

1 it.

2 As far as the impact on the quality of life for the
3 people who live on the waterfront, we're going to be
4 decimated in terms of our quality of life if you decide to
5 build the fly-over, when you do the aerial, you know,
6 replacement of the aerial proposal, I suppose. We'll be
7 affected by the construction of the fly-over, we'll be
8 affected by the noise that's generated by all the cars that
9 are whizzing by in front of our windows, essentially, and
10 we'll be affected adversely by all of the pollution that's
11 going to be produced by all of the cars whizzing by our
12 windows, and I just don't think that that's a very viable
13 idea.

14 One of the things that I'd like to see is you just
15 knock the darned thing down and do an experiment for a year
16 and see how people maneuver and how they get into the city,
17 and see if doing nothing is actually a good alternative.
18 If the City steps up and they build Park and Ride, and they
19 help people with alternatives, and encourage them to leave
20 their cars at home, better yet for all of us.

21 So, there's a lot for you all to consider, and in
22 the end, I'd like to see a tunnel get built down on the
23 waterfront. Thank you.

H-019-001

24 SUZAN NETTLESHIP: My name is Suzan Nettleship, and
25 I've been a resident on the waterfront for approximately —

30

H-019-001

We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.

H-019-001

1 well, almost four years.

2 Let me begin by saying that this public hearing and
3 open house is actually quite inadequate for ascertaining
4 what are the public views and the sharing of view points
5 from different constituencies. I would encourage and say
6 that Washington D.O.T. should indeed have true public
7 hearings, where the opinions of the various constituencies
8 are heard and commented upon. Because, without that very
9 vital element, there is no real coalition building and
10 understanding of the project.

H-019-002

11 The information presented is interesting, but let's
12 also address the deficiencies of what is presented here
13 today, as well as the issues that are included in the
14 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

15 First of all, the plans that are submitted within
16 the Draft E.I.S., I have been advised, do not truly reflect
17 what is in the current planning stage and, therefore, are
18 presenting false information.

H-019-003

19 As to the areas that have been covered in the
20 Draft E.I.S., there are several areas of deficiency. In
21 particular, I believe there has been insufficient review
22 and planning devoted to the economic impacts on the
23 existing businesses, residences, and use of the waterfront
24 during the construction period. This is a particular
25 concern in that it is not a temporary circumstance when a

H-019-002

The 2004 Draft EIS accurately described the alternatives and options under consideration at the time it was written. The lead agencies published two Supplemental Draft EISs (in 2006 and 2010) that provided updated information on the proposed alternatives and construction plans. Each supplemental draft included a formal public comment period, during which several public hearings were held. The Final EIS provides the latest information on the proposed alternatives.

H-019-003

The lead agencies plan to maintain access to businesses and residences throughout construction. Temporary limitations and any required changes to access during construction will be mitigated to the extent practicable. Mitigation measures for parking, pedestrian and vehicle access, and business assistance are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. The project team will continue their coordination and mitigation activities with local businesses and residents, freight/delivery companies, the Port of Seattle, neighborhood groups, and other affected groups.

H-019-003

1 construction period can last as long as eleven years. For
2 a number of constituencies that could be effectively a
3 lifetime in the cycle of a business or someone's residency
4 on the waterfront.

H-019-004

5 Additionally, I don't believe that the E.I.S. has
6 adequately addressed alternatives to both options dealing
7 with transportation during the construction period, which
8 might ultimately impact the total construction, and have a
9 positive affect in reducing the amount of time required for
10 construction.

H-019-005

11 There has been insufficient time devoted to looking
12 at the alternatives in terms of traffic flow, traffic flow
13 means and methods, which includes both commuter traffic,
14 destination traffic, truck delivery, as well as through
15 trucking and commerce related transportation. Insufficient

H-019-006

16 analysis has been done as to how to mitigate or compensate
17 for the economic impacts to the various parties affected by
18 construction, in terms of reduced revenue to retailers,
19 reduced revenue to the cruise ships, the economic impact on
20 land values, and what can be done for mitigation during the
21 construction period to the various constituencies.

H-019-007

22 Additionally, there has not been enough study or
23 analysis given to the displacement of existing parking,
24 both for residents, office itinerant, and mass
25 transportation, wheeled vehicles, such as busses and

32

H-019-004

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

H-019-005

Additional traffic analysis for each proposed build alternativewas presented in the 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs and the Final EIS. In addition, each EIS includes a Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C) that contains a substantial amount of information about traffic impacts and travel times.

H-019-006

Please see the Final EIS and Appendix L, Economics Discipline Report, of the Final EIS for current information on the economic impacts and proposed mitigation for the project. The lead agencies plan to maintain access to businesses and residences throughout construction. Temporary limitations and any required changes to access during construction will be mitigated to the extent practicable. Mitigation

H-019-007

1 taxi. It seems as though little planning or analysis has
2 been put into planning and how there can be a coordination
3 of the need for this traffic with existing mass transit or
4 the funding of alternative of mass transit.

H-019-008

5 Ultimately, whatever alternative design is put into
6 effect, the current land owners, inhabitants and users of
7 the waterfront should not suffer the economic brunt during
8 the construction period.

9 SANDRA POLLOCK: Well, I just wanted to say that I am
10 opposed to the fly-by alternative they have for traffic
11 flow. It seems like just a waste of taxpayer dollars.

12 I am definitely for a tunnel to go through, but
13 there should be a different way, an alternate route for
14 traffic. I've wondered why we couldn't make Alaskan Way
15 one way south, and maybe Third Avenue or another route, one
16 way north and one south, and then connect in together. It
17 seems like a common-sense way to do it.

18 I think the Viaduct is unsafe and an alternative
19 needs to be taken care of sooner, rather than later.

20 Well, I think environmentally the fly-by situation
21 is not good for tourism, for anything on the waterfront.
22 When I go down there I like to — it's noisy enough as it
23 is, and then that would just impact it even more.

24 I can't think of anything else I want to say. I
25 think that just says it in a nutshell.

measures for parking, pedestrian and vehicle access, and business assistance are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. The project team will continue their coordination and mitigation activities with local businesses and residents, freight/delivery companies, the Port of Seattle, neighborhood groups, and other affected groups.

H-019-007

The 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs, Final EIS, and Transportation Discipline Reports provide detailed information about parking removals and effects. FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are working with transit providers to determine transit routes and options during project construction. Mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.

H-019-008

Construction will be challenging for many businesses and people. Possible mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.