

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

10

H-036-001

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

H-036-001

H-036-001

1 preliminary report. The first is I believe that there was
2 inadequate consideration of not maintaining the current
3 traffic flows during the construction period. It appears
4 to me that there seems to be a presumption that current
5 traffic flows have to be maintained during the construction
6 period. This may not necessarily have to be the case.

H-036-002

7 The other inadequate consideration that I would like
8 to have addressed would be the impact upon residential uses
9 in the affected area and, in particular, on Alaskan Way.
10 It seems to me that maintaining and encouraging a mix of
11 uses in the affected area is very important during the
12 construction period. I do not believe that the preliminary
13 CEPA has adequately considered the impact of the
14 alternatives on residential use. Thank you very much.

15 ELIZABETH FREDERICK: I am Elizabeth Fredrick, and I
16 live on the waterfront on Alaskan Way.

17 I am concerned about the large Battery Street
18 fly-over detour, I believe it's called, that you have a
19 picture of on one of these story boards. And I'm concerned
20 that that seems like a tremendous waste of taxpayer money
21 to go to the expense of building something like that.

22 And I'm also concerned that the project might run
23 out of money, and that that might be what we're left with.
24 It looks like a huge monstrosity that would greatly affect
25 the waterfront area and the vision that Satellites have of

H-036-002

The 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs, and Final EIS considered impacts on residential uses in the project area. Few direct impacts on residential properties were identified, and no residential displacements would occur along Alaskan Way.

As discussed in the Final EIS, residences immediately adjacent to the proposed project corridor may be affected by various construction-related impacts such as increases in noise, dust, and traffic congestion. The project would also displace existing parking spaces in the project area, which may affect visitors to residential and other properties on Alaskan Way. The discipline reports on Noise (Appendix F), Air Quality (Appendix M), and Transportation (Appendix C) address these impacts. Mitigation measures are also addressed in the discipline reports and in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.