

From: [Olsoe, Mark E](#)
To: [AWV SDEIS Comments](#);
CC:
Subject: Viaduct/Seawall Replacement
Date: Friday, September 08, 2006 2:55:10 PM
Attachments:

Dear Viaduct/Seawall Replacement Project,

I-630-001 The lifestyle impacts of both the cut and cover option or the the viaduct replacement option are so horrible that my preference is to rebuild the existing viaduct. If this rebuild option has been truly and honestly assesses and is truly not a viable option, then I would vote for the cut and cover.

Thanks, Mark Olsoe

I-630-001

The lead agencies recognize that retrofitting highways, roadways, and bridges is often a viable option to counter earthquake threats. However, unlike other bridges and structures in the area, it isn't practical to retrofit the viaduct by only strengthening one or two structural elements. Fundamentally, such fixes transfer the forces from one weak point in the structure to another, and the viaduct is weak in too many places. The concrete frames, columns, foundations, and even the soil under the structure don't provide enough strength by today's standards. The lead agencies have studied various retrofitting concepts, and all of these concepts fail to provide a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the risks to public safety and the weakened state of the viaduct. The lead agencies also determined that retrofitting 20 percent of the viaduct as discussed for the Rebuild Alternative is not reasonable.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative due to its ability to best meet the project's identified purposes and needs and the support it has received from diverse interests. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.