

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Howard A. Monta
Address: 12034 15th Ave NE, Unit 305
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98125
Email: howardandliz2992@msn.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-365-001

My main concern is that the alternative selected for the project will be the one that will create the least traffic rerouting while the work is in progress. We have experienced the increased traffic congestion on I-5 when the viaduct is closed for just a short period of time. I am in favor of rebuilding the viaduct as it now exists if that can be done with little or no rerouting of traffic. I was born and raised in Seattle, and I have never considered the viaduct an eyesore. It is as much a part of our picturesque skyline as the rest of our structures.
Thanks, Howard A. Monta

Comments apply to:
Overall Project

I-365-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. After studying several retrofitting concepts, the lead agencies found that rebuilding the viaduct would not be a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the risks to public safety and the weakened state of the viaduct. 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.

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. Compared to the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative avoids substantial closure of SR 99 during construction and it can be built in a shorter period of time than the other two alternatives. Extended closure of SR 99 would be more disruptive to Seattle and the Puget Sound region. Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) in the Final EIS provide a more in-depth comparison of trade-offs for the three alternatives.