
From: Linda Bothell [lindabothell@me.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 8:38 PM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: 2010 SDEIS Comment

I-014-001

I have read the reports and attended meetings. I do not see the logic in building a new road that has less capacity, contains the danger of a tunnel, takes away a spectacular entry to our geographically beautiful city and does not adequately address trucking interests. Not to mention cost overruns and possible disturbance of Indian burial grounds.

Given our economic budget woes both local and state, can we use some common sense and pull back? I have watched the building of the case against the viaduct over the last several years and so far I have seen nothing that proves we need to tear it down and replace it. Why not create employment by reinforcing our existing highway?

I would appreciate a response,
thank you,
Linda Bothell

I-014-001

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 Nisqually earthquake in 2001 demonstrated the urgent need for replacing the viaduct with a seismically safe facility. 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 that it has received from diverse interests. Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, covers issues related to capacity, traffic patterns and conditions, and access for freight. Final EIS Appendix I, Historic, Cultural, and Archaeological Resources Discipline Report, covers issues related to potential effects of the project on cultural resources. FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative and rebuilding the viaduct.