From: Victor Gray [vgray@olympus.net]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 4:45 PM
To: cvbrown.pe@gmail.com
Cc: AWV SDEIS Comments
Subject: the SDEIS

Commetns by the Viaduct Preservation Group

Ms Angela Freuenstein, Environmental Manger
Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project
999 Third Avenue; Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Re The Viaduct EIS

C-021-001

This letter will attempt to summarize my concerns about the EIS.
First of all I have in the past responded to the DOT but these comments have been ignored by the DOT. The current EIS consisting of some 245 pages including some 92 references and a list of preparers about 50 in number. Included were all of the comments paid for by the DOT to provide professional services at the DOT direction. Can we really expect a objective analysis from those paid by the DOT

First of all as the lead agency the DOT should insist that al of the FHWA and State design standards are enforced. Yet they are asking for deviations from the standards regarding lane widths, shoulder widths and ignore the provisions of the American Disabilites Act (ACT). All of these deal with public safety. The DOT claims these deviations are necessary to save money yet the tunnel budget lists a 415 million of for risk and contingency. The tunnel design must be safe and revised to meet all off the current standards.

The claim is made that the viaduct is not safe and must be torn down. Yet the southern section was not damaged during the 2001 and serves the traffic needs of today. The northern section was damaged but repaired after the quake Why tear down a working facility that has served 10 years and can continue to serve another 50 years if maintained The EIS is incomplete as it does not include the retrofit as a viable option.

The sad fact is that the DOT and the City of Seattle are willing to ignore a savings of some 2 billion with a retrofitted viaduct and spend the extra money while at the same time wind up with a reduced traffic capacity of 4 lanes with the new tunnel while the existing viaduct has 6 lanes. The State and the City ignore the cost to the pubic for traffic disruption , yet it is real. About all that is done with the tunnel is to move traffic problems around . No provision is made for traffic growth. In fact traffic problems will be worse

It is ironic that the DOT is pushing ahead with a 5 billion project while the State's general fund is looking at a 5 billion shortfall in the next two years not to mention current shortfall of about 1

C-021-001

Thank you for your comments. Our team has worked hard to prepare a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement that evaluates the many technical details associated with the complexities of replacing the viaduct. WSDOT appreciates the time and thought you have put into your ideas related to viaduct replacement. We do not agree that we have ignored your comments. WSDOT has responded to your comments on multiple occasions, including the following specific documents, which have been publicly available on the Project's website at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/libraryalternatives.htm:

- Evaluation of Gray's Retrofit Proposal, T.Y. Lin International Review, July 2006 (pdf 5 Mb)
- Additional Retrofit for Gray's Modified Proposal, T.Y. Lin International review of modified retrofit proposal, November 2006 (pdf 614 kb)
- Cost Comparison between Elevated Structure and Gray Retrofit, with comments from Victor Gray, December 2006 (pdf 197 kb)

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle have been working together to ensure that the design of the viadcut's replacement will protect public safety. Provisions of the American Disabilities Act have not been ignored, they are an important requirements that are incorporated into our design. Design deviations for urban roadways are common, particularly in an environment as constrained as downtown Seattle. However, in order to be allowed to deviate from state and federal standards, WSDOT and FHWA go through a rigourous deviation review process to ensure that the deviations are appropriate and reflect a design that protects public safety. The project's budget for risk and contingency are not unusual, rather they are commonplace and viewed as acceptable and necessary within the industry.

We are not sure what specific section of the viaduct you are referring to in your letter when you refer to the southern and northern sections.

C-021-001

billion .Granted that the DOT funds are not for the general fund use. However the City and State taxpayer will still pay the bill

The letter by traffic engineer , Christopher V. Brown 12/13/2010 , best covers many of the key points that should be considered . I urge that his letter be carefully considered and answered.

Viaduct Preservation Group 12/13/2010
Victor O. Gray, PE
120 Colman Drive.
Port Townsend , WA 98368
360-379-9862

However, WSDOT has extensively studied the concept of retrofitting the viaduct and has obtained review by other parties, such as the American Society of Civil Engineers, before coming to the conclusion that retrofit was not a viable alternative for replacing the entire portion of the structure that is at-risk. The studies listed below have been focused on both the seismic vulnerabilities of the existing viaduct and various retrofit proposals that have been evaluated, including your concept:

- Retrofit Technical Analyses Table of Contents and Conclusions(pdf 77 kb)
- Seismic Vulnerability of the Alaskan Way Viaduct: Summary Report, Washington State Transportation Center (TRAC), July 1995 (pdf 63 kb)
- Alaskan Way Viaduct: Report of the Structural Sufficiency Review Committee, June 2001 (pdf 503 kb)
- Alaskan Way Viaduct Phase 1 Retrofit Option Report, American Society of Civil Engineers Review, July 2002 (pdf 50 kb)
- Rebuild/Retrofit Alternative Report, Parsons Brinckerhoff, August 2002 (pdf 475 kb)
- Rebuild/Retrofit 500, Parsons Brinckerhoff, April 2003 (pdf 4.5 Mb)
- Rebuild/Retrofit 500, Appendix B: Preliminary Deep Foundation Engineering Analyses, Existing Piles, Alaskan Way Viaduct Project, Shannon & Wilson, January 2003 (pdf 925)
- Alaskan Way Viaduct Summary: Safety and Service Limitations of the Alaskan Way Viaduct, 2005 (pdf 118 kb)
- Proposed Retrofit of Alaskan Way Viaduct Using Fluid Viscous Dampers: Preliminary Phase, Miyamoto International, Inc., July 2006 (pdf 8.9 Mb)
- Evaluation of Gray's Retrofit Proposal, T.Y. Lin International Review, July 2006 (pdf 5 Mb)
- Additional Retrofit for Gray's Modified Proposal, T.Y. Lin International review of modified retrofit proposal, November 2006 (pdf 614 kb)

- Report of the American Society of Civil Engineers Review Committee, December 2006 (pdf 36 kb)
- Cost Comparison between Elevated Structure and Gray Retrofit, December 2006 (pdf 47 kb)
- Cost Comparison between Elevated Structure and Gray Retrofit, with comments from Victor Gray, December 2006 (pdf 197 kb)
- Seismic Vulnerability Analysis Report, Parsons Brinckerhoff, November 2007 (pdf 3.9 Mb)
- Alaskan Way Viaduct: Evaluation of Seismic Retrofit Options, KPFF Consulting Engineers, September 2008 (pdf 466 kb)
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee Retrofit Presentation, July 17, 2008 (pdf 1.6 mb)

The conclusion of these analyses are summarized in the following statement in a September 2008 report entitled *Alaskan Way Viaduct: Evaluation of Seismic Retrofit Options*, published by KPFF Consulting Engineers. That report concluded that the "damping retrofit scheme proposed by the Viaduct Preservation Group would cost approximately 80 percent of the cost of replacing the viaduct."

WSDOT believes we have adequately studied various retrofit concepts and have concluded they are not feasible. WSDOT and the City have not ignored the effects that construction will have on traffic disruption. These effects are discussed in detail in the 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs, and the Final EIS. Provisions for growth have been included in our traffic modeling work.

The costs for the alternatives evaluated for replacing the viaduct are lower than $5 billion and have been updated in the Final EIS. Responses to comments provided by Christopher V. Brown have been provided in Appendix T, 2010 Comments and Responses, item I-018. The response to your 2004 letter is provided in Appendix S, 2004 and 2006 Comments and Responses, item I-215.