

1 they're trying to assess these impacts? Do they assess  
2 them against people that are young and healthy, or old and  
3 infirm, or children, pets. You know, the variety of living  
4 creatures on the waterfront of varying ages and types, I  
5 don't think have been adequately evaluated for the effects  
6 that this construction would have on them. And so, I would  
7 like to see the E.I.S. spend more time on that.

8 And once again, my thinking is that you minimize the  
9 construction period as much as possible, and so, whatever  
10 the affects are on those variety of individuals, those  
11 become minimized to the extent possible and, then again,  
12 spread it around to other communities. I think that's all  
13 I have to. Say. Thank you very much.

14 SCOTT KRAFT: I do not believe that the E.I.S. does  
15 not adequately address negative affects on the residents of  
16 the waterfront during the construction, or consider options  
17 to reduce these negative affects. Specifically, the E.I.S.  
18 does not adequately address the option of the shortest  
19 construction periods. All the alternatives seem to be  
20 based on maintaining the current traffic flow during the  
21 construction and, thus, leading to longer construction  
22 periods and costs, reduced construction costs created by  
23 shorter construction periods and minimizing traffic detours  
24 during construction, and economic impacts during  
25 construction on the waterfront related to reduced property

41

#### H-023-001

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-023-001

H-023-001

H-023-002

H-023-003

1 values, lost business, lost tax revenues and reduced  
2 revenues from cruise ship patrons. The E.I.S. does not  
3 adequately address pedestrian traffic during and after the  
4 construction, specifically for pedestrians getting to and  
5 from the Pike Place Market and the waterfront. All the  
6 alternatives don't consider extending the tunnel for the  
7 trains further north, which would improve the traffic flow  
8 on the northern part of Alaskan Way.

9       **JONATHAN DAVID:** I think that the three comments that  
10 I want to make about the Draft E.I.S. are: No. 1, is that  
11 I'm concerned that it doesn't mention anything about  
12 business impacts or how we're going to maintain the  
13 businesses that are alive and well in the water front right  
14 now throughout construction, and what we're going to do  
15 there. No. 2, it says nothing about property values for  
16 people that live on the waterfront, which I do, and I care  
17 a whole lot about that. And No. 3, there's no specific  
18 mention of the option where we build something to replace  
19 the Viaduct but in the meantime don't do a lot of work to  
20 reroute traffic, we kind of accept the fact that traffic  
21 might need to reroute itself, and we get the job done as  
22 fast as we can by just focusing on the final product. That  
23 is all. Thank you.

24       **MAX FOSTER:** My name is Max Foster. I live at 2549 -  
25 34th Avenue West, in Seattle, which is the Magnolia

42

### H-023-002

Pedestrian access and safety on the waterfront will be maintained at all times during construction activities. At times, it will be necessary to reroute pedestrians using temporary facilities and detours, but these detours will be designed to minimize any inconvenience and would be ADA compliant. Any sidewalk, path, or the pedestrian bridge to Colman Dock that may be removed to accommodate construction activities will be replaced with a temporary facility in a nearby location with equal capacity. Wayfinding signs will also be placed to help pedestrians access the waterfront, Pike Place Market, and other sites in the corridor.

Further information on how the Project will address pedestrian access and safety during construction activities can be found in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

### H-023-003

The BNSF Railway has not expressed interest in altering its tunnel as part of the project.