AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Michael Novak
Address: 2440 NW 64th Street
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98107
Email: maitaihi@comcast.net
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-385-001 | 1. Instead of tearing out the existing seawall, just add another 3' to 4' of bulkhead in front of it. We will end up with a stronger concrete structure and wider sidewalks. 2. Once the seawall is done, the Aerial Alternative could commence. 3. Build the Aerial Alternative wider and higher than the existing Viaduct. This means keeping the upper deck of the Viaduct as a working platform, while the new side structure of the Viaduct was being built. 4. The closest example I can think of would be McDonalds "arches" (they don't have to be "golden")that span the entire waterfront from the Bell Street tunnel to the Spokane Street Viaduct. 5. The arches could be higher and wider than the existing Viaduct, and the new "top" roadway (5 lanes or more headed North) would be above the existing Viaduct. 6. All traffic would be "two-way" on the existing South Bound lanes of the old Viaduct during construction. Believe me "one lane" of "express" traffic in both directions will be better than stop lights on surface streets. 7. Once the top lanes of the new structure are completed, traffic both ways (N-S) could be diverted onto this new wider roadway (something like they did when building the new First Avenue South bridge while repairing the old bridge). 8. The top lanes (North bound) of the old Viaduct could be dismantled and hauled away. The South bound lanes of the old Viaduct could be used as a work platform for the new South bound lanes of the "golden arches". 9. Once the new South bound lanes are completed, the remaining portion of the Viaduct could be easily dismantled underneath the arches and hauled away. 10. What is left under the "arch" design is more open space between the lanes, open space under the lanes, and greater distance between the "arches". The current "pillar" Viaduct looks like a concrete wall (think prison)and is very confining, but "arches" could be spaced farther apart BECAUSE...an arch is the strongest support structure we know of and has been around for Centuries. 11. Bottom line: Expand the seawall out into Elliott Bay (don't dig it up and replace it), and make the new Viaduct a series of large sweeping arches down the water front that people and cars can maneuver around and it won't feel so claustrophobic. 12. In closing, Tunnels are expensive, they trap and confine pollution, wrecks are more difficult to clear, people would require emergency exits from the tunnel, and the "landfill" proposals that I saw at the Bell Street Center a few weeks ago to add more "public park space" are ridiculous. There should be connecting "loops" between I-90, I-5, Spokane Stree Freeway, and SR-99. Thank you for letting me suggest an "alternative" that goes beyond the current proposals.

I-385-002

I-385-003

Comments apply to:
Aerial Alternative

I-385-001

By expanding the seawall further into Elliott Bay, the project would have much greater environmental impacts than the current design. Elliott Bay serves as a permanent or seasonal home to aquatic species, including endangered and threatened such as Southern resident killer whales and Puget Sound Chinook salmon. Despite urban development, the edge of the seawall still provides habitat for the fish, wildlife, and vegetation resources in Elliott Bay. Expansion of the seawall would permanently and substantially affect the habitat for these resources.

Seawall construction further into Elliott Bay would also be challenging and may produce its own set of temporary impacts. The disturbance of sediments along the seabed could create turbidity and transport of contaminated soils.

Many of these concerns have been emphasized by local environmental groups, interested tribes that depend on fisheries, and state and federal resource agencies with permitting authority. The lead agencies continue to seek input and to work with stakeholders on how to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts in Elliott Bay.

I-385-002

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for 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-385-003

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your

suggestions. Numerous design concepts were evaluated as described in Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, of the Final EIS. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative due to its ability to best meet the project's identified purposes and needs and the support it has received from diverse interests.