

1 the other ones don't really help with the traffic flowing
2 problem. I think esthetically it works the best, too, as
3 long as there isn't some hidden agenda of real estate big
4 guys. I think it's real important that we do this wisely,
5 because it's such a main thoroughfare, north and south, and
6 it can't all be rerouted all that time over to 5. It would
7 just be chaos.

8 And also, too, we as taxpayers "grudgingly" — say
9 this with quote marks around it — have funded two major
10 sports arenas, and now, if we don't plan this out very
11 well, we've just funded something that we're not going to
12 get people to and from, without just one big hassle. So,
13 as I see it, of all of the plans, it does, for me, come down
14 to doing the tunnel.

15 CONNIE HAYDEN: My comment that I would like to make
16 is in regards to who makes the final decision on which of
17 the kinds of transportation or the kind of viaduct that
18 they will build. And I would really like to see it put to
19 a vote of the people in Seattle, because they can come up,
20 usually, with what they want. Not that they are
21 trustworthy, but I would really like to have the people in
22 Seattle vote on the plan that they would prefer. That's
23 all I want to say.

24 DAVID SYFERD: Well, I've been hearing a lot of
25 people talking about this project and the alternatives, and

H-035-001

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.

H-035-001

1 I have been so appalled at some of the remarks. I have
2 detested the Viaduct for as long as I've lived in Seattle,
3 and that's most of my life. It is a visual obstruction, it
4 is an auditory imposition on its area, and it's awful. And
5 the idea that the view of a few people driving through
6 should be favored over the people who live, work, actually
7 get out of the cars and walk there, is incredibly selfish,
8 to my mind.

9 I don't like the surface solution because it puts a
10 freeway at the surface level, it would be awful, it would
11 make crossing dangerous, and the noise would be just as bad
12 as it is now. I don't like the aerial or the replacement,
13 because it's continuing the problem. The tunnel was
14 extremely expensive when it was first proposed, but they
15 have reduced the cost of it to the point that I don't see
16 why it should even be questioned anymore. The bypass is
17 too much of a cut. It doesn't serve the needs.

18 I think the choice is clear, you need to tunnel. We
19 need to stop talking about it, we need to start doing it,
20 we need to get it funded. And I hope that that's what
21 happens.

22 BRIAN FREDERICK: Okay. My name is Brian Fredrick,
23 and I am a resident, and I live on Alaskan Way, in
24 Seattle.

25 I would like to address two inadequacies of the CEPA