

From: edspooner@centurytel.net [mailto:edspooner@centurytel.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2010 10:42 AM
To: Alaskan Way Viaduct
Subject: AWV Feedback

Sent from: Phillip Hanson
Address: 27115 Wax Orchard Rd.
City: Vashon
State: WA
County:
Zip:
Email: edspooner@centurytel.net
Phone:

I-060-001

Comments:

I think the viaduct replacement, deep bore tunnel is an awful idea. The decision process used to decide in favor of the tunnel is based primarily on how to redevelop the waterfront NOT on how to best provide a north/south transportation corridor. There is currently one and a half north/south routes between Lake Washington and the waterfront. I-5 and SR 99 from just south of the West Seattle bridge and north to approx. 70th street. No wonder Seattle traffic is always, at best, miserable. Scrap the tunnel and figure out a way to extend SR99/Aurora Ave. northbound into a thoroughfare. Also you can fix the mercer mess by running Mercer St. straight into 520 so you don't have to get on I-5 to get onto 520. Thank You Phil Hanson

I-060-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Bored Tunnel Alternative. The Final EIS Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, describes the environmental documentation and alternatives analysis that occurred prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft 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. 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 have severe adverse effects on Seattle and the Puget Sound region. Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) in the Final EIS provides a more in-depth comparison of tradeoffs for the three alternatives.

From: Phil Hanson [edspooner@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 11:35 PM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: Viaduct Replacement

I-060-002

I am NOT a fan of the deep bore tunnel. I believe that the tunnel option is a flawed decision because the primary criteria is the redevelopment of the Seattle waterfront, not a heavy use, critical transportation north-south corridor. Seattle/regional traffic is awful because there is only one N/S arterial I-5. Everybody in a car going in any direction has to get on I-5 to get there. It's crazy!. I think the tunnel money could be much better spent expanding SR 99/Aurora Avenue in both directions. And while I am here I also think you should make Mercer Street the beginning of both 520 and I-90. That way you don't have to get on I-5 to access those east/west routes.

Fortunately I do not have take the viaduct very often but I have considered it's collapse with me on it. I feel that I would have a better chance of surviving "the big one" in a viaduct collapse(who knows, maybe I'll be on a section that doesn't collapse) than being entombed for eternity in a deep bore tunnel.

I-060-002

The lead agencies identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative due to its ability to best meet the project's identified purposes and needs, as outlined in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS, 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.

Your comment about making Mercer Street the beginning of both 520 and I-90 is noted. However, connecting Mercer Street with 520 or I-90 is not within the scope of this project.

All of the build alternatives being considered would be designed to current seismic standards.