Greg Adams
1629 Summit Ave., Apt. 404
Seattle, WA 98122

December 8, 2010

Angela Freudenstein
Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424, Seattle, WA 98104

Re: Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement

Dear Angela,

I-001-001 Thank you for receiving public comments; I value the opportunity to respond to the developing plans for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and the current Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This letter serves as a summary of my comments.

I strongly support the removal of the structurally deficient Viaduct as it exists today, and I believe the decisions you make will have a large impact on the future development of Downtown Seattle and the surrounding region, and I realize that you are trying to evaluate potential alternatives and a great variety of subsequent impacts.

After reviewing the report I recommend greater attention be given to a No Build Alternative (with an added Surface Boulevard). Attention should be shifted to focus on improving transit to downtown rather than continuing to support poor travel behavior.

I-001-002 The analysis provided in this report seems a continuation of a long standing transportation planning approach of 'predict and provide'. Research shows that expensive improvement projects like a Bored Tunnel serve to **enable** poor land use decisions, including the location decisions of businesses and residents -- a 'self-fulfilling prophecy'. i.e. "We expect 90,000 ADT, so we spend vast amounts of money to accommodate this behavior" thereby ensuring that it continues.

Concerns about impacts from a Viaduct removal are likely overstated in this report. Examples like San Francisco show that cities adapt well to large capacity reductions, especially in the context of a central core. Your study should look at case studies such as the Embarcadero Freeway in San Francisco or Harbor Drive in Portland. Roadway tunnels under existing cities are also enormously expensive as shown in Boston's Big Dig project.

I-001-003 Furthermore, I fail to see how the Bored Tunnel option is going to help Seattle address climate action goals or have any positive impact on congestion or multimodal accessibility over the long term. Expensive projects aimed at subsidizing access to downtown via private automobile are an outdated strategy in a 21st Century city.

Thanks,

Greg Adams

I-001-001

Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, of the Final EIS describes the project's history and alternatives evaluated prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The 2004 Draft EIS included evaluation of the Surface Alternative. This alternative was eliminated because it reduced roadway capacity and didn't meet the project's purpose as identified in the 2004 Draft EIS. Transit enhancements are program elements associated with the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative and are discussed in Chapter 7, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIS.

I-001-002

As discussed in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIS, the purpose of this project is to replace a seismically-vulnerable transportation facility that is at the end of its useful life. This project does not influence regional land use decisions. The indirect effects on land use as a result of the Bored Tunnel Alternative are discussed in Appendix G, Land Use Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

I-001-003

The Final EIS Chapter 1, Introduction, describes the Purpose and Need for the project and one of several purposes is to provide capacity for automobiles, freight, and transit to efficiently move people and goods to and through downtown Seattle. The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative has been evaluated based on their ability to meet the Purpose and Need. Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, covers issues related to congestion and accessibility. Appendix R, Energy Discipline Report covers issues related to climate change. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.