

GARY FRANKLIN
2022 12TH AVENUE SOUTH
SEATTLE, WA 98144

May 31, 2004

Ms. Allison Ray
Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement Office
Suite 2424, 999 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms. Ray:

I-191-001 Before making a decision on which option to choose to replace the viaduct, we need to be specific on the project goal. Seattle is often ranked as one of the worst cities in the nation for traffic congestion. Improving our traffic flow should be the major goal, and then the choice of options is simpler. I'm concerned that in an attempt to please all the constituencies that have opinions, we'll end up with a result that's inadequate in everything...like the joke about the camel -- a horse that was designed by a committee. Why spend millions or billions of dollars and not improve the situation?

Some have suggested that an above ground structure is a barrier between the city and waterfront and a tunnel is the answer to provide a "connection". I can think of two types of connection: visual and physical. Removing the viaduct only improves views from buildings immediately adjacent. From First Avenue eastward the waterfront can't be seen due to other buildings. The viaduct doesn't impact their views because most are above the viaduct. The viaduct doesn't hinder physical access because all major streets go under it. If re-timing stop lights and better use of surface streets is truly effective in improving traffic flow then this should be done anyway no matter what replacement option is chosen. To keep our city economically *strong we need to make it easier for people to arrive, to get around, and to leave*. Try this. Stand on the waterfront and ask yourself how much more of downtown could be seen without a viaduct? The answer is virtually nothing, and that's how much more waterfront could be seen from downtown without a viaduct. Where is any improved "connection"?

I-191-002 No one ever mentions one of the biggest barriers to accessing the waterfront and that's the train traffic. Even spending billions on a tunnel won't eliminate the railroad.

I-191-003 Finally, the best view of the waterfront is from the viaduct.

Please support replacement of the viaduct with a new one. Other more expensive options don't offer correspondingly significant benefits.

A viaduct is:

- Cost/benefit effective
- Efficient in moving traffic
- Short construction time
- Least disruptive to waterfront and businesses during construction
- Saves budget to apply toward seawall

Sincerely,



Gary Franklin
(53 year resident of Seattle)

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2004

AWWSP Team Office

I-191-001

The purpose of the project is to provide a replacement transportation facility that will, among other things, meet current seismic safety standards and provide capacity to efficiently move people and goods to and through downtown Seattle. See Chapter 1 in the Final EIS for the complete purpose and need statement for the project.

The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.

I-191-002

Comment noted. This project will not eliminate the railroad. The Final EIS discusses how the project will interact with the rail yards and rail operations located in the project area.

I-191-003

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. After studying several retrofitting concepts, the lead agencies found that rebuilding the viaduct would not be a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the risks to public safety and the weakened state of the viaduct. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.