

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Whit Hamlin  
Address:  
City:  
State:  
Zip Code: 98121  
Email: whithamlin@hotmail.com  
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-230-001

Seattle has had many previous opportunities to improve itself in a major way via infrastructure projects. As a community, we have generally failed to take advantage of these opportunities. A few examples of Seattle failures: The City plan from 100 years ago. This would have given Seattle a true center and facilitated the movement of people and goods much better. Forward Thrust - Rail. We could have had the federal government pay for 90% of a comprehensive rail system. That system would have been built before urban density increased to the point it is currently at. This change in density adds significant costs to all infrastructure projects today. So instead of a less expensive system funded 90% by the rest of the country, we have an incredibly expensive system funded 90% by us. This represents a monumental failure by the community. Seattle Commons. We had an opportunity to create an amazing spine of open space available to all citizens. This was voted down because of fears that the industrial area would gentrify, and because citizens here have a history of being cheap and without vision (I am in the fifth generation of my family to live here so can say this from the "inside"). In the end, the neighborhood gentrifies anyway, and we have no park. Incredibly shortsighted by us. Bury I-5 through downtown. When I-5 was built, there was a marginal cost to bury significant portions of I-5 through downtown. This would have maintained connections between Capitol Hill and Downtown / South Lake Union. Did we go for it? No. Why, because this region has a history of not having vision. One more opportunity. We now have an opportunity to do something right with regards to infrastructure. Our pattern as a city and a region is to go down the shortsighted route of picking the cheapest option (some city examples - Kingdome, all of the municipal buildings, etc.). Why don't we do the right thing for once and CHOOSE THE TUNNEL OPTION? Anyone who has been to San Francisco, Boston, Vancouver, or just about anywhere in Europe can see the benefits of not having a freeway, especially an elevated one, cutting right through the urban fabric. This is our chance to reconnect the waterfront, to lower noise, to spur development, and to pick an option using more factors than "what is the cheapest option?" Another reason: The cost is almost the same for the tunnel option as the others, and yet we would get all the benefits. A Question of Revenues. Has anyone studied the estimated revenues to the City based on the different options? If the viaduct goes away and the automobile capacity is replaced under the surface, land values will immediately rise all along the central waterfront. This will raise tax collections. Why is this not factored into

I-230-002

### I-230-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 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 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

### I-230-002

The Final EIS includes qualitative economic analysis of the preferred alternative to more fully describe project indirect benefits, such as increased downtown property values. A broader discussion of the project's economic costs and benefits can be found in Appendix L, Economics Discipline Report, to the Final EIS.

**I-230-002**

the DEIS? Furthermore, not only will choosing the tunnel option immediately raise revenues, but it will spur new development. This will create permanent and temporary jobs, new residences, offices, etc., increased tax revenues, more tourism, and many other benefits. The economic implications of the tunnel alternative make this choice not even close. It's time for Seattle to stop the pattern of poor planning choices, poor infrastructure investments, and shortsightedness. Let's embrace a new attitude of long-term vision, of making public investments that provide the highest returns, and of making this place better for all people. The choice is easy here. Pick the tunnel alternative.

Comments apply to:  
Overall Project