

From: Peter House [phinney6@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2004 5:47 PM
To: RayAlli@wsdot.wa.gov
Cc: phinney6@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: AWV Draft EIS Comment Form

I-263-001

Ray: I will try to reconstruct from memory:

1. The current configuration is something I like. I like the free access that everyone has to the world class views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound and the Olympics.
2. If we go with a tunnel, I think we must raise taxes on any property owner who realizes a windfall gain once the viaduct comes down. It would be wrong for a private property owner to benefit from this public project. If they do, we should tax them as a way to recoup the costs of the project. This would be complicated public policy but well worth the effort. The (1989?) earthquake in San Francisco offers a nice natural experiment of what happens to property values when a viaduct comes down.

Peter House

Peter House at home (phinney6@hotmail.com)
(Please write to me at my hotmail address
if your communication is not work-related.)

I-263-001

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 tax structure that the City of Seattle chooses to implement is not the purview of WSDOT or any of its projects. We encourage you to contact your City Council to discuss these types of issues related to property taxes.