

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

Please use this form to give us comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. The comments you make will become part of the public record for this project. 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.
 Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Name SMITH, JAMES T.
 Address 1410 11th AVE. WEST
 City SEATTLE State WA Zip 98119
 Email N.A.
 Organization/Membership Affiliations (optional) N.A.

Choose a topic

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall Project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elevated Structure Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Impacts & Mitigation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All of the Alternatives | <input type="checkbox"/> Design Choices | <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Impacts & Mitigation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tunnel Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Seawall | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

What are your comments about the Project?

I-656-001

* HAVEN'T READ DEIS. PROBABLY WON'T. IMPRESSIONS OF PROJECT AND ITS IMPACTS DERIVED FROM MEDIA & YOUR BANNED HEARING DISPLAY. I OPPOSE TUNNEL & NEW ELEVATED STRUCTURE. I SUPPORT RETRO/REPAIR OF EXISTING STRUCTURE. IF THERE IS TO BE A BANDT MEASURE TO DETERMINE PUBLIC SENTIMENT ON VIADUCT SEAWALL PROJECT IT MUST INCLUDE ALL ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, RETRO/REPAIR OF EXISTING STRUCTURE. EIS MUST SIMILARLY TREAT ALL ALTERNATIVES TO BE DEEMED ADEQUATE

* ALSO, EIS & COMPUTER SIMULATIONS MUST ACKNOWLEDGE AND EVALUATE LOSST DEAN AND VIEWS FROM EXISTING ELEVATED STRUCTURE NOW ENJOYED BY PUBLICS.
 P.S. THIS FORM HAS IN A DEQUITE SPACE FOR COMMENTS

I-656-001

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.

The 2004 Draft EIS included Rebuild and Surface Alternatives, and those alternatives were screened out in the project development process. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.