

1 values, lost business, lost tax revenues and reduced
2 revenues from cruise ship patrons. The E.I.S. does not
3 adequately address pedestrian traffic during and after the
4 construction, specifically for pedestrians getting to and
5 from the Pike Place Market and the waterfront. All the
6 alternatives don't consider extending the tunnel for the
7 trains further north, which would improve the traffic flow
8 on the northern part of Alaskan Way.

9 JONATHAN DAVID: I think that the three comments that
10 I want to make about the Draft E.I.S. are: No. 1, is that
11 I'm concerned that it doesn't mention anything about
12 business impacts or how we're going to maintain the
13 businesses that are alive and well in the water front right
14 now throughout construction, and what we're going to do
15 there. No. 2, it says nothing about property values for
16 people that live on the waterfront, which I do, and I care
17 a whole lot about that. And No. 3, there's no specific
18 mention of the option where we build something to replace
19 the Viaduct but in the meantime don't do a lot of work to
20 reroute traffic, we kind of accept the fact that traffic
21 might need to reroute itself, and we get the job done as
22 fast as we can by just focusing on the final product. That
23 is all. Thank you.

24 MAX FOSTER: My name is Max Foster. I live at 2549 -
25 34th Avenue West, in Seattle, which is the Magnolia

H-025-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies' decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

1 neighborhood. I've lived in Seattle since 1988. Before
2 that, I lived in Alaska.

3 I love Seattle, and even when I lived in Alaska, I
4 always enjoyed visiting Seattle. One of my favorite areas
5 to visit was the waterfront. I fell in love with it before
6 I ever moved here. Since I moved here I've enjoyed,
7 immensely, living in Magnolia. My business is located in
8 Magnolia, however, we have customers all over Puget Sound.
9 Many of our customers are in West Seattle and Renton, and
10 for our business we frequently visit those customers, we
11 use the Viaduct, we consider Highway 99 a vital
12 transportation link for us. I-5 is not a good substitute
13 for that, so we consider whatever it takes to make
14 Highway 99 a viable transportation artery, and to continue
15 to be that, is an important priority for government and for
16 citizens of Seattle King County and Washington State.

17 I will say my background has been working in
18 utilities and transportation, and I currently own a
19 computer services company. When I worked in utilities I
20 did feasibility studies for two hydroelectric projects that
21 were built in Alaska. One was tie Tyee Lake, and the other
22 one was Terror Lake. I also worked on a hydroelectric
23 project that was not built, called the Susitna Project.
24 Having been through that experience, I know the great
25 benefits from the projects that were built, and I know the

1 opportunity that was missed by the project that was not
2 built.

3 As a citizen of Seattle, I believe that taking the
4 same road of not building the correct transportation artery
5 for the viaduct replacement will have the same impact as
6 not building the Susitna hydro project. It will be a great
7 opportunity lost for the citizenry of Seattle, as well as
8 Washington State.

9 I also, when I moved to Seattle, worked on the.

10 Metro Tunnel project and the West Point Treatment
11 Plant project, secondary treatment project, doing cash
12 management when employed at Metro. I know about building
13 large projects, and I know what it takes in terms of the
14 financing and the resources to do those projects. It seems
15 to me that I'd like to make four points in my testimony
16 here on that. One is, many people are saying right now
17 that we don't have the money to spend or we don't want to
18 spend this money on doing this project, or we want to do
19 the least amount of spending on this project. Most of
20 those people who are pleading that we can't afford to do
21 this have their own priorities. Many of them are
22 supporting Light Rail, many of them are supporting the
23 Monorail. Some of them just want to plead the need to cut
24 taxes or to keep taxes down. I believe that pleading
25 poverty is an attempt to stop the argument for doing the

1 right thing about the Viaduct replacement, without really
2 ever allowing the arguments or the merits for all the
3 different alternatives to be considered.

4 I also think that it's absolutely not true that we
5 can't afford the project. In fact, we have both the tax
6 base and the revenue to afford it, and I can say this from
7 having looked at all the various bond rating agencies'
8 criteria, and certainly a \$4-billion dollar project or a
9 \$2-billion dollar project could be afforded easily by the
10 citizenry of Seattle, King County and the State of
11 Washington. We have the tax base, we also have the
12 opportunity to use non tax financing, as in tolls, for
13 instance. All of those could certainly pay for this
14 project over a reasonable period, 30, 40 or even 50 years
15 for financing.

16 My second point, the most expensive option is
17 usually not considered to be the best case. In many
18 projects people look for the lowest cost option. However,
19 in this case the most expensive option appears to be the
20 best option. And when we say the most expensive, I mean
21 the most expensive up front cost. In this case we're
22 talking about spending \$4-billion to build a tunnel to
23 replace the aerial viaduct. The other options, the aerial
24 option and the surface option, have some real deficiencies,
25 whereas the tunnel provides a great opportunity, not only

1 to meet the transportation problem, which it does quite
2 well, and actually provides better than any other
3 alternative for future transportation growth, but it also
4 fixes the problem of the Seawall, which needs to be
5 replaced, and frees up the space currently occupied by the
6 Viaduct. This permits the expansion and development of the
7 waterfront.

8 The aerial option would maintain the same dominance
9 that the current viaduct has over the land, and will
10 actually cause the transportation problem to not be
11 improved. We still will have to replace the Seawall,
12 regardless of whether we do the aerial option or a tunnel
13 option.

14 The surface option actually exacerbates the
15 transportation problem. It also dominates the land,
16 actually, in a much worse way than the aerial option does.
17 Worse, it cuts off the waterfront from the rest of the
18 city, causing that area to become potentially an
19 economically wasted area.

20 In addition, the aerial option and the surface
21 option actually lend themselves to earthquake
22 vulnerability, as that area is a fill area, and only by
23 building a strong, secure Seawall and proper foundations
24 can we ensure that that area is not subject to immense
25 earthquake damage.

1 I would say the bypass tunnel is also insufficient
2 in that the capacity of the tunnel is just not worth the
3 cost. If we're going to build a tunnel, we might as well
4 do it right and build the full tunnel.

5 My third point is we have an opportunity to develop
6 a waterfront neighborhood. The Mayor of the City of
7 Seattle has exercised leadership in this area, has been
8 conducting a community based effort to look at how we could
9 develop and strengthen the waterfront neighborhood and
10 develop strong ties with both the Downtown and the Bell
11 Town neighborhoods.

12 In addition, we can also provide for the stadiums in
13 providing parking and enhanced use of the stadium areas,
14 along with building a central area for community activities
15 in the area vacated by the old viaduct when it's torn
16 down.

17 What we need is a framework for financing this
18 project. First of all, we can and should receive federal
19 highway funds. Second, we should look to revenue bond
20 fundings. We can do this by securing the bonds through
21 toll collection and by establishing a local improvement
22 district for all the businesses which would benefit greatly
23 in the area of the waterfront. In this we should be
24 liberal. We should look all the way up to businesses on
25 Second Avenue, down to the waterfront, in establishing the

1 local improvement district.

2 Finally, we should look at some general obligation
3 bond financing, which would include property tax and
4 vehicle licensing tax revenue, as the basis for the general
5 obligation bond financing.

6 I also want to conclude by saying that I was
7 privileged at one time to listen to Ezra Solomon, who is a
8 tremendous Ph.D. economist, who talked about projects such
9 as the Viaduct replacement project. And he pointed out
10 that frequently when doing these projects people tend to
11 overlook the extraneous costs of doing a particular
12 alternative, and also overlook some of the benefits. He
13 called these spill-outs and spill-ins. In the case of most
14 of the options, there's a tremendous spill-in for the
15 project, in terms of the aerial options or the surface
16 option or even the bypass tunnel, and that is that they not
17 only do not directly solve the transportation unit, but
18 they don't lend themselves to developing the community.
19 There's a tremendous spill-out from the project, in a
20 positive way, in terms of the tunnel, where it does allow
21 us to greatly promote our community and to build a strong
22 Downtown, Bell Town and waterfront area, in addition to
23 providing for the transportation of today and tomorrow.

24 And so, I hope that those people who are deciding
25 upon how to do this project and on which options to

H-025-001

1 proceed, do not get caught up in a bigger type philosophy
2 of "We can't afford it." We absolutely can afford it, and
3 we absolutely should, in this case, build the most high
4 cost alternative, which is the tunnel. Thank you.

5 **o0o**
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25