Warren Yee
5912 23rd Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98108-2944
wye@earthlink.net

Alaskan Way Viaduct Comments:

I-544-001

(1) Rebuild/Aerial options: Has there been any thought of moving the NB Seneca St. offramp to another location instead (maybe Spring St, University St would been more desirable, but it has been redeveloped and no longer available). This is because of Seneca St being really a westbound one way street (it is two way between 1st and 2nd Avenues). This ramp frequently backs up, since the 1st and Seneca intersection has lots of pedestrian traffic, and Seneca St not being a through street, most cars turn left or right at 1st Avenue. If Spring St was used instead, being an Eastbound one way street, this would disburse the traffic better, than the current situation.

(2) 1st Avenue:
(2A) Between Seneca and Columbia Sts. Currently the traffic pattern is 3 lanes NB and 2 lanes SB (both of these figures include the parking lane, with no parking in the peak). North of Seneca (or Spring, if above comment is considered), this lane arrangement makes sense. South of Seneca (or Spring), this arrangement does not make sense, since most of the traffic is headed to the Columbia St. on-ramp. Has the City of Seattle thought about changing the traffic pattern, so it would be 3 lanes SB, and 2 lanes NB on 1st Avenue between Seneca (Spring) and Columbia Sts.?

(2B) Between King St. and Yesler Way. Currently, the City of Seattle allows parking during the PM rush hour on 1st Avenues between King St and Yesler Way. This has been a sore spot with Metro Transit, especially on weekday nights with a Mariner's game, with only one lane of traffic open. Has been any thought of a bus (only during PM peak) lane on Alaskan Way to mitigate this disaster?

(3) Slope of AWV between Pike St and Battery St. Tunnel (tunnel and bypass tunnel options)
How steep is this slope, and how will icy weather affect this portion of the new roadway? Due to this slope, is this why WSDOT has proposed an exit at the bottom of the slope (6 lane tunnel option), just in case the slope gets too icy, so vehicles have a way to escape the tunnel?

(4) Battery St. Tunnel upgrades are a high option, even it should be done in the rebuild option too. North of Battery St. Tunnel options are the lowest priority for fixing up, and if necessary, put off until a phase 2 option.

(5) I prefer the lowered SR-99 option for north of the tunnel, since it would reconnect the neighborhoods better. Widening Mercer will simply cause the 5th Ave N and Mercer St Intersection to reach LOS F. A better solution, as shown in some of your drawings, is a new Roy St. Underpass, with the connection at 9th and Mercer. This would be a much smoother transition.

(5) In the rebuild option, strong consideration should be given to rebuilding the approach to the Battery St. Tunnel, Columbia St on ramp, and Seneca (Spring) St off ramp? and not simply retrofit.

I-544-001

The project alternatives have evolved since the publication of the 2004 Draft EIS. The Final EIS analyzes three build alternatives: Bored Tunnel Alternative, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, and the Elevated Structure Alternative. The configurations of these alternatives, including how the Battery Street Tunnel is addressed, are presented in the Final EIS in Chapter 3. Please refer to the Final EIS for specific information about locations of ramps, lane configurations, and other design elements for each alternative. The proposed temporary Battery Street Flyover Detour is no longer part of any alternative. Chapter 5 discusses permanent effects and Chapter 6 discusses effects during construction. Chapter 8 describes the proposed mitigation to address project effects, including effects to parking.

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.

The preferred alternative was selected due to its ability to best meet the project's identified purposes and needs and the support it has received from diverse interests. Specifically, compared to the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, it avoids substantial closure of SR 99 during construction and it can be built in a shorter period of time than the other two alternatives. Extended closure of SR 99 would

I-544-001

(6) In the Rebuild/Aerial options, how much will the temporary roadway cost and how much more material (concrete/rebar?) has to disposed of?

(7) I have doubts with your rebuild option traffic figures, since it has substandard shoulders and if there was an accident or stalled vehicle, how much delay of traffic will occur? Also, in the rebuild option, I cannot see how you can have wider lanes with the similar footprint you purpose (the aerial option is a 20 foot wider ROW, I believe)?

(8) How will the temporary aerial structure affect waterfront businesses, since the elevated structure will be essentially next to them?

(9) Finally, I seem to favor the 6 lane tunnel option, because the existing viaduct can be used for the longest time before the transition period, and provides for existing capacity. The bypass tunnel option would require a 6 lane surface street, in a pedestrian type environment. The aerial and rebuild options require a lot of throwaway costs (building another elevated structure to keep traffic moving).

Thanks for allowing comment on the Alaskan Way Viaduct DEIS

Sincerely
Warren Yee
5912 23rd Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98108-2944
wye@earthlink.net

have severe adverse effects on Seattle and the Puget Sound region. Chapters 5 and 6 in the Final EIS provides a more in-depth comparison of trade-offs for the three alternatives.