

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: charles tedrick  
Address:  
City: seattle  
State: wa  
Zip Code: 98101  
Email: peshcena@earthlink.net  
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

**I-500-001**

I am infavor of the rebuild alternative because it will not increase traffic on alaskan way once it is completed thereby NOT dividing the downtown from the waterfront any more than it already is. The other alternatives do increase traffic on alaskan way, doubling and even quadrupling the traffic on the already crowded street and making it much more difficult for foot traffic to cross alaskan way; but more importantly the noise and noxious fumes will make the waterfront experience much less desirable eventually driving people away.

Comments apply to:  
Construction Impacts and Mitigation  
Rebuild Alternative

Project Comments:

**I-500-002**

This is the plan I like the best and support this alternative as the more acceptable of those presented to us. However I do not think that any of the plans give enough consideration to the enhancement of the waterfront as a place for people to enjoy and as an attraction for people to make the city their home. Too much attention is given only to moving traffic north and south through the city and too little consideration for the actual waterfront.

Comments apply to:  
Rebuild Alternative

Project Comments:

**I-500-003**

I do not see anything in the EIS tha addresses the option of not rebuilding the viaduct and the mitigation of traffic congestion by the construction of the monorail from Ballard to West Seattle. Also the EIS does not adequately address the economic impact on retail business and residential homeowners during the long construction times as well as the effects of the increased traffic(as much as 4x the present volume on alaskan way) will have on bussiness and home values. Any alternative that would decrease traffic on alaskan way would certainly inhance the attractiveness of the waterfront to bikers and pedestrians alike, as well integrating the downtown with the waterfront without the high traffic volumes that would turn alaskan way into another I-5 with endless streams of traffic.

**I-500-004**

**I-500-005**

Comments apply to:  
Overall Project  
Construction Impacts and Mitigation

### I-500-001

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-500-002

The Rebuild Alternative is no longer being considered. The final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project has considered how to protect and enhance recreational and cultural resources along the corridor - such as Pike Place Market, Pioneer Square, and the many waterfront activities along the project corridor.

If the viaduct is replaced by a tunnel, more open space would become available. This new space could become a wide waterfront promenade with bike and pedestrian paths. If the viaduct is removed, scenic views to, from, and along the waterfront would be opened up, making the waterfront more attractive visually and making it seem more connected to downtown, Pioneer Square, Pike Place Market, and Belltown.

### I-500-003

Please refer to the discussion of the Viaduct Closed (No Build) Alternative in the Final EIS for more information on the effects of closing the viaduct.

Project Comments:

**I-500-006** The EIS does not adequately address the ability of design changes and the use of advances in construction materials to mitigate the noise levels with the rebuild alternative. The measurement of decibel levels in the EIS which is all well and good, does not mention any studies by acoustical engineers that might be of value in decreasing the noise levels from the viaduct.

Comments apply to:  
Rebuild Alternative

Project Comments:

**I-500-007** It appears that traffic flow on Alaskan Way will be increased with all of the alternatives presented. I was under the impression that it is desirable to increase the connection between downtown and the waterfront by doing away with the physically and visually obstructing viaduct. None of these plans address this issue, in fact by increasing the traffic flow on Alaskan Way, you will actually isolate the waterfront from downtown even more than it is now. Also, it does not seem possible to increase the traffic and make the waterfront more pedestrian friendly.

Comments apply to:  
Overall Project

The Seattle Monorail Project's Green Line is no longer being considered for implementation, and therefore cannot be assumed as a mitigation strategy to either complement or replace the project. However, other high-capacity transit developments that are currently being planned or built (e.g., Link Light Rail) may address some of the trips that are made on a daily basis through the Alaskan Way Viaduct corridor.

**I-500-004**

Impacts to businesses and residents during construction were evaluated in Chapter 6 of the Economics Technical Memorandum, Appendix P of the 2004 Draft EIS. This document has been updated for the Final EIS as the Economics Discipline Report, Appendix L. The economics analysis includes the impacts directly attributed to construction activities for the project. An analysis on changes to the property values of individual parcels during or after construction would be speculative, subject to economic forces beyond the control of this project, and is outside the scope of this economic analysis.

**I-500-005**

Comment noted. Please see the response to I-500-002 above. The Final EIS and Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, describe traffic volumes in the corridor and on the surface street under each alternative.

**I-500-006**

Please note that the Rebuild Alternative is no longer under consideration. Methods of noise mitigation such as noise barriers and berms are not applicable due to the densely developed nature of the project area. Other noise abatement methods applicable to all build alternatives are addressed in the Final EIS Appendix F, Noise Discipline Report.

**I-500-007**

The build alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS are forecasted to have less traffic on Alaskan Way compared to the 2030 Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative). Please see the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS, for additional information.