

***Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form***

Name: Harvey Friedman

Address:

City: Seattle

State:

Zip: 98107

E-mail Address:

Affiliation (optional):

I-588-001 | **Comments:** I do not like the way the SDEIS options were presented. Linking shorter & intermediate times to tunnel and longer to elevated is misleading to the casual observer. Next time, present the shorter & intermediate times for the elevated and the longer for the tunnel. Better yet, present all 6; no need to appear biased.

I-588-002 | With regard to the seawall, has repair only been thought of with the tunnel option, or have alternatives with less impact on the waterfront businesses been considered? It seems to me that using CAISSONS (drydocks) a section (street block ?) at a time would be a practical way to repair the seawall without closing the waterfront businesses. Is a way still being looked at to rebuild/replace the elevated viaduct without having to reroute traffic as in earlier DOT presentations? Can project engineers correct incomplete and misleading statements by Deputy Mayor Tim Ceis such as the railing height to comply with federal safety standards. He claimed it would obstruct views for cars; I determined that it was only 2'8" which would only be problem for sports cars. Why do I get the impression that certain city council members and the mayor want to replace the elevated structure with a tunnel at any cost? It seems that if tunnel cost \$20 billion and elevated only \$5 billion, that some such as JD would still vote for tunnel. When is practicality finally going to supercede questionable aesthetics (after all, beauty is in the eye of the beholder)? The slogan "waterfront for people, not cars" seems like they want to get rid of waterfront businesses and replace with their grassy park. I ask what is next, "waterfront for people, not ships"? The whole Seattle waterfront corridor needs the SR99 elevated roadway. 500000+ people live within Seattle city limits. Probably less than 50000 live downtown and less than that in the viaduct corridor view area. I thought we try to

I-588-003 |

I-588-004 |

I-588-005 |

I-588-001

As stated in Chapter 3 Question 10 and Chapter 6 Question 2 of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives could be built under any of the three construction plans (the shorter, intermediate, or longer construction plan). Since 2006, the project has evolved. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

I-588-002

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

Numerous methods for replacing the seawall have been explored. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would replace the seawall with the outer wall of the tunnel from S. Washington Street up to Pine Street. From just north of Pine to Broad Street the seawall would be replaced by strengthening the soils and replacing the existing seawall with a new face panel and L-wall support structure. Under the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, the piers along the seawall would remain open for business with temporary access and utilities provided during the construction period.

I-588-003

No. If the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel or Elevated Structure Alternative is

***Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form***

I-588-005

provide the most benefit for the most people. Maybe the mayor really is innumerate. Or maybe money is more important than people. People ask if we would build elevated roadway if it wasn't already there. That is wrong question. Seattle doesn't have to buy private property to have viaduct so it is already much less expensive than starting anew. NO TUNNEL.

selected, detours would be necessary to route traffic off of the viaduct at various times during construction. Restricting traffic access to the viaduct during construction gives construction crews unrestricted access to the facility, which shortens the project construction time and fosters workplace safety. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, operations on SR 99 would be maintained throughout the construction period, with the exception of a several-week closure during the end of construction to connect the tunnel with the remainder of SR 99.

A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities.

I-588-004

If the Elevated Structure Alternative is selected, the railing height will be per state standards in order to provide a safe and reliable deterrent to errant vehicles. Standard barrier heights vary from 2 feet 8 inches up to 3 feet 6 inches but are generally less than 3 feet. The height of the barrier will be set during final design.

I-588-005

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-588-006 I do not like the way the SDEIS options were presented. Linking shorter & intermediate times to tunnel and longer time to elevated is misleading to the casual observer. Next time, present the shorter & intermediate times for the elevated and the longer time for the tunnel. Better yet, present all 6; no need to appear biased.

I-588-007 With regard to the seawall, has repair been thought of only with the tunnel option, or have alternatives with less impact on the waterfront traffic been considered? It seems to me that using CAISSONS (drydocks) a section (street block ?) at a time would be a practical way to repair the seawall without closing the entire waterfront. Is a way still being looked at to rebuild/replace the elevated viaduct without having to reroute traffic more than a block or so at a time as in earlier DOT presentations? Has the structural integrity of buildings to the east of the viaduct right-of-way been studied as to how they would survive in an earthquake powerful enough to knock down the viaduct? If these buildings would also fall, there would probably be enough weight to collapse the trenched tunnel/seawall also. I'd rather take my chances on viaduct.

I-588-010 Are project engineers allowed to correct incomplete and misleading statements by Deputy Mayor Tim Ceis . Ceis acknowledges that fantastic views from the current viaduct are important to many Seattleites and visitors but tries to counteract this by claiming that federal safety standards such as the railing height would obstruct views for cars. I learned that minimum standard is 2'8" which would only be problem for sports cars.

I-588-011 The whole Seattle waterfront corridor needs the SR99 ELEVATED roadway. Taking the 54/55 bus to downtown from West Seattle provides a spectacular view of thriving seaport unmatched by few if any cities in this country. Why take this view away from the common folk? 500000+ people live within Seattle city limits. Probably less than 50000 live downtown and less than that in the viaduct corridor view area. I thought government tries to provide the most benefit for the most people. Maybe the mayor really is innumerate. Or maybe money is more important than people. People ask if we would build elevated roadway if it wasn't already there. That is wrong question. Seattle doesn't have to buy private property (as other cities would have to) to have viaduct so it is already much less expensive than starting anew. Why the insistence on removing the viaduct rather than improving both the viaduct and the waterfront? To showcase our area for the 1962 World's Fair, Seattle didn't dig a Space Trench, but rather erected a Space Needle. Why do I get the impression that certain city council members and the mayor want to replace the elevated structure with a tunnel at any cost? It seems that if tunnel cost \$20 billion and elevated only \$5 billion, that they would still vote for tunnel. When is practicality finally going to supercede questionable aesthetics (after all, beauty or ugliness is in the eye of the beholder)? The slogan "waterfront for people, not cars" seems to imply they want to get rid of waterfront businesses (and aquarium and ferries?) and replace with their grassy park as if it were just a backyard pond. I ask what is next, "waterfront for people, not ships"? Finally, to use part of a quote on page 11 in the "Seattle Weekly" of 20September2006 about Martin Selig's Columbia Center by the late esteemed architect, Victor Steinbrueck, replacing an existing elevated roadway with a tunnel would be a "symbol of greed and egoism" and arrogance. NO TUNNEL.

Harvey Friedman Seattle

(206)784-2774

I-588-006

Please see the response to I-588-001 above.

I-588-007

Please see the response to I-588-002 above.

I-588-008

Please see the response to I-588-003 above.

I-588-009

It is likely that a severe earthquake would result in damage and the possible collapse of buildings immediately to the east of the existing viaduct between S. King Street and Pike Street. The collapse of these buildings could potentially impact an elevated structure built in the place of the existing structure. As the Bored Tunnel Alternative would be well below the building foundations, it is not thought that the collapse of any of these buildings would affect the tunnel.

I-588-010

Please see the response to I-588-004 above.

I-588-011

Please see the response to I-588-005 above.