

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: R. Mauritsen  
Address:  
City:  
State:  
Zip Code: 98115  
Email:  
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

**I-343-001** I understand the necessity of replacing the viaduct and seawall. However, I am against the alternatives that do not involve another viaduct. My reasons are emotional. I'm sure you've heard this before, but the drive along the top of the viaduct is a major uplifting experience. Much ado is made about how the waterfront will be improved for the people of Seattle if a tunnel is used. But what about the rest of us who don't live downtown? When I drive north on the viaduct, the views of downtown and of the bay and the sound are simply splendid. They always remind me of how great Seattle really is. On a non-rainy, partly sunny day, or especially a sunny day, the view of the late afternoon sky over the sound, with the bay and the waterfront in the foreground, never fails to thrill me as I drive by the downtown buildings of Seattle. And these views have become more precious to me, the more that people have agitated to tear down the viaduct. If you want the non-downtown residents of Seattle to keep a strong connection with the center, then put up another viaduct. Let them keep seeing the city and the bay and having a thrill when they do. On the other hand, don't make them sit down in a tunnel when there is a traffic jam. The jam is much easier to tolerate with the wonderful views from the viaduct. A new viaduct doesn't have to be ugly. Just look at the unbelievable new viaduct over the Tarn River at Millau in France. You are proposing to build something here in Seattle that will probably cost more than the Millau viaduct. Use the money to build a viaduct that isn't ugly and which gives something to each group. For example, you might put it on single pylons, instead of double ones. You might raise it higher. Be creative. One last thought. If you put in a bunch of park areas, especially south of the ferry terminal, those areas will just fill up with homeless people and the like. Look at the park in the Denny Regrade area. And then what? Instead, build the new viaduct higher and open up the waterfront that way.

**I-343-001**

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild Alternative, followed by the Aerial Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.