

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Anna Tamura
Address: 2411 East Helen Street
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98112
Email: annatamura@hotmail.com
Affiliation (optional): National Park Service

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-494-001

Given the numerous factors involved in the decision-making process and the analysis illustrated in the summary and comparison of alternatives... The alternative with the highest and best value for the City of Seattle's transportation system, the citizens of Seattle, and tourists is the Tunnel Alternative. Although this Alternative is the most costly, its other advantages outweigh the costs. The Tunnel Alternative would provide the fewest impacts to views and noise, which is a constant concern in downtown and along the waterfront. Tourists and citizens would be more interested in visiting the waterfront if there was less noise and more views. Consequently, the waterfront businesses would benefit economically from the Tunnel Alternative. Also, the waterfront would provide more of a civic experience and center for Seattle. Traffic speeds under the Tunnel Alternative are near the top, comparable with the Aerial Alternative. The Surface Alternative would worsen transportation and circulation through downtown, given the traffic speeds, impacts to other adjacent roadways, and congestion at nearby intersections. Safety is worst under the Surface Alternative, which should be a significant decision-making issue. Bypass Tunnel rates low on safety as well. The number of buildings, employees, and acres are most impacted by the Surface Alternative. The number of cubic yards to be excavated poses the question- where will it be moved under the Tunnel Alternative? When it comes to individual preference about what type of structure to build- I think it is best to weigh cumulative impacts- both positive and negative for the majority of people in the area. This means considering people who work in nearby buildings, take the ferry, tourists and pedestrians, drivers along SR99 and adjacent roads. As a result, drivers along SR99 are but a fraction of the total number of people affected. While views from the Viaduct are a legitimate benefit, the Viaduct conversely blocks views along the entire waterfront and is a noisy distraction to the beautiful scenery and pedestrian experience along the waterfront. The Surface Alternative is the least desirable, for many of the reasons stated above. Most importantly, it is the worst alternative because it decreases roadway capacity by 60%!!!! For the good of Seattle, its citizens, and visitors, please DO NOT select this alternative. The most viable alternatives are the Tunnel and Bypass Tunnel after being analyzed considering a variety of factors. However, the Tunnel is preferable because of its fewer impacts on noise, higher traffic speeds, less traffic on Alaska Way, better safety, fewer congested intersections in adjacent areas, and overall character of the waterfront!

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
All of the Alternatives

I-494-001

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.