Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to give us comments on the 2010 Supple-Contact Information mental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list. Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project. The comments you At a minimum, please provide your name and zip code. If you make will become part of the public record for this project. would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out Responses to your comments will be provided in the Final EIS. the rest of the contact information and check the box above. FRIFDMAN ARVEY Address Zip State City E-mail Organization/Membership Affiliations Choose a topic Overall Project Cut-&-Cover Tunnel Alternative Construction Impacts & Mitigation K Elevated Structure Alternative Traffic Impacts & Mitigation All of the Alternatives □ Other Bored Tunnel Alternative Tolling Option What are your comments about the Project?

1-045-001

Why do these shout tell sessions not include the option that mast people want if they knew it existed - an improved elevated viaduct built without denolishing the existing one? USDOT studied 2 different ways to do so but it is not official policy so not released to the media or the public. The deep-Jored burnel is an atrocious idea that steals majertic views from the majority of fuset Soundewand After West Seattleites and others from the SW to deal with much worse transportation options than eurrently.

Your answers to the questions below will let the agencies know if the Supplemental Draft EIS format was helpful. Your answers

- Is this the first EIS you have read?
 Yes X No
- 2. Have you previously participated in public meetings/ comment periods related to the AWV project?
 ☑ Yes □ No
- I-045-002 3. Did you find this Supplemental Draft EIS format easy to understand? □ Yes ⊠ No Why or why not? If is more propasarda to

It is more proposition formed convince the unin formed to accept the "big money" alternative choice,

- to these questions are not part of the EIS process and they will not receive a response.
- 4. Did the graphics help make the Supplemental Draft EIS easier to review and understand?
 Yes No
- 5. Did you refer to the technical appendices? ☑ Yes □ No
- 6. What did or didn't you find helpful when reading this supplemental Draft EIS? This was more political than technical. There were no compolling rearonn to make a deep-bored tonnel the "preferred alternative".

I-045-001

The lead agencies recognize that retrofitting highways, roadways, and bridges is often a viable option to counter earthquake threats. However, unlike other bridges and structures in the area, it isn't practical to retrofit the viaduct by only strengthening one or two structural elements. Fundamentally, such fixes transfer the forces from one weak point in the structure to another, and the viaduct is weak in too many places. The concrete frames, columns, foundations, and even the soil under the structure don't provide enough strength by today's standards. The lead agencies have studied various retrofitting concepts, and all of these concepts fail to provide a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the risks to public safety and the weakened state of the viaduct. The lead agencies also determined that retrofitting 20 percent of the viaduct as discussed for the Rebuild Alternative is not reasonable.

Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, of the Final EIS describes environmental documentation that occurred prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, including evaluation of the Rebuild Alternative. Please see this discussion for the story of how the build alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS came to be.

I-045-002

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. Specifically, compared to the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, it 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.