18:50:31 1 MR. McINTOCH: All right. My name
50:35 2 is James McIntosh, and I am impressed with the
18:50:39 3 planning that's gone into this south end of the
18:50:44 4 waterfront, SR 99 replacement of the Alaskan Way
18:50:50 5 Viaduct. It's well thought out. I was at a public
18:50:53 6 hearing in August -- well, it was an open house in
18:50:56 7 August, and now here, and you people have really done
18:51:01 8 your homework.
H-002-001 9 The only comment or concern I would have is the
18:51:10 10 route alignment is well thought out up to about King
18:51:16 11 Street, but then the place where there is really a lot
18:51:18 12 of uncertainty is the central waterfront because it's
18:51:22 13 just not decided with the City and stakeholders as to
18:51:28 14 what they are going to do on the central waterfront,
18:51:32 15 which is the bulk of the Alaskan Way Viaduct structure
18:51:35 16 that's along the central waterfront.
18:51:37 17 And as we all know, the current bridge is over 50
18:51:41 18 years old, and personally, on my end of things, I
18:51:46 19 would like to see it replaced and -- but not along the
18:51:52 20 central waterfront at all. I would like to see lane
18:51:56 21 capacity expanded on the I-5. In other words, an I-5
18:52:01 22 rebuild. That would involve straightening out
18:52:05 23 sections of the I-5 freeway, adding some lanes, maybe
18:52:11 24 up to three or four lanes, through the central part of
:52:16 25 downtown on I-5.

H-002-001

The State of Washington, King County, and the City of Seattle are working together to find a solution for the central waterfront section of the viaduct. However, the Environmental Assessment for the S. Holgate Street to S. King Street Viaduct Replacement Project does not address the scenarios being evaluated for the central waterfront. Comments on the central waterfront project have been shared with the central waterfront team, and any future comments can be submitted to viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov.

H-002-001

18:52:18 1 You would have to tunnel underneath 4th Avenues
-52:22 2 and 5th -- 6th Avenue -- well, probably 5th and 6th
18:52:28 3 Avenues would involve tunnels that go parallel to I-5.
18:52:32 4 And then you could build additional tunnel connections
18:52:35 5 over to the Battery Street tunnel to connect with the
18:52:39 6 east-west traffic that would be going through there
18:52:44 7 and connecting over to, say, Ballard and Magnolia.
18:52:47 8 But that's a long story. I understand there's a
18:52:50 9 stakeholders' meeting, you know, on July 24th. And,
18:52:56 10 you know, the central waterfront is just not decided.
18:53:01 11 The south end is very well thought out; it's very well
18:53:06 12 agreed upon that to build a surface roadway just makes
18:53:10 13 sense because it's already going through an industrial
.8:53:14 14 area and, you know, it doesn't need to go through
18:53:17 15 tunnels, and it doesn't need to be on a bridge. You
18:53:20 16 know, it could be, but there is the one overpass over
18:53:24 17 the train tracks going into the Port of Seattle.
18:53:30 18 But the amount of financial input, building ramps
18:53:39 19 that go up to the old portion of the viaduct, they
18:53:43 20 don't need to spend a whole lot of money because those
18:53:45 21 ramps may only be in place for three or fours years
18:53:48 22 because if it's decided to remove the -- the heavy
18:53:56 23 traffic on Highway 99 away from the waterfront, which
18:54:00 24 I hope they do, they won't need -- they won't need a
:54:03 25 big bridge along the waterfront anymore. And the new

H-002-001

18:54:06 traffic would have to be routed probably through
54:10 Spokane Street and some other streets over to I-5. So
18:54:16 connections really -- the east-west connections should
18:54:18 be developed where traffic can get from, say, West
18:54:23 Seattle over to I-5.
18:54:25 In other words, the Spokane Street viaduct would
18:54:29 have to be upgraded to maybe add a lane or two there
18:54:34 and to build better ramps over to the I-5 freeway,
18:54:39 northbound and southbound, but just to better connect.
18:54:45 It's sort of like the West Seattle Bridge
18:54:47 connecting with Highway 99, you know, never was
18:54:51 connected because you got one -- you got one of four
18:54:55 cloverleaves. There's one cloverleaf on -- you know,
54:58 if you look at -- the cloverleaves were built like in
18:55:02 California back in the '60s. They were -- there were
18:55:04 four of them. Well, there is only one cloverleaf on
18:55:07 this, where you exit from the Alaskan Way -- or from
18:55:11 Spokane Street viaduct and you get on Highway 99
18:55:15 northbound, where there is one loop there, but, say,
18:55:17 you can't go from the Spokane Street viaduct and get
18:55:23 onto Highway 99 northbound. It's just not possible.
18:55:26 So the 99 corridor really should be connected over
18:55:35 to the I-5 corridor, because in the late '50s, that
18:55:42 was the plan, to build an interstate highway system to
55:46 make the interstate highways your fast routes through

H-002-001

18:55:50 the cities, and then the old state highways were to be
55:54 pretty much surface streets, the slower old-fashioned,
18:55:59 you know, roadside-attraction-type highways. That was
18:56:03 the old highway system that was in place from 1913 up
18:56:08 until the -- you know, the interstate highway system.
18:56:11 So I think that pretty much concludes my thoughts,
18:56:17 that don't put a whole lot of money into the ramps
18:56:21 that go up to the Alaskan Way Viaduct because they
18:56:26 might not be there very long because if they tear down
18:56:29 the central viaduct, then, you know, they won't need
18:56:32 those ramps anymore.
18:56:33 And they really should focus on south connections,
18:56:36 the Spokane Street and Atlantic Street connections
18:56:39 over to I-5. So they really should focus on that. I
18:56:42 am hoping that we can find an alternative to get
18:56:46 traffic off of that central waterfront bridge.
18:56:49 It's too bad the thing was built. That was 50
18:56:52 years ago. It's too bad it was built when we were
18:56:57 stuck with the traffic along the central waterfront.
18:57:01 It really was railroaded through back in the '40s and
18:57:06 never should have been built back then. But it was --
18:57:08 it was done in the middle of the night, and no one was
18:57:11 really paying much attention.
18:57:13 And -- but now, you know, the waterfront has
18:57:18 changed. You know, in 50 years, there's -- you know,

H-002-001

18:57:22 tourism has grown, a need for a central park along --
18:57:26 you know, access to the waterfront. For the people --
18:57:29 people to the city it's very important. It's a
18:57:32 beautiful view. We have one of the most pretty, most
18:57:36 majestic central waterfronts in the country, you know,
18:57:39 and it -- there just should not be a heavy noisy
18:57:44 bridge along that central waterfront, and that
18:57:46 violates the Shoreline Management Act and everything.
18:57:49 You know, you don't build heavy bridges along
18:57:54 shorelines. You know, that's just not part of the
18:57:56 general accepted planning principles.
18:57:59 On one other thing, I am glad they are tearing
18:58:02 down the one mile of viaduct south of King Street
18:58:07 because it is a liability for the State to have this
18:58:11 heavy bridge. If an earthquake were to hit, a lot of
18:58:15 people could die, you know, with a collapse of a
18:58:18 bridge, especially around heavy traffic times. And to
18:58:22 get that down is important. So I'm glad they are
18:58:25 doing that. It reduces the liability for the State,
18:58:28 so I'm glad they are doing that.
18:58:30 So that's my comments. They shouldn't put a whole
18:58:34 lot of money into the ramps that go up to the old
18:58:37 portion of the old Alaskan Way Viaduct. Thank you
18:58:40 very much.
18:58:40 ///