Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project

Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to give us comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. The comments you make will become part of the public record for this project. Your thoughts will help decision makers develop a preferred alternative. Responses to your comments will be provided in the Final EIS.

Contact Information: At a minimum, please provide your name and Zip Code. If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

Name: S. Bartel

Organization/Membership Affiliation (optional): _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: 98116

E-mail: _____

☐ Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

1. Choose a topic:

- ☒ Overall Project
- ☐ All of the Alternatives
- ☐ Rebuild Alternative
- ☐ Aerial Alternative
- ☐ Tunnel Alternative
- ☐ Bypass Tunnel Alternative
- ☐ Surface Alternative
- ☐ Seawall
- ☐ Construction Impacts and Mitigation
- ☐ Other

What are your comments about the project?

I-052-001

Such a small portion of the viaduct is in any danger of failing we should focus on that portion & repair it. Charlie Chong addressed it very well in his article that appeared in the West Sea. Herald. We are being taxed & Levied enough - what with the "studies" (a way to do power lunches & fill our pockets) going on from ~~[illegible]~~ the monorail, now seawall/viaduct we've had enough.

(Please use additional paper if you need further comment space)

I-052-001

It is true that only a small portion of the existing viaduct sustained severe damage in the Nisqually earthquake in February of 2001. That portion was repaired for the interim. The structure is over 50 years old and nearing the end of its useful life. When built, it was designed to resist seismic forces less severe than we now know are possible in the Puget Sound region. The seismic standards in the 1950s were far below today's accepted design standards. Knowing what we do about the condition of the viaduct and the potential for catastrophic events, it would not be responsible or in the public's best interest to simply wait for the next event and risk loss of life.