

S-004-001

Comment – 5/26/04

Hello this is state representative Mary Lou Dickerson and I am making a formal comment on the EIS and it is that I strongly prefer either the aerial version or the rebuild version and here are my reasons. First, because these are less expensive versions. Also, because they allow for the continued views by the people who travel the viaduct of the most spectacular scenery I think in the Northwest and those views would be lost if we went to a tunnel version. The third reason and probably the most important for me is the access. I want to assure that we have portals to the north so that our people in Ballard can easily drive including the people how are part of our marine industry who drive trucks, who as I understand it would not be allowed to drive in the tunnel. This is critical. So those are the reasons and you can call me at 206-782-6129 if you would like to have further conversations. Again, its price, view and accessibility for my constituents in the north end. Thank you.

**S-004-001**

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. After studying several retrofitting concepts, the lead agencies found that rebuilding the viaduct would not be a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the risks to public safety and the weakened state of the viaduct. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

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. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the connection between Alaskan Way and Elliott and Western Avenues. These would be constructed as a separate project.