

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Bill Phillips  
Address:  
City:  
State:  
Zip Code: 98199  
Email: wwphil@aol.com  
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-410-001

My preferred option is the Rebuild Alternative. This appears to be the best compromise for providing traffic flow, minimizing the costs, taking the least space, maximizing constructibility, and minimizing construction time. This also appears to provide the best access for the west side traffic (Ballard/ Interbay, etc.), which is essential. It would be a traffic nightmare to have the westside traffic go through downtown to get to the southend or to I-5 or use additional surface streets to get to the proposed tunnel. For the south section I would suggest looking at providing aerial sructure (or flyover, if you wish) over 1st Ave So, directly to the 4th Ave So. flyover on So. Atlantic St. This could provide a complete aerial from the Viaduct to I-90 without the cross traffic of the surface streets. For the south section it is not clear what the benefits/pros/cons for aerial or surface roadway might be. Suggestthat this comparison be made more direct and obvious when the final alternative is chosen. By including the south aerial and Bell Street Tunnel refurbishment in the Aerial Alternative, not clear what the real cost trade is between the Aerial and Rebuild Alternatives. Obviously, larger structure means somewhat higher cost for the Aerial, but the groundrules for comparing the alternatives should be the same. For the Aerial and Rebuild Alternatives, has any consideration been given to employing "tinker toy" type of construction? Whereby, large sections would be constructed off-site and then barged to the waterfront to be lifted into place, and then bolted and cabled. General techniques such as this have been employed successfully for bridge construction to minimize the costs, impact on traffic, and duration of construction.

I-410-002

I-410-003

Comments apply to:  
Overall Project

**I-410-001**

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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

**I-410-002**

The overcrossing you suggested for Atlantic Street was included instead at S. Royal Brougham Way in the S. King Street to S. Holgate Street Viaduct Replacement Project. This project began construction in 2010. S. Atlantic Street remains an at-grade roadway for the build alternatives currently being considered. The elevated crossing of SR 99 would be provided at S. Royal Brougham Way as a more efficient connection across the traffic on the surface street.

**I-410-003**

Prefabrication of structural elements is being considered and will be utilized to the extent that it is appropriate for achieving project objectives. Please note that the lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project.