
From: Jane Walton [walton.jane@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2010 12:04 PM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: re: Viaduct replacement

I-148-001 | It is obvious that the only reason for the tunnel is to "improve " the area of the existing viaduct for pleasure and business. It is NOT for improvement of traffic, especially for West Seattle where I live. I was amazed when I first moved here how easy it was to drive the Viaduct, either to downtown or on through to the U-district, North Seattle and beyond. It rarely has accidents that tie-up traffic, compared to the daily stoppages on I-5 through the city. The proposed tunnel will not handle the same volume of traffic which quickly moves through the area now, will block off the downtown area, making drivers drive through the city in heavy traffic from the south end to get to First Hill for doctor visits, or the downtown business and shopping areas. Business will suffer, but the developers will love their new views. One of the great attractions for Seattle has always been the drive along the Viaduct overlooking the harbor (and at the same time avoiding the ferry traffic and rather tacky touristy areas below) and the Olympics and everything in between. I lived in the Boston area during the Big Dig fiasco there - it turned out well eventually but at the cost of great inconvenience, multiple construction problems, e.g. leaks pooling in the roadway, and incredible over-runs in costs.

I-148-002 | This will quite likely happen here, and Seattle residents will be forced to pay these over-runs as the contracts are now set-up. At the very least the entire STATE should be included in paying for these over-runs, as many cars and trucks now driving STATE Highway 99 are from outside the Seattle itself. All in all I can see nothing good about the bored tunnel, only many problems and high costs to the taxpayers and future traffic woes for all.
Sincerely, Jane Walton
1564 Alki Ave. SW #305, Seattle, WA 98116 206-932-2145

I-148-001

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. All of the alternatives have been evaluated based on their ability to meet the Purpose and Need. Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, addresses the importance of the viaduct as a transportation corridor. It also covers issues related to capacity, local access, mobility, and transit service for each build alternative. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

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.

I-148-002

The state legislature authorized funding to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct in RCW 47.01.402. According to this law;

"The legislature finds that the replacement of the vulnerable state route number 99 Alaskan Way viaduct is a matter of urgency for the safety of Washington's traveling public and the needs of the transportation system in central Puget Sound."

This legislation also authorizes WSDOT to obligate two billion eight

hundred million dollars. In order to fund this obligation the legislation further identifies sources of funding: \$2,400,000,000 of state funding; \$400,000,000 of toll funding.

In the absence of toll funding WSDOT would still have the authorization to issue contracts up to \$2,800,000,000 but the mix of funding sources would change. It is assumed that the toll funding would be replaced by new or reprioritized federal, state, or local funding sources.

The legislation authorizing WSDOT to proceed with the project also has a provision that those in Seattle who benefit from the project should be responsible for cost overruns. WSDOT interprets this as a statement of legislative intent that would need clarification to become operative.