From: Linda Neilsen
To: AWV SDEIS Comments
CC:
Subject:
Viaduct Replacement Videos
Date:
Saturday, September 09, 2006 12:15:41 PM
Attachments:

DOT Project Managers,

I have viewed both videos on the Viaduct Replacement. Thank you for providing them. My comments are:

I-626-001 1. Please add more traffic to the lanes to be *realistic* for those entry and exit lanes which require **traffic weaving**.

2. Why the weaving necessary for the entry and exit lanes? This roadway is not in the middle of nowhere.

3. Why do we view the replacement lanes 'flying' rather than 'driving' them in the videos?

4. Three lanes all the way and no disappearing lanes please in the short span and congested traffic of this roadway. Leave disappearing lanes to real magicians.

I-626-002 5. The lighting for the Replacement is poorer than for the Tunnel.

I-626-003 6. Why NO improvements for the Replacement version? It looks identical to present road.

I-626-004 7. Why are the vertical supports for the Viaduct Replacement not ***arched*** like the Romans constructed which are mostly still standing *two thousand* years later?

I-626-005 8. Research should be done to determine the colors for the ceilings and walls to make tunnel entry and exit easier for the eyes to adjust as indoor outdoor lighting changes. Headlight use in tunnels also needs to be considered for its effect on the drivers' eyes.

a. Should the walls be glossy or dull or mixed? Should tunnel ceiling be dark, light or in between? Should these vary from entry, interior to exit?

I-626-006 9. Set the videos up with heavy traffic for a "virtual reality" demonstration for average drivers and see how the "virtual drivers" do navigating weaving traffic while making various lane changes and exit and entry maneuvers. Lane changes are prohibited on bridges are they not? Why lane changes for this roadway okay?

Yes, I would appreciate a reply that addresses each of the above concerns

Linda Neilsen
2112 S. 250th St.
Kent, WA. 98032
ldneilsen@yahoo.com

I-626-001

The videos are intended to give viewers an idea of what the proposed alternatives would look like and are not a tool to evaluate traffic operations or impacts. Several other models and methodologies were used to evaluate traffic operations effects for each build alternative. Updated descriptions of the methodology and analysis tools used, as well as the expected traffic effects for each alternative, are shown in the updated Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS.

I-626-002

Lighting that is consistent with current lighting and safety standards will be provided for each build alternative.

I-626-003

The Elevated Structure Alternative described in the 2006 Supplemental Draft and Final EIS has a similar look to the existing viaduct because it is a stacked aerial structure. However, the Elevated Structure Alternative would be designed to current earthquake standards and would be larger, with wider lanes and shoulders, than the existing viaduct. Please see the Final EIS for current information about each build alternative for this project.

I-626-004

A few of the Roman aqueducts and roadways, constructed approximately 2,000 years ago, are still standing – though not in areas subject to strong earthquakes. The Roman arch was essentially a gravity structure and relied on the compressive strength of the rock utilized for the arch. These structures were not capable of resisting tension such as that imposed by the shaking of an earthquake. With the advent of concrete and steel reinforcing, structures are able to resist much higher tensile and compressive loads than those carried by Roman Arches.

I-626-005

The final design and aesthetic for the tunnel will comply with current design standards so that the tunnel will be visually safe for drivers.

I-626-006

Please see the response to comment I-626-001 above.