

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

From: Patricia Ronhaar [mailto:pafron@msn.com]

Sent: Monday, April 05, 2004 4:04 PM

To: Fergus@wsdot.wa.gov

Subject: Alaska/seawall project

I-439-001 Having reviewed the designs again, I am adamant about my decision: rebuild the wall, as it is. I understand that this design also includes replacing the seawall. The cost is less than the other alternatives and disturbs the existing businesses as little as possible. It saves the accessibility of the waterfront, as is without cluttering it up with more condos and office buildings. Our waterfront is a prized possession of us Seattleites and we have lost all too much of it in the past few years to oversized housing construction.

I live in the far South area, in Seahurst, and feel blessed to enjoy the glorious view from the present structure on my frequent trips downtown to the theater, to dine, to museums or to shop. I suppose the "aerial" plan would be my 2nd choice but how much of the surface street would be sacrificed for the additional 25 feet?

I-439-002 Question: I read the mayor and State Transportation Secretary will select some combination of these five as the preferred alternative this summer. What does this mean? Why ask us what we want if they will choose a combination of our choices, rather than the most popular sight totally?

Patricia S.; Ronhaar
Seahurst, Wa 98062
Pafron@msn.com

I-439-001

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.

I-439-002

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated

Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies' decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.