

---

**From:** Kevin K. [whereiskev@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2010 10:11 PM  
**To:** AWW SDEIS Comments  
**Subject:** 2010 SDEIS comments

**I-093-001** | I believe the 2010 SDEIS is written with significant bias toward the deep bore tunnel.

For example, the report says: "Once the viaduct is removed, views to and from the waterfront that are currently obstructed by the structure would be substantially improved". My question is FOR WHOM ?? A few dozen rich people with an office or condo on a lower floor facing the water ?? Anyone on an upper floor will see past an elevated structure. Yet this argument is made to distract us from the fact that more than 110,000 residents and visitors who enjoy this view every day now (from their vehicle) would have this taken away !!

**I-093-002** | The report also leads us to believe that removing the viaduct will create an open space for all to enjoy. Really? With no significant additions to parking, will even a fraction of us board public transportation to enjoy that open space? On weekdays? And what will prevent this space from becoming a larger version of Victor Steinbrueck Park with proportionally larger numbers of homeless and panhandlers?

Even if the cost of the tunnel were the same as an elevated structure, I would choose an elevated structure.

If you are still a government for the people, I urge you to bring this to us in one well thought out, multiple-choice question: Do you prefer: a) an elevated structure, b) a cut-and-cover tunnel, c) a deep bore tunnel ? Don't rely on some independent survey. The general public has not seen a side-by-side comparison of the 3 options due to lazy reporting. Only an impending public vote will force the pros and cons of all 3 to be exposed and considered equally at the dinner table.

Thank you for listening,

Kevin Krantz  
3510 SW Admiral Way  
Seattle, WA 98126

### **I-093-001**

It is true that with the Bored Tunnel Alternative, drivers on SR 99 would no longer enjoy the panoramic views that are available from the existing structure. However, the views from the waterfront to the east would no longer be obstructed by a very large concrete highway structure. Similarly, the views from downtown Seattle, including the Pike Place Market and its many viewpoints to the west such as the Victor Steinbrueck Park, would no longer include the intrusion of this busy highway in the extensive views toward the west of Elliott Bay, the islands, and the Olympic Mountains.

### **I-093-002**

The 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs, and Final EIS acknowledge that the proposed project may result in opportunities for redevelopment created by removing the viaduct. This may occur under both the Bored Tunnel and Cut-and-Cover Alternatives. It is also acknowledged that substantial changes would occur in the relationship between the waterfront and upland properties leading to the downtown core. To the extent that the existing viaduct has been perceived as a barrier to waterfront uses, new development on vacant or under-used property or redevelopment may take place around the new Alaskan Way surface street. However, no development within the existing viaduct right-of-way is proposed as part of the proposed project. It is anticipated that any potential new development would be consistent with zoning designations for this area. This includes public open space. Environmental documentation for the project has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4322(2)(c)) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)(Ch. 43.21 C RCW). Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, of the Final EIS describes how the project began and the alternatives development process, which included key decision points and public involvement. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.