



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: Kirby Lindsay
 Organization/Membership Affiliation (optional): _____
 Address: 465 N 36th
 City: Seattle State: WA Zip: 98103
 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 | |

I-321-001 What are your comments about the project?

I don't see why the Seawall is part of this package - it seems to make it more expensive. The Tunnel addresses only a short part of Seawall and that has to be the most expensive way to do it. Can't we (as Seattle) do our own Seawall?

(Please use additional paper if you need further comment space)

I-321-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. If either the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative or Elevated Structure Alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of the alternative because the outer wall of the cut-and-cover tunnel would serve as part of the new seawall and for the elevated structure, the new seawall is needed to support the soils in which the new foundations would be placed. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.