Schedules A&B (Form 1040) 2006

Name(s) shown on Form 1040. Do not enter name and social security number if shown on other side.

Schedule B—Interest and Ordinary Dividends

OMB No. 1545-0074 Page 2
Your social security number

Attachment Sequence No. **08** 

	eror to, a	transf		(See page B-2.)
			b If "Yes." enter the name of the foreign country ▶	בוכיוו טוום
	account?	ancial	account in a foreign country, such as a bank account, securities account, or other financial account?	Accounts
	a financial	over	7a At any time during 2006, did you have an interest in or a signature or other authority over a financial	Foreign
S 0	Yes	nds; or a forei	You must complete this part if you (a) had over \$1,500 of taxable interest or ordinary dividends; or (b) had a foreign account; or (c) received a distribution from, or were a grantor of, or a transferor to, a foreign trust.	Part III
			Note. If line 6 is over \$1,500, you must complete Part III.	
		6	6 Add the amounts on line 5. Enter the total here and on Form 1040, line 9a . ▶	
				on that form.
				the ordinary
				name as the payer and enter
				a brokerage firm, list the firm's
				substitute
				received a Form
		תט		Note. If you
				line 9a.)
				instructions for Form 1040.
				and the
				Dividends
				Ordinary
				Part II
			5 List name of payer ▶	
	Amount		9	
		4	Attach Form 8815  4 Subtract line 3 from line 2. Enter the result here and on Form 1040, line 8a ▶	
		ພ	3 Excludable interest on series EE and I U.S. savings bonds issued after 1989.	form.
		N	2 Add the amounts on line 1	shown on that
				payer and enter
				list the firm's name as the
				statement from a brokerage firm,
				1099-OID, or substitute
				received a Form 1099-INT, Form
				Note. If you
		,		
		_		
				Form 1040, line 8a.)
				and the instructions for
				(See page B-1
			buyer used the property as a personal residence, see page B-1 and list this interest first. Also, show that buyer's social security number and address ▶	Part I Interest
	Amount		1 List name of payer. If any interest is from a seller-financed mortgage and the	

#### City of Seattle Elevated **Advisory Measure No. Structure Alternative**



# **Explanatory Statement (cont.)**

-

existing ramps at Columbia and Seneca Streets and Elliott and Western Avenues would be rebuilt. The new structure would be 11.5 to 35 feet wider than the existing viaduct from south of S. Main Street up to Union Street. From S. King Street to south of S. Main Street, the new structure would be 54 to 74 feet wider than the existing viaduct as the roadway changes from a side-by-side at-grade roadway in the south to a new double level elevated structure.

appropriate another \$371 million for the project. Expert Review Panel has stated that it is preferable to take a project to a further level of design before settling on a cost for budget purposes. The state and federal governments have identified \$2.4 billion in funding for replacement of the Alaskan Way Viaduct, and the Governor has asked the legislature to City of Seattle, and private consultants, has preliminarily estimated that the Elevated Structure Alternative would cost approximately \$2.8 billion, based on the current level of design. This preliminary estimate has been validated through WSDOT's process and by the State's Expert Review Panel. The State's As of January 25, 2007, the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project Team, which includes the Washington State Department of Transportation, the

prior to the election. The information in this explanatory statement is based on information available to the City Attorney on January 25, 2007. The information may change

### **Statement Against**

## Say NO to Another Elevated Viaduct.

For more than 50 years, the Alaskan Way Viaduct has put a wall between the city and the waterfront.

That used to be a good thing. At the time, the waterfront was a dirty and dangerous place, and it made sense for Seattleites to drive above it.

Since the 1950s, however, most of the shipping terminals have moved south and opened up space and views that had never been appreciated before. Parks and museums are growing where there was once only industrial activity, and people come from all over the world to enjoy our city, the Sound, and the mountains.

And right in the heart of that experience is a noisy, dirty, crumbling freeway.

Taking the viaduct off the waterfront and returning the City's waterfront to public use is a great gift to future generations.

It will also help our economy and environment. Today Seattle's waterfront businesses are shops, restaurants and tourism, and an inviting waterfront will help bring people and jobs to Seattle and surrounding areas. More downtown green space will also encourage residents to live downtown and reduce sprawl.

We're not the first city to face this challenge. Port cities all over the globe, including San Francisco, Baltimore and Barcelona, are tearing down their elevated freeways, rediscovering their waterfronts and finding new sources of revenue and jobs.

There's no hope of building a better viaduct. Because of earthquake and other safety requirements, a new elevated highway will be much bigger and much wider than the existing viaduct—at least fifty percent wider with shoulders and walls that will even take away the stunning view enjoyed by motorists. This huge new double-decker highway will permanently place even more of the downtown waterfront in shadow.

We know how urgent problems can force hasty solutions. There is no doubt that the Alaskan Way Viaduct must be torn down, and soon. But if we rebuild the elevated structure (which will be bigger, wider and noisier), we lose so much: priceless open space, the opportunity to improve the environment of Elliott Bay and Puget Sound, and the economic benefits of a world-class waterfront.

There are alternative ways to handle our transportation needs without building a bigger, noisier viaduct on our waterfront. For economic, environmental, and quality of life reasons, vote NO on Advisory Ballot Measure Number 2, say NO to another elevated viaduct.

## Rebuttal of Statement For

Seattle has some of the most beautiful waterfront property in the world. Without the viaduct, we could have a clean, open space that everyone could enjoy, instead of just the people driving past. Why would we build another freeway there?

It also wouldn't just be another viaduct. It would be bigger and noisher and you wouldn't get the views you enjoy now.

The Washington State Department of Transportation says this about a new elevated structure:

"(It) would be between 11.5 and 35 feel wider than the existing viaduct (and) three feet higher than the existing viaduct.... Like the existing structure, the new structure would continue to obstruct views; cast shade over an extensive area; limit future development of parks, trails, and sidewalks; generate overhead traffic noise..." (2006 Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement)

Let's not make an old mistake worse. **Vote NO on Advisory Ballot Measure 2.** 

### Statements Prepared By:

Ron Sims, King County Executive

Jessyn Farrell Executive Director Transpo

Jessyn Farrell, Executive Director, Transportation Choices Coalition Kathy Fletcher, Executive Director, People for Puget Sound

Not Another Elevated Viaduct Website: www.noelevated.org Email: info@noelevated.org Phone: 206 601-0641 PO Box 9100 Seattle, WA 98109