AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: doug kaimakis
Address: 5501 latona ave ne
City: seattle
State: wa
Zip Code: 98105
Email: drkai@nwlink.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-286-001 When the tunnel concepts were announced, my initial reaction was against any such concept. First, the high cost was a big problem for me; second, the elevated route through the city generally works and provides magnificent city/water views for commuters & visitors. Nothing has changed my mind since. In fact, I'm confused about the significantly lowered cost estimate for the full tunnel option - perhaps this is due to a shorter tunnel? I'm very dubious about the "re-attach Seattle to the waterfront" benefit that has been used to advance the cause of a tunnel. While the varying schemes for the public space are somewhat intriguing, the largest benefit seems to accrue to the owners of real estate east of the right-of-way. Since tax-increment financing is illegal in our state, I'd like to see some sort of direct jv investment by these land owners, since their property values will increase

I-286-002 dramatically. Another concern I have is the lack of provision (it appears) for any sort of fixed mass transit along this route. Whether or not such a system can every get approved, it would seem prudent to build a replacement to the viaduct that would at least support such an opportunity (e.g., light rail/monorail for several miles n/s along the corridor). My

I-286-003 preferences, then, in descending order: 1. Rebuild alternative 2. Aerial alternative 3. Bypass tunnel alternative 4. Tunnel alternative 5. Surface alternative Despite the higher cost of the tunnels, I believe they are better than trying to shoe horn huge traffic volumes onto a surface-only replacement. One of the biggest issues related to the surface systems is that they don't really address bypass or through traffic, which is a large percentage of total vehicle travel. The types of signalling or ped overpasses needed to maintain a high n-s traffic flow would, I think, largely undermine any visual benefit of removing the structure - you'd still have a "wall of traffic" separating the city from the waterfront.

Comments apply to:
All of the Alternatives

I-286-001

Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area's Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

I-286-002

The alternatives analyzed did not include items other than those directly relating to replacement of the existing viaduct. High-capacity transit (HCT) developments are being addressed by other agencies, specifically Sound Transit. Potential HCT alignments that have been developed in the long-range plans for these agencies did not include the SR 99/Alaskan Way Viaduct corridor. HCT is not precluded from each alternative, but long-range state, regional, and local transportation plans do not envision HCT being deployed in this corridor.

I-286-003

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.