

From: Linda Strandberg [mailto:lindastrandberg@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 9:53 AM
To: Casseday, Katherine
Subject: NO tunnel, PLEASE

Dear Katherine,

I-664-001

I spoke with you at the end of the WSDoT session at Plymouth Church last Thursday evening. I appreciate the fact that you seem interested in public opinion on the SR99 problem/project.

I feel that a tunnel is far too extravagant and impractical. I would favor IMMEDIATE repair efforts on the viaduct, as it is being heavily used at this moment. I would also favor more extensive research regarding potential retrofit, as I feel that Seattle will suffer greatly, on many levels and for many years (at least 42 months!), if the traffic flow through the city is slowed down more than it presently is. We need a major highway in addition to I-5. If improvements to I-5 need to be made, or if there is a major incident which blocks I-5, and there is a construction project which limits the SR99 use, how will we move people from the North end of the city to the South end....via 405?

I really don't understand how a tunnel project could seem the logical choice.

I-664-002

I also have a difficult time understanding how the state could stand by and watch the devastation of Seattle's maritime industry, as the city's face is altered from that of a functioning port with its integral beauty to one of a soul-less tenant-style hotel/cruise ship 'port'.

Thank you,

Linda Strandberg

I-664-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on a tunnel alternative. The lead agencies are working to move the project forward and begin the replacement of the viaduct as soon as it is feasible.

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.

I-664-002

The City of Seattle, as a lead agency, is in the midst of a major effort in defining the future direction of the central waterfront. The Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project is expected to be compatible with the City's vision for the waterfront.