

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Pat Petersen  
Address: 3057 63rd Ave SW #10  
City: Seattle  
State: WA  
Zip Code: 98116  
Email: paxsca@hotmail.com  
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-408-001

Hey you people, You still keep saying that you can build a tunnel for the viaduct replacement that is only a billion dollars more then other alternatives. What are you smoking. Their has not been one large underground project buildt in Seattle that has been on time or on budget. Seattle has terrible soils, lots water(salt and fresh) that has cause overruns and delays on every significant public project buildt. Modern envniomental, business migation, ever present lawsuits will make it impossible for you to build a tunnel for \$4 billion dollars. It upsets me that you even present such a unrealistic alternative, give false hope to people. I fully expect everyone of your alternatives will cost in excess of \$4+ billion dollars. The only realistic one that offers any hope to the Region's transportation needs is the aerial one.

Comments apply to:  
Overall Project

I-408-001

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.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pat Petersen [mailto:paxsea@hotmail.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 01, 2004 11:37 PM

**To:** viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov

**Subject:** comment

I-408-002

I doubt this will do any good, especially with the people you have on the leadership group. First off a tunnel would be great, however I don't believe your costs are realistic at all. No tunnel project in Seattle has been anywhere close to its budget. To believe that a tunnel is only going to be marginally more expensive than other alternatives means there is really a Santa Claus. The Puget Sound area has forego its right to build a project with all the bells and whistles because of lack of planning and building of transportation infrastructure. Now we do because we can't delay any longer. Build the aerial option. Downtown doesn't need the view and the waterfront will do just fine on its own. You should actually build an expanded aerial on 99 from countyline to countyline. Make it a 4 or 5 lane limited access freeway. Bus only, HOV and 2-3 general purpose lanes would actually make an improvement in traffic. What is the area going to do when another million and a half more people move into the area in the next twenty years. Sound transit is clueless. The Monorail is being drowned by you people. Show some leadership and guts. Show the people a project that will get us on top of transportation. Elevation is the key. Make it a toll road. So what if it takes 10-15 years and 10-15 billion dollars. Like I said we have given up our rights to make pleasant looking alternatives, by not doing enough earlier. Get cross town traffic off the surface streets. Aerial is the only realistic option. Besides the Port of Seattle could interconnect its rail and sea distribution points dramatically. For those people who complain about the viaduct blocking their view, think about the 100,000 plus people a day who enjoy the view while driving on the viaduct. I am one of them.

Sincerely,  
Pat Petersen

## I-408-002

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Aerial Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative to meet today's safety standards while minimizing the effects of a wider structure. This alternative was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, and the design was refined in the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

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.

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. The aerial 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. All of these factors were weighed by decision-makers when choosing the preferred alternative.