

Name: James Kirkpatrick
Address line 1: 1017 Minor Ave #1204
Address line 2:
City, State: Seattle, WA
Zipcode: 98104
Email Address: jlkirk77@hotmail.com

Add to Mailing List: yes

How to receive project news: by_email

I-295-001 Importance of Issues:
Scale of 1 to 5 (5 is most important)

DESIGN

Improve seismic safety:	3
Reconnecting downtown to waterfront:	5
Parks/open space:	5
Views while driving:	1

ECONOMICS

Cost of alternatives:	3
Funding sources:	3

TRANSPORTATION

Connections/circulation:	2
Transit service:	2
Pedestrian access:	5
Bike Trails:	3

ENVIRONMENTAL

Noise:	5
Land use along waterfront:	5
Air quality:	5
Water quality:	5
Fish and wildlife:	4
Hazardous materials:	3
Historic buildings:	4
Cultural resources:	4

CONSTRUCTION

Traffic during construction:	3
Access to and from waterfront during construction:	4
Displacements or relocations:	3
Other construction impacts:	3

What issues concern you the most about the Rebuild alternative?

We have lived with this eyesore for 50 years. Admittedly, it has been, and still is, a very important 'traffic mover' in our city, but it is time to address that need in a much different way. In the early years of its existence, over the 'busy' railroad tracks and dividing the downtown business district from the industrialized 'working' waterfront, the viaduct was, perhaps, not the stigma it is today. However, our city has changed. Downtown has become much more than just a 'business district' (although that is vitally important and should be a major consideration in any viaduct alternative). Thousands of people once again live downtown (a trend I'd like to see continue to grow) and even more visit the 'city center' for ever increasing cultural / sports events and an evening 'on the town'. The waterfront has become a destination for residents, visitors, and business people. It's really the biggest downtown park Seattle has and it could become so much better (!

I-295-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and ranking of issues. Your ideas regarding the connection of the waterfront to downtown and the waterfront's importance as a destination are noted.

I-295-001 Myrtle Edward's is wonderful, but how many people can get there on their lunch hour or want to stroll there after dark?). Downtown Seattle, in recent years, has become a very nice place to live - to call home. To rebuild "the wall" between downtown and the waterfront would be a major blunder. A 'black-eye' that would be there, for all to see, for a long time to come.

I-295-002 What issues concern you the most about the Aerial alternative?

It would be an even bigger eyesore than the present structure. And, with more traffic (and heavier trucks) a lot more noise would be generated. Seattle has been gifted with one of the most beautiful 'front doors' any city could ask for... Why ruin it by blocking it with a wall of concrete?

I-295-003 What issues concern you the most about the Tunnel alternative?

This alternative will probably present the greatest impact on waterfront access (cars, trucks, and people) during construction. I mean, after all, we are talking about one big ditch. Business, residents, and visitors will need to adjust and adapt -- and they will. Yes, it will cause some inconvenience but the gain will most definitely be worth the pain. I like the 'stacked' tunnel rather than the 'side by side' version. I think construction of it would reduce the amount of disruption in the area (and be a better seawall). However, cost and other construction issues might have considerably more to do with the version eventually (hopefully) selected so I'm open to input on the up/down or side/side version. However, a tunnel is definitely the way to go in my opinion.

I-295-004 What issues concern you the most about the Bypass Tunnel alternative?

If I read this one correctly, it still leaves far too much traffic on the surface. If you are going to build a tunnel, build it right.. A 'half and half' is not going to please anyone

What issues concern you the most about the Surface alternative?

The traffic performance and pollution issues with this option are a major concern. Stop and go traffic and up to three times the travel time. Has anyone given any thought to how much more air and noise pollution this will dump on the waterfront and the downtown area? The waterfront is a major 'pedestrian' location. Mixing a lot of surface traffic with that many people is asking for severe vehicle - pedestrian interaction (yes, even fatalities). Don't go there....

I-295-005 What opportunities about these alternatives most interest you?

We have a 'once in a lifetime' opportunity to do something for our city that will have an impact on Seattle for generations to come. So many times in our recent past, transportation and parks come to mind, we have let our children down. Yes, some of these viaduct 'alternatives' are expensive, but perhaps we should not be asking ourselves 'what's this going to cost me' but rather 'what's this going to cost them if we screw this up'.

I-295-006 Other Comments

I think that many of the benefits inherent in (or missing from) the various viaduct alternatives have been ignored in the EIS. OK, maybe not ignored, just omitted. Certainly, a reduction in noise and air pollution should be a consideration - a very important consideration. Aesthetic improvements are perhaps impossible to quantify, but no one can doubt that the dollar benefits to business (the tourist trade is no small entity in the local economy) and to property owners (yes, that relates to property taxes) should also be major considerations in this process. Beyond, the dollar calculations, there are a number of 'quality of life' issues. They are not easy to put into a budget, and their value probably varies as much as our citizens do, but the cost/value is there never the less.

I-295-002

Your objection to the Aerial Alternative is noted.

I-295-003

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-295-004

The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. The Bypass Tunnel and Surface Alternatives are no longer alternatives under consideration. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the build alternatives considered for this project.

I-295-005

Your comment regarding the importance of considering impacts to future generations is noted.

I-295-006

Please see Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) in the Final EIS for a comparison of trade-offs and benefits between the three current build alternatives.

How many times a week do you use the Viaduct?

3_to_4

I use the viaduct to:

bypass-access

Tell us a little about your background. Please
check any of the following categories that apply to you and your
connection to the Viaduct:

[] Commuter
[] Cyclist/Pedestrian
[] Freight
[on] Neighborhood Advocate
[] Port
[] Rail
[on] Urban Design Advocate
[] Waterfront business