plan is affordable, and neither is an environmentally friendly choice. I urge you to develop a range of lower cost alternatives for viaduct replacement. Include the Transit + Streets approach, where all the available capacity in the transportation network is considered and employed to provide mobility in this corridor. This alternative will save us money, provide increased mobility for everyone in the area, not just a single corridor, improve transit service, help meet greenhouse gas reduction goals, and provide a true waterfront for all.

I-665-002

Construction Traffic Management Plan, which plans to fix the street grid and improve transit while the Viaduct is torn down and replaced. Regardless of solution chosen, we should get started implementing the recommendations from the Plan today. We know the existing Viaduct is unsafe, and we need to tear it down as soon as possible.

I-665-003

Advisors from outside Washington State have looked at the current planning process, and find it lacking.

An excellent, expert report from the Congress for the New Urbanism provides details:

http://www.cnu.org/news/index.cfm?formAction=press_release_item&press_release_id=92&CFID=14890562&CFTOKEN=13704183

They conclude that the analysis of traffic capacity and needs by WSDOT is inadequate, and strongly recommend more work on the Transit + Streets approach.

from
Jacob Struiksma
Feetfirst policy board member
Community Transit citizens Advisory council board member
Second vice president of the National federation of the blind of Washington (NFB) greater Seattle chapter
vice president of the national federation of the blind of Washington northwest chapter
transportation choices Coalition member
lawnmower84@hotmail.com

I-665-001

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.

I-665-002

Formal adoption of project mitigation measures, including transportation mitigation, will be through the Final EIS and the project Record of Decision. The intent is to have as many measures as possible in place before construction begins.

I-665-003

Thank you for sharing this article. The project team has conducted a thorough analysis of alternatives as described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Please refer to Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, in the

Final EIS for updated information regarding traffic analysis in the corridor.