



Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project

Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to give us comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. The comments you make will become part of the public record for this project. Your thoughts will help decision makers develop a preferred alternative. 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.

Name: Robert Keeney
 Organization/Membership Affiliation (optional): _____
 Address: 124 NW 83rd St
 City: Seattle State: WA Zip: 98117
 E-mail: _____

☐ Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

1. Choose a topic:

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall Project | <input type="checkbox"/> Tunnel Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Impacts and Mitigation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> All of the Alternatives | <input type="checkbox"/> Bypass Tunnel Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rebuild Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Surface Alternative | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aerial Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Seawall | |

What are your comments about the project?

I-289-001 | I would prefer an aerial structure
 I-289-002 | to a tunnel. If we cannot rebuild the
existing structure then we should
incrementally replace it with a new
viaduct. I believe it could be done
in such a way that the viaduct
would be largely useable during the
 (Please use additional paper if you need further comment space)

I-289-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Aerial Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative to meet today's safety standards while minimizing the effects of a wider structure. This alternative was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, and the design was refined in the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-289-002

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. 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 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

Construction. I envision new bridge supports built between the existing supports. Then, by use of temporary spans, similar to the adjusting spans at the Puget Sound Ferry docks we should be able to continue using the "old" part that remains as we build the new from one end to the other. This would require deck heights fairly near the heights of the existing decks.

Thank You for your consideration of my thoughts on this matter.