

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

From: Pat Sargent [mailto:patsargent@seanet.com]

Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2004 11:06 AM

To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov

Subject: Viaduct Opinion

I-449-001

I vote for the tunnel!

Despite the increased costs and construction time, it seems that in the long run, the tunnel would be the best option. Due to the physical enhancements of the waterfront, I'd imagine that the city and state would gain significant tax revenue on real estate sales and leases, especially on western exposure condos. The property value would undoubtedly be enhanced by the view and noise level improvements.

I-449-002

The tunnel would also open up a much more attractive waterfront retail environment for tourism (read "tax dollars"). What would Seattle stand to gain in total tax revenue increases in 50 years from tunnel completion? I'm betting it's more that the difference between the cost of the tunnel and a lesser expensive alternative. Why not try to find a private financier that would be willing to give the city a 50 year loan to cover the expenses? Call it the Allen Tunnel if necessary.

I-449-003

Some people are concerned with losing the view from the viaduct if it's removed. We'll it's a bit difficult for view seekers to spend money at the local retailers while driving. Go to the Pike Place Market for the view. While there, buy some fresh seafood and local produce. Parking is free, as is the view.

Imagine San Francisco with a viaduct running through the Fisherman's Wharf parking lot.
Imagine Seattle without a viaduct.

Let's all get over our nostalgia for an old, decrepit piece of Seattle's past planning mistakes, and move to something that will enhance the waterfront environment, as well as the local tax revenue.

Thank you,

Pat Sargent
Seattle Native

I-449-001

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.

I-449-002

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.

I-449-003

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments regarding views and the character of the waterfront. The City of Seattle is leading the Central Waterfront Project, which will help shape the urban design of the central waterfront area with the preferred alternative.