

## AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: David Haggith  
 Address: 3100 W. Commodore Way, #300  
 City: Seattle  
 State: WA  
 Zip Code: 98199  
 Email: haggith@earthlink.net  
 Affiliation (optional): Signature Communications

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

## Project Comments:

I-227-001

Based on your environmental impact statement, I think we have been handed an opportunity to deal once-and-for-all with a problem that has been long discussed in Seattle. Many citizens, business owners and people involved in Seattle's economic development have wanted for years to get rid of the blight created by the Viaduct. Now we have the opportunity to do that for very little cost. Since the Viaduct must be replaced no matter what, the cost of finally getting rid of it for good is only the difference between the replacement cost and the tunnel cost. A small price to pay for the enormous economic and social benefits created. One thing mentioned a couple of times in your EIS is the trade-off of views for drivers v. people living, working, and shopping downtown and tourists on the waterfront. In my opinion people who are driving shouldn't be distracted by spectacular views anyway, especially when travelling at sixty miles per hour on an aerial route. As your EIS points out, removing the Viaduct completely opens expansive views for all the people who live and work downtown at or below the viaduct level. What isn't mentioned is that it also IMPROVES the quality of the view for all who live or work ABOVE the Viaduct. So everyone downtown benefits by putting the route underground. Also not mentioned in the EIS is the important fact that the tunnel options open up the view BACK toward the city FROM the waterfront for all the tourists on the waterfront and tourists entering the city by boat and ship. That's a LOT to be gained for the sake of what drivers lose who should be paying attention to the road and not the view anyway. And it's LOT to be gained for the difference in price between rebuilding the viaduct and building a tunnel. As your EIS mentions, the tunnel options also greatly dampen the horrendous noise across the entire face of our town. Who wants to roaring traffic while they're enjoying our city's primary tourist attraction -- its waterfront -- or what could be its primary tourist attraction. What's more important? A spectacular view for those who are on the viaduct for all of five minutes at 55mph ... or the view plus freedom from noise for those who look at the view for several hours many days a week? Would it make more sense to save the view for people who shouldn't be looking while taking it away from all of those who should??? One political argument that has been raised against the Viaduct is that fuel truck will not be able to travel through a tunnel. To the best of my knowledge that is the only negative traffic impact of the six-lane tunnel. In fifteen years of traveling the viaduct, I don't think I've ever seen a fuel truck. So, they can't represent a significant traffic factor. I would also point out that putting fuel trucks twenty feet above the ground at sixty miles an hour is as questionable from a safety point of view as running them through a tunnel. Perhaps its time for the Seattle Fire Department to consider the risk of a fuel truck careening over the rails and throwing its fuel

I-227-002

6/26/2004

## I-227-001

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. A tunnel alternative would create more open space along the waterfront. This new space could be converted into a variety of new uses like a waterfront promenade, bike and pedestrian paths, and expanded streetcar service. Also, if the viaduct is removed, scenic views to, from, and along the waterfront would be opened up, making the waterfront more attractive visually, and seem more connected to downtown, Pioneer Square, Pike Place Market, and Belltown. Please refer to the Final EIS for more information on how the alternatives have developed since the 2004 Draft EIS and how the preferred alternative was selected.

## I-227-002

Yes, with either tunnel alternative, freight with hazardous and/or flammable cargo would be prohibited in the tunnel. Instead of traveling on SR 99 through downtown, freight with such cargo would be required to use another route, such as Alaskan Way or I-5. While this impact would be inconvenient to some, the lead agencies still have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative due to its ability to best meet the project's identified purposes and needs.

**I-227-002** all over the streets below. The city would be safer if the small number of fuel trucks involved travelled at ground level on I-5. There is no fishing fleet nor any pleasure boats on the downtown waterfront, so there would be no impact to the maritime industry along the waterfront. Any maritime fuel needs along the downtown waterfront are already handled by the surface roads anyway because you can't drive a fuel truck off of the viaduct to service the downtown maritime industry. Delivering oil between the Ballard Interbay area and the Duwamish and West Seattle via I-5 would only add a few extra miles. All the needs of downtown ought not to be held hostage to that minor increase in delivery costs. Since all other maritime truck deliveries can still happen by the tunnel, the only impact to the maritime industry would be the delivery of flammables between north and south Seattle. That's a tiny economic impact compared to the unmeasured negative economic impact that already exists with the raised Viaduct. Removing the viaduct will remove an enormous EXISTING negative impact and result in a huge economic boon for all of downtown. If the state is going to stretch beyond its approximate \$2M fundraising capacity, then stretch the furthest and enable Seattle to do a major project right for once. The enormous economic and social benefits of putting all the traffic underground -- the big tunnel -- is an absolute bargain, given that the difference in cost between building the aerial and the tunnel is only half a billion dollars. I also want to point out that expanding the existing aerial by twenty feet makes the Viaduct bigger an uglier than ever, and so many people already hate the imposing shadow of the existing viaduct and the dank, dirty area underneath that an expanded aerial only makes the current situation worse. Now is the only shot we'll ever have at putting the entire blight of the Viaduct underground. To miss this opportunity for the sake of immediate financial considerations would be the biggest political mistake in a long, long time. The economic cost to the city of Seattle over the next hundred years that is imposed even by the existing Viaduct is almost incalculable. By comparison the cost of the big tunnel (with all the ramp options for servign Ballard and Interbay) is calculable and a bargain. Do it right. Pick the Cadillac option that will forever improve the city of Seattle. In the process, don't add any new lanes of traffic to the surface. Keep that area for parking and for park space. (Ideally, you should even add underground parking for the waterfront in order to get the automobile as far out of the picture as possible.) This will be the single greatest improvement to city of Seattle since the World's Fair. And wasn't that all about Seattle being the Transportation City of the future. Let's live up to the promise of the World's Fair and think for the future, not allowing immediate financial constraints to hobble the city's future forever. The only cost of the tunnel now is the difference in price between that option and replacement. --David Haggith

Comments apply to:  
Tunnel Alternative

Impacts and mitigation related to freight transportation are discussed in detail in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

### **I-227-003**

The cost estimates for the build alternatives have been updated since the Draft EIS was published. Project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Please refer to the Summary Chapter of the Final EIS for a summary of the cost and funding information for the alternatives.

### **I-227-004**

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 publication of the Draft EIS in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information about the build alternatives.

The exact configuration and types of activities provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project led by the City of Seattle.

6/26/2004