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Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.
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.
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.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the 2004 Draft and 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

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 build alternatives.

The exact configuration and types of activities provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. It is anticipated that the waterfront can become a premier public amenity for Seattle’s downtown, the City of Seattle, and the Puget Sound region. There will be many opportunities for the public to participate in that master planning effort and to determine the future of their waterfront.
The viaduct was not built to withstand major earthquakes. Over the last 50 years, engineers have learned a lot more about earthquake hazards in the Seattle area and how to design and build structures that can withstand the major earthquakes that have shaken the area in the past. Engineers now know that to withstand a major earthquake, the viaduct needs to have foundations that extend much deeper into competent soil, and it needs to be built of stronger materials.

Even if the current two-level viaduct structure does not pancake in a seismic event, the seawall that holds the soils in place along Seattle’s waterfront could collapse, making the column footings of the viaduct structure vulnerable to collapse as well. As noted in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS, the viaduct's foundations are embedded in the soil held back by the seawall. If the seawall fails, sections of the viaduct, the Alaskan Way surface street, and adjacent structures and major utility lines would collapse or cause other safety hazards.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Your thought for naming the seawall is appreciated. There is no official name proposed for the new seawall at this time.
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.
Proposed changes to Mercer Street (and other east-west streets north of the Battery Street Tunnel) would provide several notable benefits. The changes would improve connections between the neighborhoods in the lower Queen Anne and South Lake Union areas. They would improve response time for emergency service suppliers. In addition, they would provide a safe and direct east-west route for bicycles and pedestrians.

The Battery Street Tunnel will not remain unchanged. Under the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, work in the Battery Street Tunnel will include seismic upgrades, fire and life safety improvements, and increased vertical clearance. Under the Bored Tunnel Alternative, the Battery Street Tunnel would be decommissioned and closed.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Thank you for providing comments on the Draft EIS and attending project open houses. We are glad that you found the information provided by our engineers to be helpful and informative.

The analysis of impacts and visual simulations for the Elevated Structure Alternative is equivalent to the analysis provided for the other alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, Supplemental Draft EISs, and Final EIS. Attachments to the EISs contain further analysis and additional simulations for the alternatives evaluated. In the Final EIS, these can be found in Appendices D (Visual Quality Discipline Report) and E (Visual Simulations). Visual simulations are provided for views from the proposed facilities (including the tunnels) as well as from street level. For the tunnel alternatives, the loss of the panoramic view from atop the viaduct is acknowledged.

A road cannot be built without a foundation, and for this project the seawall would effectively form the foundation for both the surface street and any aerial structures along the waterfront. Therefore, for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, it is a necessary part of the overall project. For the Bored Tunnel Alternative, seawall replacement is not necessary for the operation of the bored tunnel facility, but it is necessary for the construction of the new Alaskan Way Surface Street and Waterfront Promenade, which are independent projects that will be led by the City of Seattle.
Efforts to reduce project costs are ongoing and will continue throughout the design process. This includes periodic detailed review by independent experts not affiliated with the project.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.

WSDOT agrees with your belief that the viaduct needs to be replaced with a new highway. Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street...
would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

I-013-007

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

I-013-008

A road cannot be built without a foundation, and for this project the seawall would effectively form the foundation for both the surface street and any aerial structures along the waterfront. Therefore, for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, it is a necessary part of the overall project. For the Bored Tunnel Alternative, seawall replacement is not necessary for the operation of the bored tunnel
facility, but is necessary for the construction of the new Alaskan Way Surface Street and Waterfront Promenade, which will be led by the City of Seattle.

I-013-009

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild or Aerial 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.
Viaduct views

One immediate factor makes it worth considering; life and labor saved along the Alaskan Way Viaduct is the amazing view.

Most of the time when the word "view" comes up during discussions on how to replace the viaduct, it’s in the context of losing the precious viewpoint for people who live on and work downtown. The current viaduct does not have such a view. It’s a visual flight that can take off the city from its downtown. Thus they sit with the thought of an underground tunnel that would keep all the annoying traffic out of sight.

The tunnel trend has its practical drawbacks — aesthetically high expense, to name one — but on an aesthetic level, it would remove a view considered by many Seattle drivers to be "meaning" one that the city has loved without a change in half a century.

Therefore going either south or north on the Alaskan Way Viaduct get a spectacular view of the city and its water. It’s an intangible benefit of the above viewpoint.

Outlying neighborhoods like Ballard and West Seattle, which depend on the transportation corridor, should consider the view benefit that an extended structure offer. Few people in the city can afford the kind of view they can get from the Alaskan Way Viaduct. It’s a spectacular benefit of the structure.

A tunnel won’t offer that kind of view. A surface highway, also not a major consideration for replacing the viaduct, won’t offer it, either. Indeed, by putting two of thousands more cars on Alaskan Way, the surface roadway will disperse to set off the transform from downtown to the existing situation.

Aesthetic appeal should not be the only consideration when choosing a replacement option for the Alaskan Way Viaduct. Downtown mixed-use would be just another bonus. But the idea of preserving a view corridor that all of Seattle can enjoy should be a factor in choosing the best replacement.

The world is probably options on ensuring the new expansion remains at the water. Watering is major impact on the odors from the most situations.
Once the viaduct replacement project is complete, most of the 110,000 vehicles currently using the viaduct will use the SR 99 replacement and surrounding streets. Please see the Final EIS and Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

During certain construction stages, when SR 99 is closed, trips on the SR 99 corridor will shift to downtown streets and I-5, with most of the shift to local streets. Because of increased traffic on the local highways, some of the trips made today on SR 99 won't be made due to increased traffic congestion.

Strategies such as parking restrictions (to free up travel lanes), improved freeway operations, increased transit service, and programs to get more people out of their cars through transit, carpools, vanpools and telecommuting (among others), will help manage travel demand during the construction stages when SR 99 is closed. Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, provides a more complete list of the traffic management strategies being considered for implementation during project construction. Through the transportation planning process for construction, the lead agencies will continue to refine these strategies as needed.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The lead agencies have been working with transit providers, including Sound Transit, to maximize transit options during construction. Additional transit services will be provided during construction to help offset effects to traffic.
I-016-001

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-017-001

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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. While rebuilding the viaduct is not prudent, 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.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project has a separate purpose, is funded separately, and cannot include any determinations for King County or Washington State Ferries operations.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-022-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-024-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild or Aerial 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.
The ramp and roadway configuration planned in the south end of the project area is expected to provide sufficient capacity near the Port, railroads, and stadiums in this area. Planning efforts for this project have considered the eventual population increases in the South Lake Union area.

I-025-001

Comment - 4/20/04

I would just like to remind the designers of the need to consider seriously both ends of this project. Most people are more interested in the tunnel versus the viaduct. I am more interested in seeing that for example in the South end that there is adequate on and off ramps to handle the traffic generated by Safeco Field and Seahawks Stadium as well as the ferry terminal. At least 100 times a year there are events at Seahawks or Safeco and of course the ferry traffic is steady year round. On the other end there is going to be according to the mayor another 25,000 to 30,000 jobs in the South Lake Union area.

Those people have to have a way to get to and from work and the viaduct could be one of those ways. Likewise if the workers are going north or east it is imperative although not a part of this project to provide access to I-5 and also direct access to 520 for those 25,000 to 30,000 people who will not live in Seattle.

Those are my comments and I suspect that some of these will have to be set aside for the future but at least provide a way that they can be provided in the future and not hindered by what you do now.

Thank you for listening, my name is Bob Tate and my address is 9406 NE 14th St, Clyde Hill, WA 98004. My phone number is 425.454.8420 and I am on the 520 Advisory Committee. Thank you for listening.
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.
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.
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. The aerial structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

Comment - 6/1/04
Hi my name is Barb Christianson and I really think it would be a shame to deny all those people who use the viaduct even once in while especially when taking visitors along the water showing them the city and everything and putting them in a tunnel and I don't know why you don't higher somebody like Cal Trava to do a beautiful bridge kind of structure that would go along the waterfront that would have a nice connection to the street below, and something beautiful for people to look through to the water beyond. There is definitely an opportunity for an incredible city symbol at that point and I hope you would consider it. Thanks bye.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The transportation modeling horizon year for this project is 2030, which was used to estimate traffic volumes during the operation of each build alternatives. Vehicle volumes among the build alternatives would vary, but only up to four percent depending on the screenline. See Chapter 5 of the Final EIS for the details about traffic operations for each proposed build alternative.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in the Final EIS.

Providing capacity is a stated purpose of the project; see Chapter 1 of the Final EIS for the project's purpose and need statement. 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-032-001

The “Cut & Cover” design was once discussed as an option for the AWV, yet currently I hear little about it. The semi-submerged feature of “Cut & Cover” (C&C) appears to me to have numerous important advantages:

1. Every expense estimate for C&C has been lower than either tunnel or viaduct designs, I believe.
2. As opposed to tunnel designs, the C&C design requires much simpler engineering against water seepage and much less expense for construction.
3. As opposed to viaduct designs, the C&C design has several advantages -
   a. less expensive
   b. does not divide downtown from the waterfront
   c. does not block water vistas from downtown
   d. is not an eyesore.

I only a simple and low “hump” would divide downtown from the waterfront under the C&C design. I recommend it.

Best regards,

DOUGLAS J. ALLMON, PH.D.
When publishing environmental documents, WSDOT makes every attempt to ensure that the public, agencies, and tribes have timely and easy access to the documents. For public viewing, hard copies and/or CDs of the Draft EIS were distributed to several federal, state, and local agencies; local business and trade organizations; 16 local libraries; media contacts; and the project office. Electronic copies were also made available online.

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, followed by the 2004 Bypass Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-033-004
The 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Technical Memorandum, discusses each of these haul methods. The Final EIS discusses the construction plans for the preferred alternative, although no single method for the removal of spoils will be selected as part of the EIS process.

I-033-005
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your suggestions for various alternatives. The environmental process has reduced the number of alternatives in consideration to three: the Bored Tunnel Alternative, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, and the Elevated Structure Alternative. Many of your suggestions are reflected in the design of the final three alternatives.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
The lead agencies agree that the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project provides a unique opportunity for the City of Seattle and Puget Sound region. The preferred alternative is to replace the existing viaduct structure with a tunnel along the Seattle's central waterfront area. As a result, the existing viaduct structure will be removed, which will open up the waterfront and help to create a much more pedestrian-friendly environment compared with existing conditions. We are not proposing to eliminate all traffic from the Alaskan Way surface street, because this roadway provides critical connections to the Washington State Ferries Terminal, local businesses located on the waterfront, and the Port of Seattle. However, we are committed to improving and enhancing conditions along the waterfront for pedestrians and bicyclists. The final configuration of the Alaskan Way surface street and promenade will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.
Thank you for your comment. Cost was one of the factors the lead agencies considered in selecting the preferred alternative, but it was not the determining factor.
The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

The total construction duration for the Bored Tunnel Alternative is 5.5 years. At the end of Traffic Stage 7, up to a 3-week closure would be needed to connect SR 99 to the bored tunnel.

The total construction duration for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative is 8.75 years. The construction plan for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would close SR 99 to all traffic for 3.25 years (39 months) between Royal Brougham Way S. and Denny Way. The Alaskan Way surface street would also be closed to north-south traffic during construction. The project will investigate opportunities to open at least one lane of traffic in each direction along the project corridor during major closure periods. Access to waterfront businesses will be provided. Complete closure of the viaduct would create 8 hours of peak congestion on downtown streets daily and would add 6 more hours of
The total construction duration for the Elevated Structure Alternative is 10.0 years. The Elevated Structure Alternative’s construction plan would completely close SR 99 to all traffic for 2 to 4 months in Traffic Stage 4 and for 3 months in Traffic Stage 7. SR 99 will be restricted to two lanes in each direction throughout the construction period. The Alaskan Way surface street would maintain one lane in each direction by transitioning temporary detour alignments along the corridor as needed.

Additional information on traffic detours and associated strategies for minimizing and mitigating traffic delays are discussed in the Final EIS and its Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Appendix C covers a wide range of transportation modes, facilities, and facility types, including SR 99, I-5, surface streets, intersections, transit, traffic accessing ferries at Colman Dock, and traffic accessing downtown sporting events.

Please refer to the Final EIS Appendix L, Economics Discipline Report, where you will find discussion related the potential economic effects of the project. WSDOT cannot speculate as to how the various factors that influence property values will come together at some future time.

The project team has been meeting with the business owners and the community as described in Appendix A, Public Involvement Discipline Report. The mitigation measures for transportation will be coordinated with surrounding businesses and are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.
The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city’s parking resources. SDOT’s studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking. Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures under consideration and refinement include:

- Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
- Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
- Implement electronic parking guidance system
- Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading activities
- Develop a Center City parking marketing program
- Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide frequent parking updates
- Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented by the Contractor

Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for additional information.
As part of the ongoing public involvement process, the project will continue to coordinate with the residents, businesses, and property owners along Alaskan Way through meetings, open houses, newsletter updates, and e-mail. Mitigation measures addressing noise, parking, traffic, dust and other factors are included in the Final EIS and appendices. The lead agencies will continue to refine construction mitigation for the preferred alternative's construction sequencing and methods. The mitigation measures may also become part of the conditions for permits required for the project.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information. Additional information on traffic, parking, and parks is also included in the Final EIS.
I-039-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-039-002

The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city’s parking resources. SDOT’s studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking.

Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures under consideration and refinement include:

- Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
- Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
- Implement electronic parking guidance system
- Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading activities
Develop a Center City parking marketing program
Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide frequent parking updates
Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented by the Contractor

Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for additional information.

I-039-003
The lead agencies understand the importance of efficient access to Colman Dock and continue to coordinate with Washington State Ferries. All of the alternatives evaluated in the 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, and the Final EIS carefully considered not only the access to Colman Dock, but also the areas in which cars must wait for ferries. Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report of the Final EIS discusses several important aspects of Colman Dock in relation to the preferred alternative, including measures of effectiveness, and operational impacts and benefits.

I-039-004
No specific development plans have been proposed for Terminal 46 at this time. If new types of development are proposed for this area in the future, the lead agencies would consider them as part of cumulative impacts and coordinate project efforts appropriately.
I-040-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your objections to a widened surface highway along the waterfront.

I-040-002
The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.

I-040-003
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-041-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
In March 2009, Casa Latina moved to their new building east of I-5 in the International District neighborhood. The new location is outside of the Alaskan Way Viaduct project area.

WSDOT will comply with the federal requirements for disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) participation. WSDOT cannot require contractors to hire workers from specific organizations. However, WSDOT can and does encourage contractors to work with local organizations and to develop programs that draw on the local labor pool.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:
Name: Mauricio Ayon
Address: PO Box 69255
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98166
Email: mauricioayon@hotmail.com
Affiliation (optional):
Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes
Project Comments:
I will ask you to consider the Latino workers that historically have been on Western Avenue seeking employment. They have come along way working with community members in Belltown. They are now organized inside the Day Worker Center (CASA Latina). If Day workers will be affected by the construction of the new viaduct, please consider relocation of their center to a suitable location with easy access to freeway and public transportation. I will also suggest that companies bidding for the work should be encouraged to hire workers from the center and help the economy of many people from our community.

Comments apply to:
Construction Impacts and Mitigation
I-045-001
Thank you for your comment on the Bypass Tunnel Alternative. This alternative is no longer being considered as it did not provide sufficient capacity. The Bored Tunnel Alternative would provide the greatest opportunity "revitalize" the waterfront, as you suggest.
Thank you for providing your ideas for tunnel construction. Many years ago, it was common to build projects by filling in large aquatic areas. Many of the waterways in the Duwamish industrial area were created by filling in Elliott Bay and the Duwamish River. Over time this practice has changed because it eliminates important habitat for fish and aquatic species. As a result, it is highly unlikely that the lead agencies would be able to gain approval and necessary permits from several federal, state, and local agencies to construct the tunnel by filling in a large portion of Seattle’s shoreline. A large-scale fill would reduce available habitat for fish and other aquatic species, many of which are protected by the federal Endangered Species Act.

In addition, a tunnel built entirely along the Elliott Bay shoreline would eliminate the waterfront businesses located on piers and it would impede commerce and navigation associated with the Port of Seattle and Washington State Ferry system.
Thank you for sharing your concerns about the construction impacts of the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The construction of any of the build alternatives would result in effects, such as noise, traffic congestion near construction areas or detours, and visual impacts, but these effects would end when the project is complete.

The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. Since then, the lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative due in part to its shorter duration of construction and fewer construction impacts along the central waterfront. The current project description and comparisons of construction impacts among the alternatives can be found in the Final EIS.
Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to give us your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. Your thoughts will help decision makers develop a preferred alternative. Responses to your comments will be provided in the Final EIS.

Contact Information: At a minimum, please provide your name and Zip Code. If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

Name: Dwight C. Baker
Organization/Affiliation (optional): K.C. TAC
Address: 11447, 108th Ave. NE
City: Kirkland State: WA Zip: 98024
E-mail: dwight@wabaker@yahoo.com

[ ] Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

1. Choose a topic:
   - [ ] Overall Project
   - [ ] Tunnel Alternative - preferred
   - [ ] Construction Impacts and Mitigation
   - [ ] All of the Alternatives
   - [ ] Bypass Tunnel Alternative
   - [ ] Other
   - [ ] Rebuild Alternative
   - [ ] Surface Alternative
   - [ ] Aerial Alternative
   - [ ] Seawall

What are your comments about the project?

See attached typed comments dated 6-1-04. I have enclosed a photo example of how PRT access enhances life in downtown and moves vehicles efficiently.

(Please use additional paper if you need further comment space)
ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT AND SEAWALL REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Draft EIS Comments

Due June 1, 2004
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

By

Dwight C. Baker
Citizen
11647-104th Ave N. E.
Kirkland, WA 98034

E-mail: dwightc424@yahoo.com

(Add to mailing list)
(Member: K.C. TAC)
While referring to this undertaking as a "program" is an interesting idea, the terminology used for many years and understood by many parties leads us to continue to use the term "project" for the viaduct replacement. In the Final EIS, the project is part of the overall Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program.

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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

I-048-001

I-048-002
diverse interests. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-048-003

The alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS did not include items other than those directly relating to replacement of the existing viaduct. Mid- to high-capacity transit developments are being addressed by other agencies, specifically Seattle Department of Transportation (e.g., South Lake Union Streetcar), King County Metro (e.g., RapidRide), and Sound Transit (e.g., Link Light Rail, Sounder). Potential fixed guideway HCT alignments that have been developed in the long-range plans for these agencies and at present do not include the SR 99/Alaskan Way Viaduct corridor. The Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program includes transit enhancements in the Moving Forward Projects and in the Letter of Agreement signed by the state, city, and county in January 2009. See the Final EIS for more information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and agree that this project is important to the region.

The final design of the Alaskan Way surface street is being led by the City of Seattle's Central Waterfront Project. The City recognizes the value of improving pedestrian connections and providing improved public space along the waterfront that will allow people to walk, bicycle, play, view Elliott Bay and the mountains, learn, and reflect. The exact configuration and types of activities (e.g., pedestrian and bike lanes) on the waterfront are not part of the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative.
Directional signage? A Waterfront Trail traveling parallel to the waterfront is meaningless if there are no safe, direct east-west connections across Alaskan Way to the waterfront itself. In addition to these pedestrian and bicycle access issues, the DEIS also lacks a discussion of the character of the corridor itself. Many groups and individual citizens have commented in the media and in public forums about the potential for developing a significant amount of new open space - be it in privately developed plazas as part of commercial or residential redevelopment of the half-blocks to the east of the present viaduct, or in public park land - as part of the project. Where in the DEIS are those issues fully discussed? This is the first time in a generation that the city and region have an opportunity to significantly reshape part of the region's urban core, and provide additional amenities that are otherwise sorely lacking. I point to the City of Portland's redevelopment of its riverfront, San Francisco's redevelopment of the Embarcadero, and Boston's reclamation of its direct water access. These cities developed public park areas, commercial and residential areas, promenades and urban amenities of which their citizens are rightly proud. Seattle should do no less. In other words, the DEIS seems to lack a discussion of how the waterfront of the City of Seattle will be improved with any of these alternatives. It discusses the potential to move a lot of vehicles THROUGH the city at high speeds, but does not talk about the ultimate effect on the shape and character of the city itself. They all lack a discussion of how people, be they tourists, residents or downtown workers, will safely access the waterfront and its attractions and amenities, and how this project will improve the Central Waterfront.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
All of the Alternatives
Other Topic: The Waterfront as an urban amenity
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
It is true that only a small portion of the existing viaduct sustained severe damage in the Nisqually earthquake in February of 2001. That portion was repaired for the interim. The structure is over 50 years old and nearing the end of its useful life. When built, it was designed to resist seismic forces less severe than we now know are possible in the Puget Sound region. The seismic standards in the 1950s were far below today’s accepted design standards. Knowing what we do about the condition of the viaduct and the potential for catastrophic events, it would not be responsible or in the public’s best interest to simply wait for the next event and risk loss of life.
In March 2009, Casa Latina moved to their new building east of I-5 in the International District neighborhood. The new location is outside of the Alaskan Way Viaduct project area. The Millionair Club building also would not be affected by the project.

WSDOT will comply with the federal requirements for disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) participation. WSDOT cannot require contractors to hire workers from specific organizations. However, WSDOT can and does encourage contractors to work with local organizations and to develop programs that draw on the local labor pool.
A variety of opportunities for use of the waterfront have been evaluated in the 2004 Draft, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft, and Final EISs. The design of the Alaskan Way surface street and promenade is being carefully considered and coordinated with the City of Seattle. It is anticipated that the waterfront can become a premier public amenity for Seattle's downtown, the City of Seattle, and the Puget Sound region. The exact configuration and types of activities on the waterfront are not part of this project.

I-054-001

The most expensive solutions would be any of those that do not allow for the development of a world class destination waterfront park. The history of such facilities enhancing (increasing) adjacent property values, which also generate the associated property and retail sales taxes, is overwhelming. It is the only solution that provides a continuous public income stream into the predictable future. We must be long range smart. That such a park will greatly enhance the livability of our city is no small item, but the steady public and private income stream must not be denied. Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct, replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way, and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle acknowledge your concerns about access to the Elliott/Western corridor. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Access to and from SR 99 would be provided by new ramps near the stadiums and near Seattle Center. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the City of Seattle would construct a new road between Alaskan Way and the Elliott/Western corridor as an independent project.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Your concern about traffic volumes on surface streets in the downtown area is noted. Information about traffic volumes with each of the alternatives can be found in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS and in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
I-059-001
The Surface Alternative is no longer being considered. 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. The final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.

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-059-002
With the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative, the final surface street design and landscaping along Alaskan Way S. will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project, which is a separate project led by the City of Seattle. If the Elevated Structure is selected, the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project will address surface street design and landscaping along Alaskan Way S.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. 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.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-061-001
The Final EIS addresses more completely impacts to south-end travelers. Please consult Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS for more information on traffic impacts.

I-061-002
The Final EIS contains additional information about travel times by alternative. This information includes forecast travel times to the Seattle central business district from north and south trip origins. Please consult the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C) of the Final EIS for more information.

I-061-003
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The transportation planning process for construction is ongoing. To date, a number of strategies have been identified to help West Seattle residents travel into and through the downtown area. The Spokane Street Viaduct project will add a ramp at Fourth Avenue S., which will help divert some in-bound traffic off of First Avenue S. Peak hour parking restrictions along First Avenue S. could also be implemented to provide additional roadway capacity.

Transit service to and from West Seattle will be greatly expanded and roadway treatments to improve the speed and reliability of buses travelling from West Seattle to downtown will be provided. Please see the Final EIS for more information on traffic impacts during construction.
The Surface Alternative is no longer being considered. 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. The final configuration of Alaskan Way and the waterfront streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.

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. Please refer to the Final EIS for more information on how the alternatives have developed since the 2004 Draft EIS and how the preferred alternative was selected.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-064-001

It is critical to the future of Seattle to bury 99 and have useable community green space. It should allow for commercial and residential development as necessary to build the downtown community as a place that is alive past 5pm.
I-065-001
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.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. The aerial structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report. "Before" and "after" view simulations of the alternatives can be found in Final EIS Appendix E.

I-065-002
We acknowledge your comment stating your concerns and preferences for the alternatives studied.

I-065-003
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. Lost revenue from the removal of parking meters/pay stations associated with the removal of parking spaces is presented in the Final EIS and Appendix L, Economics.
Adjacent property owners could potentially receive indirect economic benefits associated with increased property values and increased potential for redevelopment. The City of Seattle may consider a Local Improvement District (LID) in the future, but it is not part of the project.

I-065-004
Thank you for stating your preference for the Rebuild Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information. The alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS maintain or improve traffic flow compared to existing conditions. Additional information about travel times and speeds for the preferred alternative is provided in the Final EIS.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle will continue to provide multiple opportunities for public involvement and feedback as we move forward with this project. FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are working with the Port of Seattle on this project, but the Port will not decide which alternative gets built. Thank you for providing your comments.
I-066-001

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.
I-067-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

To Whom It May Concern: I believe the tunnel option is by far the best. The surface option is obviously flawed because of increased traffic congestion. Seattle certainly does not need more of that. All the other options call for an unsightly, obtrusive structure like the current viaduct. I grew up in Chicago and love the waterfront available to the public in that great city. It is one of the aspects that makes Chicago such a desirable city to live, work and play in. It is unfortunate that the available waterfront in Seattle is so limited in a city with so much water! A mixture of a waterfront park and Alaska Ave is the best choice for this prized real estate. It will help current waterfront businesses, stimulate new businesses, and add more energy into downtown. People of Seattle will want to be there, not just the tourists. I understand that this project is more costly than the other options, but great cities have great civil projects. It is what separates them from other average cities. Seattle has the potential to be one of North America’s greatest cities, let’s not waste it. Dr. Eric Bergstrom
Small Business Owner. Queen Anne
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.
I-073-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-073-002
With the Bored Tunnel Alternative, Alaskan Way would have the same number of lanes as it does today through the central waterfront. Cross streets will be in the same locations as they are today. If the viaduct was replaced by a tunnel, large areas of open space would become available. This new space could be converted into a variety of new uses (e.g., a waterfront promenade, bike and pedestrian paths, and expanded streetcar service). Also, 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. The City of Seattle is leading the planning effort for the central waterfront, including the location of the streetcar. Please refer to the Final EIS for more information on how the alternatives have developed since the 2004 Draft EIS and how the preferred alternative was selected.

I-073-003
A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor
Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated. The Elevated Structure Alternative does include the Broad Street Detour, please see Chapter 6 of the Final EIS for a description of the detours currently proposed for the build alternatives.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:
Name: Janice Blair
Address: 1900 Alaskan Way #115
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98101
Email: janiceblain@msn.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
6-10 years is too long to disrupt the waterfront. I suggest not building the "temporary" bypass, and let drivers find alternative routes which will save 1/2 billion dollars, and speed up the project.

Comments apply to:
Construction, Impacts and Mitigation
Thank you for providing your ideas to add a third deck to the viaduct as a public open space. The public would be well-served by additional public open space along the waterfront; however, it would be difficult for people to access such an area since it would be located nearly 90 feet (nine stories) above the existing waterfront street level. The additional deck would also severely affect views for owners, residents, and tenants in many downtown buildings, reducing property values for many properties. The third deck would also negatively affect views from downtown to the waterfront. A similar idea was considered during the 2008 Partnership Process. Ultimately, the lead agencies 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. 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.

I-075-001

Thank you for providing your ideas to add a third deck to the viaduct as a public open space. The public would be well-served by additional public open space along the waterfront; however, it would be difficult for people to access such an area since it would be located nearly 90 feet (nine stories) above the existing waterfront street level. The additional deck would also severely affect views for owners, residents, and tenants in many downtown buildings, reducing property values for many properties. The third deck would also negatively affect views from downtown to the waterfront. A similar idea was considered during the 2008 Partnership Process. Ultimately, the lead agencies 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. 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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are working hard to move the project through the environmental and permitting processes and to secure funding so construction can begin as soon as possible.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The project team uses several communication and public involvement tools (see Appendix A, Public Involvement Discipline Report) to gather input and help shape the project throughout design and construction. There are opportunities to attend public meetings and community events to learn more about the project and multiple ways to contact the project team with any questions or concerns, including a hotline (1-888-AWV-LINE) or e-mail (viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov).

In addition, many forums are in place to provide feedback to the project team:

- North and south portal working groups have been meeting since May 2009, and they do not have a firm end date.
- Maintenance of traffic meeting in the south end discusses upcoming construction and potential traffic impacts. This includes stakeholders as well as the contractor and staff from the project office.
- Construction outreach tools such as distributing (often in person)
• Notices to adjacent businesses and residents about upcoming work, regular construction reports on the website, and e-mail updates.
• Other resources: 24-hour hotline, web site, viaduct e-mail for comments or questions, community briefings, information booths, and community events. Many of these tools are used as opportunities to have dialogue or discuss any issues with stakeholders or neighbors.

I-076-004
Several individuals and organizations have made the suggestion that construction noise associated with the project that exceeds City of Seattle residential nighttime noise regulations should be limited to non-residential areas. The construction plans evaluated for noise and vibration are described in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report, of the Final EIS. While actual construction plans and activity sequencing could differ substantially from this evaluation, the locations and types of activities would be similar.

Construction of the project may require nighttime construction activities, and the City may require a Major Public Project Construction Noise Variance. Construction noise mitigation requirements would be developed and specified in the noise variance.

I-076-005
There is no question that the downtown arterial street network will be impacted by project construction closures. Traffic management strategies have been identified through the transportation planning process for construction, and some of the strategies to help reduce the severity to impacts to streets such as Western Avenue include on-street parking restrictions to provide additional travel lanes, increased transit service to encourage conversion of single-occupancy vehicle trips to transit, advanced traveler information to provide travelers with up-to-date construction and detour information so they can make better route
More information about these strategies can be found in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

I-076-006

The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city's parking resources. SDOT's studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking. Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures under consideration and refinement include:

- Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
- Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
- Implement electronic parking guidance system
- Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading activities
- Develop a Center City parking marketing program
- Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide frequent parking updates
- Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented by the Contractor
Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for additional information.

I-076-007
WSDOT is currently preparing a claims process that would address any damage to property directly related to the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative. This information will be given to individual property owners that may be affected by the project.

WSDOT plans to install an array of monitoring equipment to alert the construction team of any settlement, which would be used in the claims process.

There are specific impacts that WSDOT can compensate for, such as excessive noise and vibration levels or damage to property. However, impacts that are not quantifiable are generally not compensable. If you experience impacts during construction, please call our 24-hour hotline, 1-888-AWV-LINE.

I-076-008
Access to the parking garage will be maintained throughout construction. Temporary access limitations and any required changes to access during construction will be mitigated to the extent practicable. All affected businesses will be informed on all related activities throughout the project construction period.

I-076-009
Mitigation measures for air quality both during construction and operation are discussed in Appendix M of the Final EIS.
I-076-010
The lead agencies plan to maintain access to businesses and residences throughout construction. Temporary limitations and any required changes to access during construction will be mitigated to the extent practicable. Mitigation measures for parking, pedestrian and vehicle access, and business assistance are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. The project team members will continue their coordination and mitigation activities with local businesses and residents, freight/delivery companies, the Port of Seattle, neighborhood groups, and other affected groups.

I-076-011
An exhaust stack near Pike Place Market is no longer included in any of the alternatives. The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would have two tunnel operations buildings that include exhaust stacks. One building would be located in the south portal area near Alaskan Way S. and Railroad Way S., and a second building would be located in the north portal area near Sixth Avenue and Harrison Street.
I-077-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Bypass Tunnel Alternative. 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-077-001
think this is the best alternative available. While the tunnel alternative is also reasonable, I feel it is too massive and costly and would probably devolve into a Boston Central Artery type mess because of the difficult construction conditions on the waterfront. I feel a smaller bypass for through traffic and an improved surface Alaskan Way for local traffic, plus the new seawall, will be the best project for the buck. Thanks

Tyler Bonstead

Comments apply to:

Bypass Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-078-001

In the long term, it really does seem that the tunnel alternative would be the best for the City as a whole. Avoiding the barrier that would result from the rebuild or aerial options would significantly improve the livability and appeal of the City to downtown employees and residents, as well as tourists. Although some have expressed concern about the windfall current residents may receive from removal of the barrier, the more important consideration is the long-term benefit to the economy and quality of life downtown as new residents and visitors are attracted to the area. And much as I love the view from my car while I'm on it, I don't think the viaduct should be viewed as a scenic route -- rather, it's a critical transportation corridor and the speed of travel through it should to be maximized. The tunnel alternative is also superior to the others as to noise, travel time and construction time. It costs about 15% more than the replacement/aerial/bypass -- a smaller differential than I expected considering the exciting benefits it is likely to provide to the economy and livability of the City, over the long term.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

Although the Embarcadero Freeway had some similarities to the Alaskan Way Viaduct, it served a different function. The Embarcadero Freeway was primarily a way for drivers to access the regional highway network from downtown San Francisco. After it was taken down, traffic shifted to more than a dozen parallel streets that served the same neighborhoods. Traffic on some city streets increased by as much as 50 percent following the closure of the Embarcadero Freeway. Please refer to Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, for information on
what would happen in the corridor under the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative).
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The alternatives analyzed did not include items other than those directly relating to replacement of the existing viaduct. High capacity transit (HCT) is not precluded from being implemented in the SR 99 corridor, though there are not any plans to incorporate it at this time. Transit enhancements are included in the Moving Forward Projects and the Bored Tunnel Program. See the Final EIS for more information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-081-001

Do this project properly. Please use a tunnel alternative and think about doing this project in conjunction with the new rail. I work in the Federal Building between First and Second Avenues. If done properly, this project will enhance the City of Seattle for generations. The Alaska Way viaduct is antiquated and outdated and will result in many unnecessary deaths if we are hit with a big earthquake. It will not survive another big one like the one we had a few years ago.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. Time, wear and tear from daily traffic, the salty marine air, and a couple of earthquakes have taken their toll on the viaduct since 1963. At that time, the seawall was not in the state of deterioration that it is today.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments about various aspects of the project.

Replacing the seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives include replacing the seawall. Please see Chapter 3 of the Final EIS for the alignments currently being considered.

Regarding ramps connecting to West Seattle, Delridge Way, and Alki, the project is specific to the SR 99 corridor between the SODO neighborhood and the part of SR 99 just north of Battery Street Tunnel. It is not possible for the project to include planning and design for all nearby areas adjacent to or connecting to SR 99.

Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion
These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

Cost estimate ranges for the project have taken into account the hard costs (i.e., concrete, steel), as well as the risks and schedule factors that will affect the ultimate cost of the project. Delay in starting construction is a major factor that could add to the cost. Tolling is being considered as described in the Final EIS.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-083-001

the project is moving to slow and I favor the tunnel options, the lowered area north of the tunnel with over passes. the government needs to help pay for this vital route.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on a single-level roadway with toll booths.

Thank you for your comment. The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, Mercer Corridor Project, and the Seattle Monorail Project are separate from the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project. You may want to direct your comments related to the SR 520 Project and the Mercer Project to public involvement opportunities related to those projects.
The information in the Final EIS presents the updated information on the project. Please visit the website http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/Library.htm if you would like to view the library of documents that have been prepared as the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project has progressed.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle, are committed to careful and prudent use of public funds when considering the alternative to be constructed.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Name: Dascha Bright
Address: 1121 Broadway E, Apt 1
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98102
Email: daschabright@yahoo.com
Affiliation (optional):
Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

Please tally my "vote" for the tunnel alternative. Although it is more expensive, as a Seattle resident, I am willing to shoulder the extra cost for what looks to me to be the best solution. Moving the majority of the viaduct traffic underground, while keeping the current Alaskan Way streets (4 lanes) open to local traffic (downtown, ferries, ballgames, Pioneer Square and Pike Place shopping) while at the same time providing a new seawall is the ultimate solution. If funding is a major issue, my second vote would be for the bypass tunnel alternative, though it makes me uncomfortable to have that additional traffic flowing down Alaskan Way. Thank you for your time, Dascha L. Bright

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
I-090-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Costs are an important consideration in selecting an alternative but are not the only factor. Maintenance and operation costs, including electricity, are included in the costs presented in the Final EIS.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. Any tunnels that are constructed for this project will contain a fire suppression system.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.

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.

Including a view-oriented boardwalk on the upper deck of the proposed elevated structure would be prohibitively expensive and would add to effects like shading and view obstruction. As a transportation facility, an elevated bicycle/pedestrian facility would require grades of well over the 5% percent specified in AASHTO guidelines and would be separated from the many amenities and connections found at ground level along the waterfront. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. Any tunnels that are constructed for this project will contain a fire suppression system and be built to the current safety standards. The lead agencies have considered the analysis of all alternatives carefully when choosing the preferred alternative.

Ms. Allison Ray
Washington State DOT
999 3rd Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

May 28th, 2004

Re: Alaskan Way Viaduct & Sea-Wall Replacement Project
DEIS Comments

Dear Ms. Ray,

As a frequent driver on the Alaskan Way Viaduct and being personally impacted by all claustrophobic driving environments, and also being aware that many other drivers are likewise handicapped, I wish to take this opportunity to express my fervent hope that WSDOT and its companion participating agencies will reject any option that includes a new tunnel or a portion of a tunnel for the proposed new SR 99 viaduct.

Ignoring obvious cost impacts associated with any tunnel option, especially recognizing the appalling cost overruns of Boston’s Big Dig, and noting that any tunnel option will deprive me and other citizens of access to air and light, while increasing the driving hazard, you should only consider those options that will allow for our continued driving safety, efficiency, pleasure and ease as well as affording the required necessary future increases in capacity.

I must remind the Department and participating agencies that you do not enjoy an unfettered right to inflict driving problems or related tunnel hazards on me or any other citizen for that matter. Given less expensive alternatives, involving both capital costs and long term maintenance costs, a tunnel option is not the appropriate choice.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret M. Brown, M.A.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your concerns about having an elevated structure. Adverse affects to historic resources would be addressed by a Memorandum of Agreement developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, tribes, and the consulting parties and would meet the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other applicable laws, regulations, and policies.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Steve & Mary Ann Bunnell
Address: 1131 N. 83rd
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98103
Email: stevebunnell@comcast.net
Affiliation (optional): Puget Marine Advertising

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
Replacing the seawall with a full length tunnel is the only sensible option. Doing so will: 1. replace a dangerous, noisy, ugly structure. 2. open up the waterfront in a way most of us can’t really imagine. 3. provide a traffic route able to better handle future traffic needs. While arguments have been made for the “scenic” qualities of the existing viaduct, in reality, only passengers can look about when passing over the viaduct, the driver must concentrate on the narrow, dangerous lanes.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
Bypass Tunnel Alternative
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are committed to working with the freight community to explore all practicable measures to facilitate freight mobility during construction and after the project is complete. Through the transportation planning process for construction, the lead agencies have consulted with members of the freight community and identified strategies to help trucks get around during construction. More information about these strategies can be found in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. The lead agencies will remain committed to communication with the freight community as the strategies become more defined.
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.
With the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, the southbound on-ramp at Columbia Street and the northbound off-ramp at Seneca Street will be removed. Traffic patterns are expected to alter slightly with removal of these ramps, and the Alaskan Way surface street is expected to carry additional traffic to and from the central business district. Therefore, to provide similar capacity levels as currently exist today, six lanes of traffic on the Alaskan Way surface street are necessary south of Yesler Way. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the Alaskan Way surface street as part of the project.

With the Elevated Structure Alternative, additional lanes proposed on portions of Alaskan Way are for the purpose of improving traffic circulation and flow, especially in the vicinity of Colman Dock.

It is expected that, overall, traffic that diverts to use surface streets and I-5 will distribute based on available capacity of these various roadways. At this time, there are no plans to substantially increase capacity along I-5 through the downtown core.

Because of the range of activities on the central waterfront, there is no clear-cut "best" alternative for providing bicycle facilities. On-street bike lanes are proposed to allow commuter and other experienced cyclists to travel in the roadway and avoid heavy pedestrian traffic associated with the waterfront promenade. The on-street bicycle lanes will be design to AASHTO national standards for bicycle lanes adjacent to parking. The waterfront promenade in this area will provide an area where slower-moving, recreational cyclists may ride.

The City of Seattle is leading the design effort for the Central Waterfront, which will determine parking along Alaskan Way.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-104-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild or Aerial 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-104-002
Your objections to the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, Bypass Tunnel, and Surface Alternatives are noted.

I-104-003
The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each
alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.
Thank you for your comment. Before a project of this size is ready for contract bidding, a certain amount of planning and coordination with stakeholders is necessary to ensure its success. The contracts for this project will be open for bids from local contractors.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

--- Original Message ---
From: Dick Campbell [mailto:dick524@cablespeed.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2004 7:34 AM
To: aw900350comments@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: Viaduct

We have gone to several informational meetings about the Alaskan Way Viaduct and would like to say that we are in favor of the cut and cover tunnel that extends to Battery. We live on Alaskan Way and certainly think it would be a nicer place without the noise of the viaduct and with the city opening up to the waterfront in a more attractive way.

We would hope that you could avoid having more lanes of traffic on Alaskan Way, so that it would be attractive to visitors, and perhaps the trolley could be moved to Western.

Thank you for all your concern and work to make Seattle an even more pleasant place to live and work.

Dick and Marilyn Campbell
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Connections to the West Seattle Bridge are beyond this project’s corridor and will not be considered as part of this project.
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.
The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project.

To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your concern for the Pioneer Square businesses and residents. The lead agencies have been working to find a cost-effective solution that meets the transportation needs of the region. The lead agencies have also worked with local businesses, residents, and other stakeholders in an effort to find ways to minimize effects during project construction. In the Final EIS, Chapter 6 describes construction effects for each alternative and Chapter 8 describes mitigation measures.
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.

Dear Viaduct Committee,

I was raised in Seattle, WA and have memories of traveling on the viaduct. When I was younger I did not really care about the viaduct itself; I only cared that when traveling on it I could smell the Ivar’s French fries cooking, and my mom would point out the Olympic Mountains to me, telling me that we were lucky to have such a nice view from the city. Now that I am older (currently fourteen years old) I care about my city more, which includes everything from the homeless population to transportation. I live in West Seattle and go to an Alternative school in Northgate. I hate it when there is traffic. When the freeway is packed we take 99, which carries us over the viaduct and straight into West Seattle. Sometimes I miss the bus and my mom drives me to school. It is a long way, but by taking the viaduct it makes traveling easy, not to mention giving us a beautiful view. In my opinion, a tunnel would clutter things up and there would be no more smelling Ivar’s French fries, but I instead eat exhaust. There would also be no more beautiful view of the Olympic Mountain range, but instead concrete. To me, the viaduct is a part of Seattle’s downtown and I would hate to see a tunnel in its place. I vote for the rebuild. Thank you for letting me voice my opinion. Sincerely, Gemma Clarke
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on an alternative that is below grade and includes the seawall. The lead agencies recognize that public spaces along the waterfront are invaluable amenities and have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. The City of Seattle is leading the Central Waterfront Project, which will help shape the urban design of the central waterfront area with the preferred alternative.

**I-114-001**

The replacement strategy for the existing viaduct should result in no additional surface traffic on Alaska Way. The replacement should be below grade, and should be combined with a new seawall. It would be narrow minded to view the viaduct replacement purely as a transportation project. It would be a huge mistake to ignore the importance of this project to the urban design and quality of life of the most important city in the region. Do not allow traffic engineers and planners to make an above grade solution the preferred alternative based on cost, at the sacrifice of a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform Seattle's waterfront into a vibrant place for visitors and locals of all ages. Seattle's existing waterfront suffers from poor planning and lack of vision. The existing viaduct is an eyesore, a horrible view obstruction, extremely noisy, and harks the waterfront from a meaningful connection to the City's neighborhoods. Let's provide a replacement below grade, with no net gain in surface traffic, that will accomplish the necessary traffic volume counts, and that will seize on the opportunity to transform Seattle into a City with a world class waterfront that can be enjoyed by pedestrians. The project needs to marry the needs of transportation infrastructure with the most intelligent and sensible practices of urban design. The result should include public open spaces along the waterfront, greatly improved pedestrian access along the waterfront, and vastly enhanced connections to the City's neighborhoods. The design solution should encourage new housing, addition of cultural destinations, restored habitat for sea life, promenades, and opportunities for parks that provide direct access to the water. Opportunities to cause such positive change come so rarely. Discover your sense of vision. Shame on planners who should lack the courage, or good common sense, or the conviction to make this happen.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-115-001

It is imperative that the waterfront be returned to the people of Seattle and the region. That is why the best solution for the replacement of the Alaskan Way Viaduct is some sort of tunnel. I believe the option with the six lane tunnel is the best one.
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

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. The Final EIS and Appendix E contain visual simulations, and effects on visual quality are discussed in the Final EIS as well. There is insufficient space for additional large high-rise buildings to be developed in the right-of-way on the east side of Alaskan Way.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project

Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to give us comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. The comments you make will become part of the public record for this project. Your thoughts will help decision makers develop a preferred alternative. Responses to your comments will be provided in the Final EIS.

Contact Information: At a minimum, please provide your name and Zip Code. If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

Name: [GRANT COGSWELL]  Organization/Membership Affiliation (optional): [PEOPLE'S WATERFRONT COALITION]
Address: 551 1st Ave S.
City: [SEATTLE]  State: [WA]  Zip:  [98104]
E-mail: [GRANT@PEOPLE'SWATERFRONT.ORG]

☒ Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

1. Choose a topic:
☒ Overall Project  ☐ Tunnel Alternative  ☐ Construction Impacts and Mitigation
☐ All of the Alternatives  ☐ Bypass Tunnel Alternative  ☐ Other
☐ Rebuild Alternative  ☐ Surface Alternative
☐ Aerial Alternative  ☐ Seawall

What are your comments about the project?

[SEE ADDED SHEET.]

(Please use additional paper if you need further comment space)
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make transit times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and are also concerned about the safety of the existing structure. Replacing the viaduct is an urgent need for transportation in the region.

With the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, the southbound on-ramp at Columbia Street and the northbound off-ramp at Seneca Street will be removed. Traffic patterns are expected to alter slightly with removal of these ramps, and the Alaskan Way surface street is expected to carry additional traffic to and from the central business district. To provide similar capacity levels as currently exists today, six lanes of traffic on the Alaskan Way surface street are necessary south of Yesler Way. With the Elevated Structure Alternative, additional lanes proposed on portions of Alaskan Way are for the purpose of improving traffic circulation and flow, especially in the vicinity of Colman Dock. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the Alaskan Way surface street as part of the project. Overall, it is expected that traffic that diverts to use surface streets and I-5 will distribute based on available capacity of these various roadways. At this time, there are no plans to substantially increase capacity along I-5 through the downtown core.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel's north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS.
5. The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley. The Western neighborhood character is a great compliment to the trolley. This would change it from a tourist ride to a real component of the general transportation picture, linking Pioneer square to the furniture shops and office buildings on Western to Pike Place Market and residences in Belltown. This is a use of transportation dollars that makes sense, by improving quality of life and moving more people.

Nate Cole-Dauz
3015 SW Avalon Way
Seattle, WA 98126
425.605.8369

and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

I-120-004
Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-122-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-122-002

With the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, the southbound on-ramp at Columbia Street and the northbound off-ramp at Seneca Street will be removed. Traffic patterns are expected to alter slightly with removal of these ramps, and the Alaskan Way surface street is expected to carry additional traffic to and from the central business district. To provide similar capacity levels as currently exists today, six lanes of traffic on the Alaskan Way surface street are necessary south of Yesler Way. With the Elevated Structure Alternative, additional lanes proposed on portions of Alaskan Way are for the purpose of improving traffic circulation and flow, especially in the vicinity of Colman Dock. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the Alaskan Way surface street as part of the project. Overall, it is expected that traffic that diverts to use surface streets and I-5 will distribute based on available capacity of these various roadways. At this time, there are no plans to substantially increase capacity along I-5 through the downtown core.

I-122-003

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where
SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

**I-122-004**

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
The 2004 Draft, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft, and Final EISs all analyzed the No Build Alternative. In addition to the No Build Alternative, many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your thoughts regarding the 2004 Draft EIS alternatives and preserving and improving access and mobility within the corridor. The lead agencies are committed to the wise use of public funds in the planning, design, and construction of this project. Since the publication of the 2004 Draft EIS, the project has evolved. The Bored Tunnel Alternative has been identified as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.

I-124-001
Whatever is decided, it is absolutely imperative that the I-5 corridor continue to exist as a rapid means of accessing downtown Seattle and going through to the South or North. This, of course includes easy access to W. Seattle, SeaTac, etc. This is essential given the difficulties on the I-5 corridor. Also, for residents to the west of I-5 living in the city, Aurora Ave is usually a better route.

The rapidity of access must not be compromised by becoming a road interrupted by lights or stops. The number of access points should be carefully considered and limited. It should be constructed so that highway speeds are able to be maintained on the route.

As a property owner in the city, I feel I'm on the receiving end of an endless progression of property tax hikes for an infinite list of projects planned to be done. This one is essential—maybe some others aren't.

Thank you for the chance to comment.
5/31/03
Peter O'Meara
3821 Carr Pl N
Seattle, WA 98103-8125
206-632-0918 (voice mail)
I-125-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Robert E. Condon
Address: 2722 86th Avenue NE
City: Clyde Hill
State: WA
Zip Code: 98004
Email: rec@wolfenet.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

Considering all the options for replacement, and the future need to create a visitor/resident-friendly waterfront, the reconstruction of the seawall combined with a covered below-grade tunnel (a la Mercer Island I-90) seems the best solution in terms of accomplishing 1) easy access to the waterfront, 2) adequate traffic capacity for the present and future, and 3) improved amenities all round.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are committed to working with the freight community. Since the publication of the 2004 Draft EIS, the project has evolved. Please see the Final EIS for current project information and proposed mitigation measures. Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS also contains updated information about freight mobility and proposed mitigation measures.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. 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.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Your suggestion to eliminate traffic along the waterfront would increase the congestion on I-5 and downtown streets over the levels found in the study mentioned in the paragraph above.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild or Tunnel Alternative. The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004, and 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. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-133-001
I think that the viaduct should be repaired or perhaps a tunnel could be an alternative. To have the viaduct completely torn down and an alternative plan of having traffic re-routed through downtown would be complete madness. Traffic already a nightmare through and around this city, hoping that bus tunnels could be shut down etc sounds awful to me. A simple plan of road/re-surface seems to me to be the viable edition. The folks that believe the viaduct is an eye sore I don’t think so. It is part of Seattle’s heritage. Let them try and colour traffic. We stand to lose a lot more if we try other alternatives.
May 27, 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms. Ray:

I have read through the draft EIS for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall project. I have lived in Seattle all of my life, and have used the area’s transportation network for the last 25 years. I have taken a keen interest in transportation issues in the area, and particularly the larger ones, such as the SR99, SR520 and I-405 challenges.

All of the options are expensive, and that is to be expected with a project of this nature. Nonetheless, I feel that it is important to invest the money in a revitalized SR99 corridor, and I feel the most cost-effective, least risky approach is either the Rebuild or Aerial alternatives. While the tunnel option appears attractive, I think it is inherently more risky, and would be more difficult to maintain. The view corridors to be created would not really benefit the average citizen; rather, they would benefit a few property owners in the first few floors of downtown properties. All of our previous experiences with tunneling in the Seattle area suggest that it is problematic, expensive, and presents significant risk of cost overruns.

A surface alternative is entirely unrealistic, and will result in significant negative traffic impacts on the downtown surface streets, but more importantly on I-5. I-5 is already congested during a significant portion of the day, and pretending that all of the traffic that bypasses downtown via the viaduct can be handled with a surface street seems absurd. In addition, the effect of increased through traffic on Alaskan Way itself will prove to be even more of a barrier between the waterfront and downtown than the current viaduct is perceived to be.

The viaduct as it exists today is worn out and obsolete, but the concept is still viable. That is: grade separate the through traffic, limit the on and off ramps, and provide an alternative for freight and vehicular traffic, while allowing easier pedestrian access to the waterfront from downtown. An Aerial or Rebuild alternative would replace the viaduct, built to 21st century traffic and seismic standards, would repair the seawall, and be a significant improvement from the current situation.

I look forward to following the continued progress of this important project. I appreciate the effort required to produce the Draft EIS. I would be happy to comment further, so please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Brad Cummins, Seattle
home phone: 206-528-1160

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild or Aerial Alternatives. 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. 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. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle acknowledge your concerns about access to the Elliott/Western corridor. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Access to and from SR 99 would be provided by new ramps near the stadiums and near Seattle Center. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the City of Seattle will lead the Elliott/Western Connector project, which would provide a connection from Alaskan Way to the Elliott/Western corridor.

As a Magnolia resident, the surface street and bypass tunnel options are unacceptable. In the "Why do we need the project?" section of the EIS it states, "the Alaskan Way Viaduct serves as a vital route for drivers, transit providers and riders, and the freight community by linking several key areas, including Burien, West Seattle, Duwamish Industrial area, downtown Seattle, Ballard and Interbay, Magnolia, and north Seattle," yet the bypass tunnel option eliminates the Western Ave exit and adds at least 5 minutes to commute time to the Ballard/Interbay/Magnolia area. Please find a way to keep a suitable exit in place if the bypass tunnel option is picked. The surface street alternative is not attractive either, as we need the higher capacity link through the western side of the city.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Bypass Tunnel Alternative
Surface Alternative
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
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.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.
The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects. Any plan to replace the viaduct will require some type of closures and/or lane restrictions on SR 99 through downtown and the Alaskan Way surface street.

After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects (including the cost) of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and the Elevated Structure evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated primarily due to these impacts. The Elevated Structure Alternative would construct a temporary Broad Street detour.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. This alternative does not include use of a temporary aerial structure during project construction. Details about the Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover, and Elevated Structure construction plans are presented in Chapter 3 and effects are presented in Chapter 6 of the
Final EIS. The Final EIS also discusses mitigation strategies for parking effects in Chapter 8.

**I-142-003**
Please see the response to your previous comment I-142-001.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-143-001

Name: Caroline Davis
Address: 2501 Nob Hill P I N
City: Seattle
State: 
Zip Code: 98109
Email: 
Affiliation (optional): n/a

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

I favor a tunnel to open up the waterfront, make the land more valuable and usable and allow the beauty of that area to be enjoyed. I live on Queen Anne and want to be able to enter and leave 99 both heading north and south at some point on Queen Anne. This is an opportunity to remove an eyesore, cut down on traffic noise, improve property values, and make one of the most beautiful features of this city appreciated by others. Don't cut corners. The pay off in the long run is worth the expense. Thanks

Comments apply to: Overall Project
I-144-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:
Name: Jacquelyn Davis
Address: 13160 91st Place NE
City: Kirkland
State: WA
Zip Code: 98034
Email: jacquelyn.davis@wamu.net
Affiliation (optional): Washington Mutual

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
I would very much like to see the tunnel alternative, in spite of the higher cost. I believe this to be the solution that provides the greatest value in human terms, creating a traffic solution together with an aesthetically usable surface space which can be used for the enjoyment of the public, visitors and residents. It represents a large scale, long term, 100 year vision instead of a quick fix decision based solely on the cheapest solution. If we are going to do this project, let us do it in a way which will add economic benefits from commerce and tourism and a rich vitality to our Seattle Waterfront for everyone to enjoy.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Dynne Daly
Address: 1707 Boylston Avenue #201
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98122
Email: ddcaly@loring.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
I support the full tunnel for many many reasons which have already been used before. Ditto the reasons, but vote yes for me for the tunnel. Thanks!

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
In March 2009, Casa Latina moved to their new building east of I-5 in the International District neighborhood. The new location is outside of the Alaskan Way Viaduct project area.

WSDOT will comply with the federal requirements for disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) participation. WSDOT cannot require contractors to hire workers from specific organizations. However, WSDOT can and does encourage contractors to work with local organizations and to develop programs that draw on the local labor pool.
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.

In addition, the project team considered the idea of replacing the viaduct with a tunnel under 5th Avenue. This concept was rejected for several reasons, including that it would require complex, state-of-the-art construction with high costs and high risks.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Thank you for your alternative suggestion. The deck of the structure you propose would need to be high enough to allow vertical clearance for trucks, and the structures required for the development of the elevated surface would be a minimum of one story tall. The deck itself would need to be deep enough to support the development you've proposed. The resulting structure would act as a multiple-story wall between downtown and the waterfront, affecting east/west travel for vehicles, pedestrians, and traffic, impacting views and visual character for people at street level, and diminishing neighborhood connectivity between the waterfront, Belltown, the Market, and Pioneer Square.

Since publication of the Draft EIS in 2004, the project has evolved. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.
Thank you for your comment. The purpose of this project is to replace the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct, which is in poor condition and in danger of failing in an earthquake. A new interstate loop is beyond the scope of this project, does not meet the purpose, and is not proposed by the lead agencies.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments.

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. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:
Name: Kelly Devlin
Address: PO Box 2311
City: Tacoma
State: WA
Zip Code: 98401
Email: kdevlin@hotmail.com
Affiliation (optional):
Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes
Project Comments:
I believe the full cut-and-cover tunnel is the best option to facilitate flow of traffic while giving us the opportunity to shape the Seattle waterfront into a landmark destination it has the potential to be, by adding more parks, shops, community spaces and maximizing pedestrian access and safety.
Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild or Aerial Alternative. 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. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for the project because it best meets the project's purposes and needs. Please refer to the Final EIS for current project information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Thank you for your comments. Clear signage that meets current engineering standards will be provided for this project.

The lead agencies recognize the importance of maintaining access to Queen Anne, Interbay, Magnolia, and Ballard, and the alternatives have been designed with this consideration in mind. Please see the Final EIS for current project information about access to these neighborhoods.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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-157-002
No vote occurred for the Aerial Alternative. However, there was a vote in 2007 on versions of the Elevated Structure and Cut-and-Cover Alternatives. Seattle citizens voted down both versions that were on the ballot.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. The lead agencies have determined that it would not be wise to make such a substantial investment to build a narrow roadway that would not meet today's safety standards for the SR 99 mainline. Instead, 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.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
I-160-001
At present, the state legislature has committed funding only for the Bored Tunnel alternative.

The outcome of cost overruns depends on the situation. If the overruns are a result of the contractor’s actions, then the contractor would bear the liability for the cost. If the overruns are due to other factors, then the agencies funding the project may be responsible. On large, complex projects, the responsibility for cost overruns is often shared.

I-160-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle recognize your preference for the Aerial and Tunnel Alternatives. Since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004, the project has evolved. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the the Final EIS for a current description of the project alternatives.

I-160-003
Bicycle access will be maintained at all times during construction activities. At times, it will be necessary to reroute bicycles using temporary facilities/detours, but these detours will be designed to minimize any inconvenience to the greatest extent possible.

I-160-004
Your concerns about project cost and timeline are noted. The lead agencies are also interested in keeping the project on budget and on time. The Final EIS contains current project cost and schedule information.

Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with
other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

I-160-005
A great deal of thought and planning has gone into the transportation management plans to mitigate for construction and permanent project effects. These management measures are discussed in the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C, of the Final EIS.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
A complete discussion of economic impacts was presented in Appendix P, Economic Technical Memorandum, of the 2004 Draft EIS. The economic impacts were summarized in the Draft EIS as well. Since the project has continued to evolve, the economics analysis has been updated for and summarized in the Final EIS. A detailed discussion can be found in Appendix L, Economics Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Thank you for your comments. Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS contains updated and more in-depth information on the transportation analyses conducted for the project than was summarized in the 2004 Draft EIS. The Final EIS also presents a discussion of traffic impacts on surface streets in the area as well as the transportation management plans that are under consideration. The 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS evaluated several additional construction approaches and provided more information on traffic impacts during construction. The temporary bypass elevated highway referred to in your comment has been eliminated in the current build alternatives.

Although costs are an important part of project planning and decision-making, they are purposely not a major part of the environmental review process. As provided in CFR 1502.23 “For purposes of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of the various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations. Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts.

Chapter 8 in the Final EIS presents mitigation measures to address project construction effects. Please see the Final EIS for current project information and analysis.
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

---Original Message---
From: Rob Dunn [mailto:robd@aqhrodte.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2004 10:09 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: no-highway

Hi,

I would like to see a no-highway alternative to the viaduct EIS. The money spent on a new highway could be better served to make improvements to arterial streets and transit.

When San Francisco lost the Embarcadero Freeway the traffic moved else where or disappeared and the city was given back it's waterfront. I want Seattle to have the same chance.

Thanks,
Rob Dunn
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-167-001

I am strongly for the tunnel alternative. We need to invest in a solution that would add dramatically to the beauty and public use of downtown Seattle. Tightening our belt and paying the cost now will be repaid a million-fold in the enjoyment both the citizens of Seattle and tourists will receive for generations to come. It would be tragic to saddle our city with another ugly highway in the sky. The loss of view for drivers is minimal since it is difficult to look at things while you’re driving in traffic. But being able to walk in an open area adjacent to the waterfront and the attractions of the downtown area will enrich the city immeasurably. We need to follow the lead of Vancouver and Portland if we are not to end up another squalid city caught in the shackles of the automobile.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have explored many options and are committed to providing an alternative that maintains the transportation capacity in the corridor. The Bored Tunnel Alternative has been identified as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.
Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to give us comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. The comments you make will become part of the public record for this project. Your thoughts will help decision makers develop a preferred alternative. Responses to your comments will be provided in the Final EIS.

Contact Information: At a minimum, please provide your name and Zip Code. If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

Name: __________________________

Organization/Membership Affiliation (optional): __________________________

Address: __________________________

City: __________________________ State: __________________________ Zip: __________________________

E-mail: __________________________

☐ Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

1. Choose a topic:
   ○ Overall Project
   ○ All of the Alternatives
   ○ Rebuild Alternative
   ○ Aerial Alternative
   ○ Tunnel Alternative
   ○ Bypass Tunnel Alternative
   ○ Surface Alternative
   ○ Construction Impacts and Mitigation
   ○ Other

What are your comments about the project?

(please see attached)

(Please use additional paper if you need further comment space)
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. The Bored Tunnel Alternative removes the Columbia Street on-ramp and Seneca Street off-ramp. Instead, access would be provided at a full access interchange at S. Royal Brougham Way and S. King Street. Traffic destined for downtown would use off-ramps at S. King Street and then access a wider Alaskan Way surface street (six lanes to Yesler Way) to access the downtown streets via connecting east-west arterials. An advantage of this configuration is that traffic flow between these new ramps and Alaskan Way is expected to be more efficient than with the current ramp configuration at Seneca and Columbia streets. In other words, all downtown destined traffic would not congregate at one intersection, which happens today.

For all proposed project alternatives, safe and accessible pedestrian crossings will be provided.
Pedestrian access and safety on the waterfront will be maintained at all times during construction activities. At times, it will be necessary to reroute pedestrians using temporary facilities/detours, but these detours will be designed to minimize any inconvenience. Further information on how the project will address pedestrian access and safety during construction can be found in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

As the project has evolved, construction effects for dust (particulate matter) and noise have been further evaluated and the conclusions are summarized in the Final EIS with more detail presented in the Final EIS Appendix M, Air Discipline Report, and Appendix F, Noise Discipline Report.

The project team has been developing parking mitigation strategies since the 2004 Draft EIS was published. It is recognized that businesses and residents along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project, has conducted an in-depth parking study as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies. SDOT’s Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Parking Assessment/Parking Mitigation Plan identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking, including new or leased parking spaces and the increased utilization of existing parking. These strategies are being considered in the transportation planning for construction process and will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. More information on parking strategies can be found in the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C, of the Final EIS.

We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to
share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild or Aerial 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-172-002

The public discussions and opinions referred to are normal during project development. These comments do not invalidate the decision-making process required by NEPA and SEPA.
There is no question that traffic impacts on city streets and I-5 will be felt by the traveling public. However, through the transportation planning process for construction, the project team has assembled a number of proven strategies to help manage traffic. For more information about these strategies, please refer to Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Carlos Estrada
Address: 4742 42nd Ave SW #101
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98116
Email: car24los88@yahoo.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

I surely believe the tunnel alternative would be a great asset for our city in the long run. Yes the cost would be larger now but the expense would allow our city to expand and grow in the future. I hope this plan is used and approved by voters, they will realize its long term contribution to the City of Seattle.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Tunnel Alternative
In March 2009, Casa Latina moved to their new building east of I-5 in the International District neighborhood. The new location is outside of the Alaskan Way Viaduct project area.

WSDOT will comply with the federal requirements for disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) participation. WSDOT cannot require contractors to hire workers from specific organizations. However, WSDOT can and does encourage contractors to work with local organizations and to develop programs that draw on the local labor pool.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Thank you again for expressing your support for the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. Your comments on the central waterfront area and involvement in learning about the project at public meetings and workshops are appreciated.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. 

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Ralph Federspiel 
Address: 8242 NE 110th Place 
City: Kirkland 
State: WA 
Zip Code: 98034 
Email: farfarsal@aol.com 
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list? 
Yes

Project Comments:

Guayaquil, Ecuador and Barcelona, Spain both have beautiful waterfront parks and I hope that our planners can see them via the internet or mail, or at least one of them personally.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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-178-001

As it is a major part of the Seattle waterfront skyline, I would like to keep the viaduct as an aerial route. I personally enjoy taking this stretch of the highway for the views. I do think a widened version of the viaduct would decrease traffic problems, sometimes experienced on the viaduct.

Comments apply to:
Aerial Alternative
I-179-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-179-001

Project Comments:

I am very much in favor of this project. Removing the viaduct and replacing it with a tunnel along a portion of the waterfront thru downtown would be a huge benefit to the City.

I am against retrofitting the Viaduct or replacing it with an aerial structure. A primary purpose of this project should be to create a more livable, beautiful waterfront.

Replacing portions of the seawall that are failing is a good idea - but replacing the seawall in total as part of this project may be too costly.

The Viaduct is no more vulnerable to earthquakes than many other bridges and buildings in the City - seismic concerns are easy to express, but not the best rational for this project.

This project and improving capacity of the 520 crossing of Lake Washington are the two most feasible, major transportation improvements we can make in the region.

Hopefully our political leaders can find significant Federal money to help make these projects happen. Also many property owners near the Viaduct would benefit from increased property values - hopefully they could contribute significant funds to the project.

Good luck with the Project!

Comments apply to:

Overall Project

Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-180-001

I use the Viaduct on a regular basis, but as an architect and visionary, I feel that it would be a great step in city development to remove the eye sore and noise of the viaduct from our waterfront. The viaduct is ugly, noisy, and physically and psychologically separates the downtown from the waterfront. The separation is an historical outcome of the days when the waterfront was an industrial zone, but with the current use of the waterfront as a tourist attraction (which could be better) and a Seattle public amenity, the industrial components need to be removed / concealed. For these reasons, I support the removal of the viaduct and support the tunnel solution. The tunnel would completely eliminate the structural and noise impact of traffic and since subsurface work is required in the area due to replacement of the seawall, it only makes sense to build both at the same time. The tunnel solution would also create developable land on the surface both for a smoother more pedestrian based circulation corridor as well as more retailing opportunities that our waterfront definitely needs to encourage tourist growth.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. 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.
Thank you for your suggestions. Many options were looked at during the initial phases of the AWV project's screening process. The screening process involved early analysis by the project team and discussions with community groups at more than 140 community meetings and community interviews, including businesses along the corridor. A total of 76 initial viaduct replacement concepts were considered, and concepts that were not feasible, or were outside the purpose of the project were dropped from further consideration. The most workable ideas were shaped into the alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs, and Final EIS. These alternatives analyzed include a range of viaduct repair and replacement designs with some elements of earlier concepts combined with other design structures as the engineering team looked at feasibility, cost and other criteria.

The concept of a tunnel in Elliott Bay was not carried forward in part because it could affect shipping and navigation, including Washington State Ferries, and because of the potential effects to endangered species and fish habitat.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild Alternative, followed by the Aerial Alternative. Elements of both the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. Emergency access, evacuation routes, ventilation, and fire suppression systems are incorporated into the tunnel design.

Since publication of the Draft EIS, the Surface and Bypass Tunnel Alternatives have been removed from further consideration. Please refer to Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for information about alternatives development.
The Rebuild, Aerial, Surface, and Bypass Tunnel Alternatives are no longer under consideration for this project. However, elements on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative analyzed in the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since publication of the 2004 Draft EIS, the project team has updated the traffic analysis for the current proposed alternatives. Please see the Final EIS for a summary of the updated traffic analysis and the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C, for all the details.

Again, we appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have considered the character of the SR 99 corridor and the historic structures within the project area when analyzing the alternatives.
Thank you for your comment. Funding for transportation improvements often does not match the perceived need. The lead agencies are working to coordinate funded transportation improvements in Seattle to provide the most benefit for taxpayers.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project includes improvements to Mercer between 5th Ave North and Dexter Ave. The Mercer Corridor Project between Dexter and I-5 is currently under construction, led by the City of Seattle.
Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Tunnel Alternative
All of the Alternatives
Bypass Tunnel Alternative
Rebuild Alternative
Surface Alternative
Aerial Alternative
Seawall
Thank you for your suggestions. Many options were looked at during the initial phases of the project's screening process. The screening process involved early analysis by the project team and discussions with community groups at more than 140 community meetings and community interviews, including businesses along the corridor. A total of 76 initial viaduct replacement concepts and seven seawall concepts were considered, and concepts that were not feasible, or were outside the purpose of the project were dropped from further consideration. The most workable ideas were shaped into the alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs, and Final EIS. The alternatives analyzed over the course of the project include a viaduct repair and several replacement alternatives. The Final EIS contains alternatives that combine some elements of earlier concepts as result of stakeholder input and and the engineering team design refinement as they considered feasibility, cost, and other criteria.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
The purpose of the project is to provide a replacement transportation facility that will, among other things, meet current seismic safety standards and provide capacity to efficiently move people and goods to and through downtown Seattle. See Chapter 1 in the Final EIS for the complete purpose and need statement for the project.

The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.

Comment noted. This project will not eliminate the railroad. The Final EIS discusses how the project will interact with the rail yards and rail operations located in the project area.

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.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

All of the proposed alternatives maintain access to the neighborhoods north of downtown Seattle, such as Ballard and Magnolia.
I-194-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. Current funding plans do not include a local improvement district (LID), but the City of Seattle may consider one in the future.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information. Improvements made to the Battery Street Tunnel are described in the Final EIS and include fire and life safety upgrades.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Mark Garff
Address: 8110 34th Ave NE
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98115
Email: 
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I support the FULL TUNNEL OPTION. We have a unique opportunity to enhance our sad and dilapidated waterfront once and for all. Make Seattle better: Remove the viaduct!

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.
The state legislature authorized funding to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct in RCW 47.01.402. According to this law:

"The legislature finds that the replacement of the vulnerable state route number 99 Alaskan Way viaduct is a matter of urgency for the safety of Washington’s traveling public and the needs of the transportation system in central Puget Sound."

This legislation also authorizes WSDOT to obligate two billion eight hundred million dollars. In order to fund this obligation the legislation further identifies sources of funding: $2,400,000,000 of state funding; $400,000,000 of toll funding.

In the absence of toll funding WSDOT would still have the authorization to issue contracts up to $2,800,000,000 but the mix of funding sources would change. It is assumed that the toll funding would be replaced by new or reprioritized federal, state, or local funding sources.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and acknowledge your preference for 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.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be
during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day, compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
During the 2009 legislative session, the Washington State Legislature passed Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5768, which directed WSDOT to study whether money could be raised by tolling a new SR 99 facility. WSDOT was also directed to analyze the performance of a tolled facility and the potential effects of diverted traffic on alternate routes.

The results of this initial work were reported in the "SR 99 Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Updated Cost and Tolling Summary Report to the Washington State Legislature" published in January 2010.

The 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS includes preliminary analysis on the effects of tolling. The Final EIS also includes a more in-depth analysis of the effects of tolling the viaduct replacement alternatives.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Bypass Tunnel Alternative. The Bypass Tunnel Alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it did not meet the project's purpose; please see Chapter 2 for the full discussion about why this alternative was dropped. 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Alison Ray,

I have been a lifelong Seattle resident, 52 years, and proud of it. I remember when Highway 99 was the main route of travel. That time has past however and it needs replacing. The solution must be cost effective, done in a timely manner and improve efficiency. Of the 5 plans to replace the viaduct, I support the Bypass Tunnel. It appears to be cost effective by utilizing a tunnel through downtown and freeing up the waterfront area to be more citizen friendly. The time frame is acceptable, being less than other options. It would also have more lanes to travel with. The other options require more dollars or more time to build. A surface roadway is the most idiotic choice. An aerial would take much too long to build. Replacing the viaduct would create massive traffic jams and NOT solve the problem of safety.

I live in West Seattle and use the viaduct every day. As one of the 110,000 auto’s a day using 99, I consider it of the highest priority of our transportation problems. Please make a choice and BUILD IT. It is past time when our leaders show direction and commitment.

Realistically,

Peter Giese
PO Box 10303
Seattle, WA 98116
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Bypass Tunnel Alternatives. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in the Final EIS. The Bypass Tunnel Alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it did not meet the project's purpose; please see Chapter 2 for the full discussion about why this alternative was dropped. 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
The state legislature authorized funding to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct in RCW 47.01.402. According to this law:

"The legislature finds that the replacement of the vulnerable state route number 99 Alaskan Way viaduct is a matter of urgency for the safety of Washington’s traveling public and the needs of the transportation system in central Puget Sound."

This legislation also authorizes WSDOT to obligate two billion eight hundred million dollars. In order to fund this obligation the legislation further identifies sources of funding: $2,400,000,000 of state funding; $400,000,000 of toll funding.

In the absence of toll funding WSDOT would still have the authorization to issue contracts up to $2,800,000,000 but the mix of funding sources would change. It is assumed that the toll funding would be replaced by new or reprioritized federal, state, or local funding sources.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
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Think we should take the lead from Portland and San Francisco. Tear down the Viaduct and do nothing! Other than making a park under where it now stands.

By the time the viaduct project is ready to go, driving a single occupant car will be less of an option for people. Why spend billions of dollars to promote global warming. I-5 is just fine thank you.

Comments apply to:

Overall Project

---- Original Message ----
From: Aaron Goss [mailto:aaronngoss@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2004 1:46 AM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: no option

How come there isn’t an option to remove the viaduct and build a park like Portland or S.F.? I have been to both cities and their waterfronts are much nicer and there is much more business and people space than ours.

Sincerely,
Aaron Goss
Owner & Mechanic,

PLEASE NOTE OUR NEW ADDRESS:

Aaron’s Bicycle Repair
6521 California Ave SW
Seattle WA 98136

(206)938-9795 Fax (206)923-1597
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FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have continued to work through the concerns regarding cost. Please see the Summary Chapter of the Final EIS for more information. It has been determined that retrofitting the viaduct has been determined not to be a good investment because it would cost 80-90 percent of the cost of a new structure to meet the required earthquake standards.
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

----Original Message-----
From: Jonathan Granato [mailto:lord_st_earth@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2004 4:15 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: FIVE PLANS FOR THE ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT

Well, hello there, all you WSDOT persons!

I presume this email addy will be a-jitter w/everybody and their uncle giving you their opinions on wh. of the five proposals for the Alaskan Way Viaduct they prefer.

In order to keep this email succinct, simple, and concise, here's my choice:

"* Tunnel: Replace the viaduct with a tunnel along the central waterfront with three lanes in each direction. An aerial structure would connect the tunnel from the waterfront to the Battery Street Tunnel and, in the south, the viaduct would be replaced with an at-grade roadway. This is the most expensive option with cost estimates of $3.6 billion to $4.1 billion. It would take from seven to nine years to build."

Look, let's do it right this time around!

Jonathan Granato
206 284 8437

Do you Yahoo?
Yahoo! Mail - More reliable, more storage, less spam
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FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

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.
Although costs are an important part of project planning and decision-making, they are purposely not a major part of the environmental review process. As provided in CFR 1502.23 “For purposes of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of the various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations.” Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.
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FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
The Surface Alternative is no longer being considered because it does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. 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. However, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.

Dear WashDOT and City of Seattle Members:

I am writing to share my concerns about the proposed drafts for rebuilding Seattle's city waterfront.

As a resident of downtown Seattle and as one of the many pedestrians that walk under the existing viaduct daily on my way to and from work, I have a vested interest in seeing Seattle's waterfront become a living city center. I share the waterfront vision of many others - a waterfront filled with pedestrian spaces and amenities that serve the broad demographic profile that constitutes Seattle's public community.

In this vision I look forward to a time when all of the adjacent downtown neighborhoods feature useable connections to Seattle's waterfront, fostering and adding life to our new urban center. This waterfront vision considers our incredible natural surroundings, resources and precious habitats as crucial elements to Seattle's future appeal.

Our living waterfront cannot be realized, and cultural amenities that will truly serve the public of Seattle cannot be cultivated in a scenario where motorized traffic is the predominant feature of our waterfront, as suggested by AASSTT of the current EIS draft viaduct replacement options. The only thing that 8 lanes of motorized traffic along Alaskan Way can contribute to Seattle's waterfront is a congested and hazardous highway - completely devoid of pedestrian life (as is the void that currently defines the underside of Seattle's existing viaduct). The current draft suggestions do not allow for the thriving community growth, public pedestrian spaces, and the types of neighborhood businesses and amenities that will make our waterfront a destination and a joy to those that live, work and visit our beautiful city.

As a concerned resident of Seattle, I implore you to continue considering options for Seattle's waterfront that do not require so much of our valuable public waterfront space to be consumed by vehicle traffic. I encourage you to require that a strong connection be enforced from the waterfront to our other local treasures, such as Pike Place Market, Pioneer Square, and other waterfront neighborhoods, which can in part be accomplished through the extension of the proposed Highway 99 tunnel lid, and the public-space connections that such a solution provides.

I feel that it is only through endeavors like these that our precious resources can be preserved for future generations to enjoy, and that through our perseverance, time, and dedication our city can grow to become one of the most thriving and desirable cities in the US.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jessie R. Griess
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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I grew up in Seattle, and love the city and its waterfront. I have also always admired the use to which Vancouver B.C. has put its waterfront property; so much is public access. We now have a grand opportunity to connect the downtown Seattle area with the waterfront, and to enhance the public open air spaces in between. Please put as much of the highway 99 project as possible underground, and develop public parks places on the surface. This is not the time for public parsimony. For our future generations, please take advantage of this opportunity for enhancing the connection between downtown Seattle and its waterfront.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
All of the Alternatives
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel
and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

**I-219-003**

Your comments on preliminary cost estimates are appreciated and noted. Updated cost estimates are included in the Final EIS.
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FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, replacing the seawall would be a separate project, led by the City of Seattle, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alternative. Measures to avoid and/or mitigate effects on fish and wildlife would be determined under that project. If the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative or the Elevated Structure Alternative is selected, the lead agencies would take the appropriate measures to avoid and/or mitigation effects on fish and wildlife as required by law as part of this project. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each proposed build alternative.
A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen...
Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-222-002

The state legislature authorized funding to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct in RCW 47.01.402. According to this law:

"The legislature finds that the replacement of the vulnerable state route number 99 Alaskan Way viaduct is a matter of urgency for the safety of Washington’s traveling public and the needs of the transportation system in central Puget Sound."

This legislation also authorizes WSDOT to obligate two billion eight hundred million dollars. In order to fund this obligation the legislation further identifies sources of funding: $2,400,000,000 of state funding; $400,000,000 of toll funding. Both the City of Seattle and the Port of Seattle are also contributing substantial funding to this project and other complementary improvements.

In the absence of toll funding WSDOT would still have the authorization to issue contracts up to $2,800,000,000 but the mix of funding sources would change. It is assumed that the toll funding would be replaced by new or reprioritized federal, state, or local funding sources.

I-222-003

The Monorail Project no longer exists. However, as you note, it is not
realistic to remove SR 99 from our transportation system. Careful study shows that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. The build alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS replace the existing capacity of SR 99 in the project corridor.

I-222-004
Yes, adjacent property owners could potentially receive indirect economic benefits associated with increased property values and increased potential for redevelopment. However, the lead agencies will not pursue state financing reforms to allow tax increment financing to fund this project.

Tolling the new facility is considered in the Final EIS.

I-222-005
If the Bored Tunnel Alternative, the preferred alternative, is chosen, the exact configuration and types of activities provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project led by the City of Seattle. The lead agencies are coordinating with the City on its planning efforts for that project. As the City moves forward with that project, there will be opportunities for the public to participate in the master planning effort and to help determine the future of their waterfront.

I-222-006
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-222-007
If the preferred alternative, Bored Tunnel Alternative is chosen, the exact configuration and types of activities provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project led by the City of Seattle.

If the Elevated Structure or Cut-and-Cover Alternative is chosen, this project would include an Alaskan Way with two lanes each direction with center turn pockets along the central waterfront. Expanded open space, a waterfront promenade, broad sidewalks on both sides of the surface street, bicycle lanes, and parking are also included as part of these alternatives.

Please see the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.

I-222-008
The Surface Alternative is no longer being considered. The lead agencies are not planning to reduce capacity in the corridor. In addition to improving the earthquake resistance, the purpose of the project is to "maintain or improve mobility, accessibility, and traffic safety for people and goods along the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct Corridor." Both the state and federal governments also require that traffic capacity be the same or greater than it is today as a qualification for funding.

I-222-009
A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public
comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

I-222-010
Although retaining a portion of the existing viaduct as a view platform would provide an interesting public open space amenity, space along the waterfront is physically constricted, and preservation of a viaduct section would come at the expense of future transportation facilities and of public open space at ground level.
I-223-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your objection to the Bypass Tunnel and Surface Alternatives. These alternatives are no longer being considered. Please refer to the Final EIS for the alternatives currently being evaluated.

I-223-002

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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-223-003

Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the Supplemental Draft EISs and Final EIS. The latest information on effects to parking, project costs, and the construction plan for the Elevated Structure are included in the Final EIS. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be provided along Alaskan Way.
I-223-004
The Final EIS analyzed two tunnel alternatives: Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Bored Tunnel. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would include the replacement of the seawall because it would be a component of the west tunnel wall. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the replacement of the seawall because the alignment of the bored tunnel would not be along the seawall.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the alternatives considered and the environmental analysis. The Elliott Bay Seawall will be replaced by the City of Seattle.

I-223-005
After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated
Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

The configuration of Alaskan Way and amount of parking provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project, which is being led by the City of Seattle as a separate project. The area beneath the viaduct is owned by the City of Seattle and will remain under its ownership once the viaduct is removed.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-226-001

We have a unique opportunity to create something beautiful and healthy for our waterfront. I am reminded of the Chief Seattle parks & birds legacy. Building a larger tunnel for traffic will leave more open space for us to create something beautiful. We must push for the most beautiful, enhanced, retrofitted ecological, Northwest style possible because it will be a part of our legacy.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. If either the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative or the Elevated Structure Alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of that alternative. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. A tunnel alternative would create more open space along the waterfront. This new space could be converted into a variety of new uses like a waterfront promenade, bike and pedestrian paths, and expanded streetcar service. Also, if the viaduct is removed, scenic views to, from, and along the waterfront would be opened up, making the waterfront more attractive visually, and seem more connected to downtown, Pioneer Square, Pike Place Market, and Belltown. Please refer to the Final EIS for more information on how the alternatives have developed since the 2004 Draft EIS and how the preferred alternative was selected.

Yes, with either tunnel alternative, freight with hazardous and/or flammable cargo would be prohibited in the tunnel. Instead of traveling on SR 99 through downtown, freight with such cargo would be required to use another route, such as Alaskan Way or I-5. While this impact would be inconvenient to some, the lead agencies still have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative due to its ability to best meet the project's identified purposes and needs.
Impacts and mitigation related to freight transportation are discussed in detail in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

**I-227-003**

The cost estimates for the build alternatives have been updated since the Draft EIS was published. Project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Please refer to the Summary Chapter of the Final EIS for a summary of the cost and funding information for the alternatives.

**I-227-004**

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. Because the project has evolved since publication of the Draft EIS in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information about the build alternatives.

The exact configuration and types of activities provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project led by the City of Seattle.
I-228-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-228-002
The alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS focused on replacement of the existing viaduct. Mid-to-high capacity transit developments are being addressed by other agencies, specifically Seattle Department of Transportation (e.g., South Lake Union Streetcar), King County Metro (e.g., RapidRide), and Sound Transit (e.g., Link Light Rail, Sounder). Potential fixed guideway high-capacity transit (HCT) alignments that have been developed in the long-range plans for these agencies and at present do not include the SR 99/Alaskan Way Viaduct corridor. Potential future pedestrian enhancements in the waterfront area would be addressed in the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The Final EIS includes qualitative economic analysis of the preferred alternative to more fully describe project indirect benefits, such as increased downtown property values. A broader discussion of the project's economic costs and benefits can be found in Appendix L, Economics Discipline Report, to the Final EIS.
Furthermore, not only will choosing the tunnel option immediately raise revenues, but it will spur new development. This will create permanent and temporary jobs, new residences, offices, etc., increased tax revenues, more tourism, and many other benefits. The economic implications of the tunnel alternative make this choice not even close. It's time for Seattle to stop the pattern of poor planning choices, poor infrastructure investments, and shortsightedness. Let's embrace a new attitude of long-term vision, of making public investments that provide the highest returns, and of making this place better for all people. The choice is easy here. Pick the tunnel alternative.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project.
I-231-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Transportation Building
Washington State Department of Transportation
310 Maple Park Avenue SE
PO Box 47300
Olympia WA 98504-7300

April 14, 2004

I am writing in regards to the SR 99-Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. I am in favor of the tunnel option. Even though it is more expensive than other options, the tunnel plan takes full advantage of the need to deeply excavate for the new seawall; the tunnel will leave our waterfront more attractive.

For a world-class city, as Seattle should become, we need to invest in our infrastructure now. Let’s not try to do another cheap project, such as the Kingdome. Let’s build something strong, solid, and long-lasting.

Sincerely,

Mark Hammeken
2121 N. 143rd St.
Seattle, WA 98133
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

**I-232-001**

After reviewing the options for the replacement of the viaduct and the seawall I strongly urge WSDOT to make an investment in the future of the city. The tunnel may be more expensive initially but the benefit to the city will be enormous. I believe the tunnel is generally accepted as the best alternative, we must push forward with it. In addition to this I would like to bring up the surface traffic issue. I have seen the sections through the proposed tunnel and the amount of space dedicated to surface traffic is quite intimidating. The lanes broken up but unusable strips of plantings does not seem like a good idea. If the traffic could be minimized or pushed off to one side of the right of way to allow for a greater depth of usable pedestrian space at the water, it would be greatly preferred. Thank you.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-234-001
The range of costs is discussed in the Final EIS. It is difficult to estimate how much money would be saved if the viaduct was not replaced, because alternate improvements to the downtown street grid would have to be made to accommodate at least some of the loss in capacity. There would also be additional costs to increase transit service, both in terms of additional transit vehicles and other capital improvements to augment transit speed and reliability. Therefore, no specific cost savings can be given to the "no replacement" concept at this time.

We are not aware of any plans for future colleges or stadiums in the project area, and if they exist they have not progressed to the point where they can be considered.
Traffic delays during construction are a concern. Traffic detours and associated strategies for minimizing and mitigating traffic delays are summarized in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS and discussed in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. This alternative avoids substantial closure of SR 99 during construction. Chapter 5 of the Final EIS provides a discussion of construction effects for all the proposed build alternatives.
I-236-001

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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-237-001

I work Downtown and have always thought that the current Viaduct is not only an eyesore, but unsafe as well. It's got narrow lanes, short sight lines and noisy offramps. The Tunnel option, while the most invasive choice, will open up the waterfront views for the buildings (condos and businesses alike) closest to the area as well as the views of downtown from the Waterfront. It also appears to add additional greenery and possibly pedestrian areas to the waterfront. I think that this will improve the overall impression of two of our most popular tourist areas – the waterfront and Pike Place Market. I note that there is some concern over the loss of views from the Viaduct if the elevated roadway is removed. In my opinion, this is a safety issue rather than one of views - people should be paying attention to their driving rather than gaping at the view of the Sound.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
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.

The seawall holds back fill placed along the waterfront that now supports the foundations of the viaduct, adjacent buildings, and the Alaskan Way surface street. This makes fixing the seawall a critical project. The alternatives being considered maintain or improve the transportation functions of the project corridor.
North of the Battery Street Tunnel, SR 99 needs improved connections to and from the roadway. To clarify the need for these improvements, the project's purpose and need statement was modified after the 2004 Draft EIS was issued. As a result, new configurations for this area were analyzed with the alternatives in the 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs. Please see the Final EIS for updated information on the alternatives.

Besides the chambers for vehicle traffic, a waterfront tunnel would need space for ventilation, utilities, tunnel mechanical systems such as control wiring, and/or emergency egress. Various tunnel design alternatives have considered different combinations of temporary and permanent chambers. A tunnel with four lanes in each direction would not leave enough room along the waterfront for utilities, which must be relocated from the existing viaduct, even if they are placed in a stacked configuration. In addition, the project has not considered providing four lanes of traffic in either direction because this would exceed the capacity of SR 99 north and south of the viaduct section, where there are no plans to increase the number of lanes.

The purpose of the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project is to provide a transportation facility with improved earthquake resistance that maintains or improves mobility and accessibility for people and goods along the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct Corridor. While increasing capacity may be possible along the corridor, it is not the ultimate goal of the project and was not considered a necessary component of the alternatives.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. The long-range capacity needs of...
the corridor would be adequately served by this alternative or the other two build alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS. Please see the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, for more information.
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.

The tunnel alternatives are safe options. Emergency access, evacuation routes, ventilation, and fire suppression systems will be provided. Please see Appendix K, Public Services and Utilities Discipline Report, of the Final EIS for more information on the proposed safety measures.

Residential and commercial development are not likely to occur in the space where the existing viaduct is located. Much of the space would be needed for the Alaskan Way surface street, trolley, pedestrian walkways, bike paths, and parking. The Final EIS includes qualitative economic analysis to help describe potential development that might result from the project; however, planning for private development is not included in the scope of the EIS.
I-241-001

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.

Fire and life safety improvements will be made to the Battery Street Tunnel as part of the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives. If the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the Battery Street Tunnel would be decommissioned after the bored tunnel is operational.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-245-001

I own a business in Pioneer Square. Every day I wonder what kind of idiocy led to the building of the viaduct. It is noisy, extremely ugly and ruins natural beauty that Seattle is blessed with. An underground tunnel would restore the area. Views from buildings would be reopened, making the whole area more desirable. The removal of the noise and dirt from the viaduct would make the location ideal for restaurants with outdoor seating and great views. No true refurbishing or renewal of Pioneer Square, which is the historic heart of Seattle, is possible with the viaduct in its current location. Moving the viaduct will drastically change this area - make it much more friendly to business and tourists. Please, please, please move it underground.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
I-246-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs.

Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent, though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-249-001

WSDOT, King County, and the City of Seattle have developed transportation improvements to minimize traffic effects to keep people and goods moving during construction of the program. These enhancements and improvements are an independent project that will benefit all pending program elements. They are designed to increase transit options, shift traffic away from construction areas, and provide drivers with the information they need to choose less congested routes. More information about strategies to mitigate construction traffic impacts can be found in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.
I-250-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments regarding each of the alternatives.

Several individuals and organizations have made the suggestion that construction noise associated with the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project that exceeds the City of Seattle residential nighttime noise regulations should be limited to non-residential areas. The construction plans evaluated for noise and vibration are described in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report, of the Final EIS. While actual construction plans and activity sequencing could differ from this evaluation, the locations and types of activities would be similar under the final sequence. This means that there is some flexibility in the proposed construction plans.

Construction of the project may require nighttime construction activities, and the City may require a Major Public Project Construction Noise Variance. Construction noise mitigation requirements would be developed and specified in the noise variance.
I-252-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. Your suggestion that the lead agencies should adopt a tunnel alternative with a maximum of two or three lanes would be infeasible, because the state legislature has stipulated that state funding is contingent upon accommodating at least as much traffic as the existing viaduct does today. The lead agencies have selected the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please refer to the Final EIS for information on the alternatives evaluated.

I-252-002

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-253-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

The tax structure that the City of Seattle chooses to implement is not the purview of WSDOT or any of its projects. We encourage you to contact your City Council to discuss these types of issues related to property taxes.

Additional construction plans, which take less than 11 years, were presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS.
Thank you for your comments regarding the Surface Alternative. This alternative is no longer being considered. Please see the Final EIS for information on the alternatives that were considered.

Constructing a bypass tunnel with an open-air roof would indeed allow a more shallow excavation and preclude the need for ventilation while reducing noise. Despite these advantages, the Bypass Tunnel Alternative was eliminated as discussed in Chapter 2, Question 1 of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. The Bypass Tunnel Alternative did not meet the project's purpose because it would have increased travel times and congestion. There are also a large number of utilities that must be placed over the tunnel including large electric vaults; large diameter storm drainage pipes; fiber optic duct banks; high pressure gas mains; and several electric, water, and steam utilities serving the waterfront businesses.

In addition to the utilities, there are structural reasons not to leave the facility open. Leaving the structure open leaves less room for a surface street and promenade along the water. Because of the high water table, buoyancy calculations indicate large uplift forces that would require extraordinary means to secure without the weight of overburden. Without a roof, the structure would also be much more vulnerable to earthquake forces. The buoyancy and earthquake forces can be overcome with a robust structure, but not without adding considerably to the cost of construction.
In this scheme, the bypass tunnel is built similarly but with an open air roof. In other words, SR 99 is sunken to allow for a more shallow tunnel which requires less excavation. No ventilation is necessary. Noise is reduced. And pedestrian overpasses & parks can be built over parts of the road to allow for safe circulation and create unique green spaces.

This scheme has the same traffic capacity as the surface scheme so it might be considered a hybrid between the bypass tunnel & surface schemes.

Thanks!

Nicole Hilliard
432 Woodland Park Ave #105
Seattle, WA 98103
nhilliard@hotmail.com
Thank you for your interest and participation in the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project and for your feedback on the public hearing in Ballard (4/29/04). The lead agencies have tried to provide many opportunities for the public to participate in this effort and to keep the communities well-informed.

I-254-003

I already submitted comments on the schemes but I wanted to also comment on the public hearing itself. I attended the hearing in Ballard on Apr. 29. I was very impressed by the amount of information available. The history and studies were organized very well and were very educational. I liked all of the exhibits that demonstrated what the noise would be like and what the schemes would look like. That was excellent. It was great to have people from the DOT there to be able to explain how each scheme would be built. The visual aids and the representatives there helped me to understand what the obstacles are and helped me to differentiate facts from myths. Thank you for making the effort to provide the public with an educational forum and giving us the opportunity to participate in the project.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Thank you for your comments and your careful consideration of the Draft EIS. As a neighbor, the lead agencies recognize your concerns. The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
An exhaust stack near Pike Place Market is no longer included in any of the alternatives. The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would have two tunnel operations buildings that include exhaust stacks. One building would be located in the south portal area near Alaskan Way S. and Railroad Way S., and a second building would be located in the north portal area near 6th Avenue and Harrison Street.

Several individuals and organizations have made the suggestion that construction noise associated with the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project that exceeds the City of Seattle residential nighttime noise regulations should be limited to non-residential areas. The construction plans evaluated for noise and vibration are described in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report, of the Final EIS. While actual construction plans and activity sequencing could differ from this evaluation, the locations and types of activities would be similar under the final sequence. This means that there is some flexibility in the proposed construction plans.

Construction of the project may require nighttime construction activities, and the City may require a Major Public Project Construction Noise Variance. Construction noise mitigation requirements would be developed and specified in the noise variance.
The lead agencies recognize that the Pike Place Market area is especially sensitive to traffic impacts during construction. Updated construction transportation planning can be found in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS. Detoured traffic is not expected to pass through the immediate market area. However, nearby streets, such as First Avenue South, are likely to see impacts to traffic as a result of detours.

Thank you for your suggested mitigation measures to minimize impacts to businesses along the waterfront and along streets adjacent to the construction zone. These suggestions have been considered in preparation of the mitigation measures included in the Final EIS.

The project team uses several communication and public involvement tools (outlined in Appendix A, Public Involvement Discipline Report) to gather input and help shape the project throughout design and construction. There are opportunities to attend public meetings and community events to learn more about the project and multiple ways to contact the project team with any questions or concerns including hotline (1-888-AWV-LINE) or e-mail (viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov).

In addition, many forums are in place to provide feedback to the project team:

- North and south portal working groups exist today. They have been meeting since May 2009 and they do not have a firm end date.
- Maintenance of traffic meeting in the south end discusses upcoming construction and potential traffic impacts. This includes stakeholders as well as the contractor and staff from the project office.
- Construction outreach tools such as distributing (often in person) notices to adjacent businesses and residents about upcoming work,
• Regular construction reports on the website and e-mail updates.
• Other resources: 24-hour hotline, the website, viaduct e-mail for comments or questions, community briefings, information booths and community events. Many of these tools are used as opportunities to have dialogue or discuss any issues with stakeholders or neighbors.
We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.

Measures to mitigate construction noise, parking, traffic, dust, and other project effects are presented in the Final EIS and its appendices. As project design is finalized, the lead agencies will continue to refine construction mitigation for the preferred alternative’s construction sequencing and methods.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

An exhaust stack near Pike Place Market is no longer included in any of
the alternatives. The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would have two tunnel operations buildings that include exhaust stacks. One building would be located in the south portal area near Alaskan Way S. and Railroad Way S., and a second building would be located in the north portal area near 6th Avenue and Harrison Street.
I-257-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The Final EIS considers tolling for all the build alternatives.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. This alternative is no longer being considered. Please refer to the Final EIS for information regarding the current alternatives. Your comments regarding cost, safety, and parking are also noted.

The project is planning to begin construction in the Fall of 2011. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will issue a ROD no earlier than 30 days after this Final EIS is published. Construction will begin once the ROD is issued and required permits are obtained.
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.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated...
The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

I-259-003
The Bored Tunnel Alternative would provide as much capacity as the existing Battery Street Tunnel. For details on anticipated operations in other sections of the project corridor, please refer to the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C, of the Final EIS.

I-259-004
Environmental documentation for the project has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4322(2)(c)) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (Ch. 43.21 C RCW). Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIS describes the history of the project, including development of the Purpose and Need and alternatives. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
We agree with State Representative Helen Sommers that the BEST alternatives will be the Re-build or the new Aerial.
We agree that two of the three of the Alternatives are NOT feasible. The all surface Boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic.
The four lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal which is access from Elliott Ave. and exit to Western Ave. and therefore, be closed to all traffic to or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and further north, including industry along the canal. The six-lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, not included in the basic design and cost the most.
We believe only the Aerial or Re-build has the same capacity as the present Viaduct.
Capacity should not be reduced, as this will further gridlock I-5 and city streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner's Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Residence Address, Street &amp; Number</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liz Ward</td>
<td>Liz Ward</td>
<td>1926 8th Ave W</td>
<td>53044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doretta Halvorsen</td>
<td>Doretta</td>
<td>2517 W Bay St</td>
<td>98101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja Moore</td>
<td>Sonja Moore</td>
<td>1604 20th Ave W</td>
<td>98101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Rowlings</td>
<td>Phil Rowlings</td>
<td>2240 1st Ave W</td>
<td>98101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.J. Koehl</td>
<td>C.J. Koehl</td>
<td>3606 25th Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan T. Hunscheid</td>
<td>Alan T.</td>
<td>3606 35th Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant B. Traylor</td>
<td>Grant B.</td>
<td>2350 1st Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. M. B. Wasserman</td>
<td>A. M. B.</td>
<td>2082 1st Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Madden</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>2626 20th Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary A. Franklin</td>
<td>Mary A.</td>
<td>3510 Norway Ave E</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. J. St.</td>
<td>W. J. St.</td>
<td>8331 35th Ave E</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carline V.</td>
<td>Carline V.</td>
<td>2555 13th Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard O.</td>
<td>Richard O.</td>
<td>2520 W Bay St</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. Young</td>
<td>J. W. Young</td>
<td>4003 25th Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. Smith</td>
<td>John S.</td>
<td>3413 35th Ave E</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James V. Smith</td>
<td>James V.</td>
<td>3510 Norway Ave E</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A.</td>
<td>James A.</td>
<td>3510 Norway Ave E</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We agree with State Representative Helen Sommers that the BEST alternatives will be the Re-build or the new Aerial.
We agree that two of the three of the Alternatives are NOT feasible. The all surface Boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic.
The four lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal which is access from Elliott Ave, and exit to Western Ave, and therefore, be closed to all traffic to or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and further north, including industry along the canal. The six-lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, not included in the basic design and cost the most.
We believe only the Aerial or Re-build has the same capacity as the present Viaduct.
Capacity should not be reduced, as this will further gridlock I-5 and city streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner's Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Residence Address, Street &amp; Number</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna E. Hayes</td>
<td>ANNA E. HAYES</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. Hayes</td>
<td>WILLIAM R. HAYES</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan D. Faucett</td>
<td>ALAN D. FAUCETT</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parker</td>
<td>JOHN PARKER</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Fink</td>
<td>GARY HINK</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lark Elks</td>
<td>LARK ELKS</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Powell</td>
<td>LARRY POWELL</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Richardson</td>
<td>SANDY RICHARDSON</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Shaffer</td>
<td>ANTHONY SHAFFER</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wolfe</td>
<td>ROBERT WOLFE</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Roller</td>
<td>BRIDGET ROLLER</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeFlore</td>
<td>LEFLORE</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernestine Lopin</td>
<td>ERNESTINE LOPIN</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam James</td>
<td>PAM JAMES</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Finkle</td>
<td>VIRGINIA FKELLE</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Shutes</td>
<td>MOLLY SHUTES</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Bower</td>
<td>SHARON BOWER</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darla Rodgers</td>
<td>DARLA RODGERS</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Radler</td>
<td>DAN RADLER</td>
<td>3603-42 NW, Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT DRAFT EIS PETITION

We agree with State Representative Ilen Sommers that the BEST alternatives will be the Re-build or the new Aerial.
We agree that two of the three of the Alternatives are NOT feasible. The all surface Boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic. The four lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal which is access from Elliott Ave. and exit to Western Ave. and therefore, be closed to all traffic to or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and further north, including industry along the canal. The six-lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, not included in the basic design and cost the most.
We believe only the Aerial or Re-build has the same capacity as the present Viaduct. Capacity should not be reduced, as this will further gridlock I-5 and city streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner's Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Residence Address, Street &amp; Number</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MOVAH MILLER</td>
<td>3339 27th Pl W, #414</td>
<td>98119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRACE LAYTON</td>
<td>3520 47th Av W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RICHARD SMITH</td>
<td>7810 34th Ave, #746</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ANDREW MCKEE</td>
<td>4916 West Government Way</td>
<td>98106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>2326 Webster Way</td>
<td>98103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RICHARD MCNALLY</td>
<td>3200 W Commodore W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT DRAFT EIS PETITION

We agree with State Representative Helen Sommers that the BEST alternatives will be the Re-build or the new Aerial.

We agree that two of the three of the Alternatives are NOT feasible. The all surface Boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic.

The four lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal which is access from Elliott Ave and exit to Western Ave, and therefore, be closed to all traffic to or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and further north, including industry along the canal. The six-lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, not included in the basic design and cost the most.

We believe only the Aerial or Re-build has the same capacity as the present Viaduct.

Capacity should not be reduced, as this will further gridlock I-5 and city streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner's Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Residence Address, Street &amp; Number</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4551 W. Park Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4551 W. Park Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2624 W. Plymouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2624 W. Plymouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2151 41st Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2151 41st Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2151 39th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2151 39th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4949 35th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4949 35th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 77th Ave W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We agree with State Representative Helca Sommers that the BEST alternatives will be the Re-build or the new Aerial.

We agree that two of the three of the Alternatives are NOT feasible. The all surface Boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic. The four lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal which is access from Elliott Ave. and exit to Western Ave, and therefore, be closed to all traffic to or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and farther north, including Industry along the canal. The six lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, not included in the basic design and cost the most.

We believe only the Aerial or Re-build has the same capacity as the present Viaduct. Capacity should not be reduced, as this will further gridlock I-5 and city streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner's Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Residence Address, Street &amp; Number</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tony Marshall</td>
<td>2460 Montana St APT 1302</td>
<td>98179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lorene Harper</td>
<td>3400 25th Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loren F. Harley</td>
<td>3400 25th Ave W</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Margaret Rettig</td>
<td>3932-60th West</td>
<td>98179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jan H. Greene</td>
<td>1526 2nd Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Michael Kostig</td>
<td>8351 11th Ave NW</td>
<td>98117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Carol A. Pate</td>
<td>2272 2nd Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John R. Miller</td>
<td>2008 W. Prairie St APT 202</td>
<td>98107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Francisco Calvo</td>
<td>3808 34th Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fred B. Hopkins</td>
<td>2905 34th Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Constantine Dr</td>
<td>1534 6th Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John H. Thomas</td>
<td>1500 6th Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>John F. Goodwin</td>
<td>300 W. Bunker St APT 64</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Charles J. Brown</td>
<td>5201 1st Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Charles J. Brown</td>
<td>3241 4th Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Evelyn J. Smith</td>
<td>8320 W. Benson St APT 712</td>
<td>98149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>John W. Ogilvie</td>
<td>8230 1st Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>William H. Lass</td>
<td>5539 27th Ave W</td>
<td>98199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WASHINGTON'S UNIQUE PRIMARY ELECTION

For 70 years we have enjoyed a range of party choices in our unique "blanket" primary election. The voter could pick a Democrat in one race, a Republican in another, a Libertarian in the third, and on to a Green in yet another.

Almost all other states 1) allow only registered party members to vote in the primary, or 2) make the voter choose the ballot of one of the parties. Louisiana allows choice among all party candidates, but only the top two go on to the general election. So, it is possible to see two Democrats or two Republicans as the only choices—and probably none of the minor party candidates.

Last year the major parties challenged our unique primary in court. The federal court banned our open system, finding that the parties have the right to select their own nominees.

The Legislature approved the “top two” Louisiana model. In case of another court challenge, the bill provides an alternative—“open primary/private choice”, where voters choose among candidates of one political party but the choice of party is private.

The Governor vetoed the first alternative. The Governor reasoned that the “top two” alternative was likely to be challenged, and that minor party and independent candidates have the right to bring their diverse views to the November ballot.

In summary, in the September primary you will choose a Democratic, Republican, Libertarian or other party ballot, but you will not be required to declare any party affiliation.

THE VIADUCT - HIGHEST PRIORITY

In transportation polling, the Viaduct rates highest even among residents east of Lake Washington. The Dept. of Transportation has completed initial analysis of five alternatives. They are: a six-lane tunnel, a four-lane tunnel, rebuild the present structure, a new aerial structure, and a six-lane surface boulevard along the waterfront. Costs range from $3 to $4 billion.

I believe two or three of the alternatives are not feasible. The all-surface boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic. The four-lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal (access from Elliott Ave. and exit to Western Ave.) and therefore be closed to all traffic or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and further north, including industry along the Canal. The six-lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, NOT included in the basic design, and is the most costly.

I believe the most likely alternatives will be to rebuild or the new aerial.

Public hearings are scheduled for: April 27, Doreen Room, Arctic Bldg., 700 Third Ave., 4 to 7 pm; and April 29, Leif Erickson Hall, 2245 N W 57th St., 5 to 8 pm. Comments may also be sent by e-mail via the website www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/viaduct. Make your voice heard.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Elizabeth Holland
Address:
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98119
Email: lizholland14@hotmail.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

How can we consider alienating Seattle from Puget Sound for another 50 years? We have suffered enough having to have our front door cut off from the rest of the city by the viaduct. Think outside of the money, think of the legacy that could be created. Think of how you can improve this city. Build the Tunnel. You have an opportunity here to go down in the annals of Seattle's history as the forward thinking entity that realized that an extra outlay of money at one point would be more than made up for in a century of increased tourism, enhanced community and a city that welcomes its visitors to visit its waterfront, rather than shunt them off from the value Seattle has in its waterfront property. Don't be known for saving a few bucks by making the same mistakes that previous Seattle governments did. Have a vision. Make a statement. Grow Seattle into the potential that it might have if it wasn't cut off from the body of water that has made it beautiful.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. During the 2009 legislative session, the Washington State Legislature passed Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5768, which directed WSDOT to study whether money could be raised by tolling a new SR 99 facility. WSDOT was also directed to analyze the performance of the tolled facility and the potential effects of diverted traffic on alternate routes.

The results of this initial work were reported in the "SR 99 Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Updated Cost and Tolling Summary Report to the Washington State Legislature" published in January 2010.

Please refer to the Final EIS for a more comprehensive analysis of tolling and the potential effects on the environment.
All the build alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS would accommodate traffic patterns similar to the current facility. The tunnel alternatives will not provide access in midtown, but new on-and-off ramps to and from the north are added in the Stadium area. Improvements to the existing facility will include wider lanes that meet current engineering standards. Travel times on SR 99 for trips traveling through central Seattle will be approximately the same as what is experienced today.

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.
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The tax structure that the City of Seattle chooses to implement is not the purview of WSDOT or any of its projects. We encourage you to contact your City Council to discuss these types of issues related to property taxes.
Pedestrian traffic and safety

Pedestrian access will be maintained at all times during construction activities. At times, it will be necessary to reroute pedestrians using temporary facilities/detours, but these detours will be designed to minimize any inconvenience. Any pedestrian facility (e.g., sidewalk, bridge, path, etc.) that may be removed to accommodate construction activities will be replaced with a temporary facility in a nearby location with equal capacity. Further details regarding the specifics of pedestrian detours during construction will become available once the construction plans evolve. The discussion of pedestrian safety and access has been updated in the Final EIS to reflect the work that has been done since the 2004 Draft EIS was published.

Dirt and noise pollution

The Final EIS Appendix F, Noise Discipline Report, and Appendix M, Air Discipline Report, contain analysis of the dust and noise associated with construction. The construction plans have been updated since the 2004 Draft EIS. Please see the Final EIS for updated information.

Impacts of lost parking and waterfront access for residents and visitors

The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. Refer to the Parking section of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, for updated information.

I-264-002

We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could...
submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.
Pedestrian traffic and safety

Pedestrian access will be maintained at all times during construction activities. At times, it will be necessary to reroute pedestrians using temporary facilities/detours, but these detours will be designed to minimize any inconvenience. Any pedestrian facility (e.g., sidewalk, bridge, path, etc.) that may be removed to accommodate construction activities will be replaced with a temporary facility in a nearby location with equal capacity. Further details regarding the specifics of pedestrian detours during construction will become available once the construction plans evolve. The discussion of pedestrian safety and access has been updated in the Final EIS to reflect the work that has been done since the 2004 Draft EIS was published.

Dirt and noise pollution

The Final EIS Appendix F, Noise Discipline Report, and Appendix M, Air Discipline Report, contain analysis of the dust and noise associated with construction. The construction plans have been updated since the 2004 Draft EIS. Please see the Final EIS for updated information.

Impacts of lost parking and waterfront access for residents and visitors

The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. Refer to the Parking section of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, for updated information.

I-265-002

We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could
submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

**AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:**

Name: Larry J Hubacka  
Address: 1016 121st Ave SE  
City: Bellevue  
State: WA  
Zip Code: 98005  
Email: hubacka@foxinternet.com  
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?  
Yes

**Project Comments:**

Do it once and do it right. Tear down the viaduct, and build a tunnel for traffic. Build a new sea wall. Yes it will cost more, but in the long term, it will beautify the city, eliminate a monolith that divides the city from the waterfront. And, don't waste all the tax payers money on committee after committee. Just do it!!!

Comments apply to:  
Tunnel Alternative  
Seawall
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Bypass Tunnel Alternative. 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.

The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. Please refer to the Final EIS for current project information.

The exact configuration and types of activities provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project led by the City of Seattle. There will be opportunities for the public to participate in the master planning effort and to determine the future of their waterfront.

Comment noted. The existing conditions, construction, and operation noise analyses presented in Appendix F, Noise Discipline Report, of the Final EIS may be of interest to you.

Your concerns regarding the Surface Alternative are noted. This alternative is no longer being considered.

Your concerns regarding the construction of a tunnel alternative are noted. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. The Final EIS contains a summary of the construction techniques, sequencing, and schedule for the build alternatives. Also, please see Appendix B, Alternatives Description and
Construction Methods Discipline Report, for more detailed construction information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Bypass Tunnel Alternative. 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. The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.

---Original Message-----
From: rod huling [mailto:hotrodhul@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2004 4:33 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: viaduct

My wife and I live in P. Square. I work here as well. We both enjoy the Square and the waterfront, but the viaduct is a constant source of noise and filth. Get rid of it.

We vote for the Bypass Tunnel, the only sensible solution.

Rod Huling
The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city’s parking resources. SDOT’s studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking. Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures under consideration and refinement include:

- Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
- Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
- Implement electronic parking guidance system
- Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading activities
- Develop a Center City parking marketing program
- Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide frequent parking updates
- Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented by the Contractor

Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for additional information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

In accordance with the WSDOT Bridge Design Manual and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, the project team has identified a target structural design life of 75 years for the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project. As the design continues, that target may be refined for individual features. It may make economic sense to design certain parts for a life of 100 years or more, while others may be designed for 75 years or less. Longer is not always better, if the cost of providing for extended life is unreasonably high. Also, criteria may change. As a case in point, the present viaduct was designed with an intended life of 60 years, but changes in seismic design and traffic geometry criteria (underscored by damage in the 2001 Nisqually Earthquake and unacceptable accident rates) led us to planning a replacement after only 50 years.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle recognize the importance of rebuilding the seawall. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. Replacement of the seawall...
would occur under the Elliott Bay Seawall Project led by the City of Seattle.

Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and Elevated Structure Alternative would both include replacement of the seawall, if chosen.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.
I-272-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. Your objections to the Surface and Rebuild Alternatives are noted. The Surface Alternative is no longer under consideration because it does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. The Rebuild Alternative is also no longer under consideration, but elements of this alternative have been incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative that is included in the Final EIS. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. The project has evolved since the publication of 2004 Draft EIS. Please see the Final EIS for current configurations of the proposed build alternatives.

I-272-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-277-001

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.

I-277-002

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
Thank you for your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. Please see the Final EIS for the current information about the proposed build alternatives.
I-278-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional analysis and revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in the Final EIS, Chapter 2. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

The I-5, Surface, Transit Hybrid alternative was studied as part of the 2008 Stakeholder Advisory Committee process. The alternative was measured against the screening criteria and did not advance for further environmental review because it did not meet the objective of providing capacity for the future. It would require investments on I-5 to accommodate shifted viaduct traffic, leaving little room for future regional and state growth. In addition, travel times for trips through downtown on Alaskan Way would be 10 to 15 minutes longer.
In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. The Partnership Process embraced a new strategy referred to as the Systems Approach that looked more broadly at the region as a whole to identify innovative strategies for moving people and goods in and through Seattle. The study area was broadened from the limited SR 99 corridor to a wider area more or less bounded by N. 85th Street to the north, the Seattle city limits to the south, Elliott Bay to the west, and Lake Washington to the east. This process led to the development and analysis of three hybrid scenarios, one of which was the I-5, Surface, and Transit Hybrid, which included extensive improvements to I-5. Details about the Partnership Process and its evaluation results can be found in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix S, Project History Report. A summary of the project history is described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the No Build, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EIsS, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.
The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives include the replacement of the Elliott Bay Seawall as a critical element of their structural integrity. However, the Bored Tunnel Alternative (preferred alternative) does not require replacement of the Elliott Bay Seawall. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the replacement of the Elliott Bay Seawall will be designed, analyzed, and permitted by the City of Seattle.
While the viaduct does not carry as much freight traffic as I-5 through downtown Seattle, it is a viable freight corridor that serves a number of freight users (roughly 4,000 trucks per day) that are not well-served by I-5. It also provides an alternative to I-5.

The lead agencies have worked extensively with representatives and staff from the Port of Seattle, the Manufacturing Industrial Council of Seattle, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad to understand freight needs throughout the Alaskan Way Viaduct study area. The lead agencies have repeatedly heard that the Alaskan Way Viaduct is an important freight route to all of the above-noted users and one that needs to be maintained and enhanced, if possible. Further data and information on freight movement and demand can be found in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

Comment noted. Project information and analysis has been updated and the EIS has been revised since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. Please see the Final EIS and the accompanying Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C, for current project information.
As you have noted, the volumes on the viaduct vary by segment. However, the total number of users on the viaduct in the central waterfront segment for the existing condition corresponds to 110,000 in the 2004 Draft EIS. Updated information regarding traffic volumes on the viaduct can be found in the updated Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS.

The total number of vehicles that currently use the viaduct are not all expected to transfer to I-5 in the event of a viaduct failure or during construction closures. Some traffic is expected to transfer to I-5, some to parallel city arterials, and small increases in traffic on I-405 are expected as well. Additionally, some users will use alternate modes (such as buses), while some trips are expected to not be made at all (or made to different locations), due to congestion on alternate routes and capacity limitations. More detailed information concerning expected shifts in traffic can be found in the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS.

Please see the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, for a detailed discussion of freight issues. In addition, the Seattle Department of Transportation completed a freight survey and interviewed 35 businesses in both the Ballard and Duwamish manufacturing and industrial centers, which contains information on the number of trips made by various businesses and their typical hauling routes.

Origin and destination data for freight trips on the viaduct is not available, though truck enter and exit volumes for the viaduct are known and presented in the Transportation Discipline Report. However, the lead agencies have been working with the freight community to understand their needs and address them as part of the alternatives under
significant proportion of trips on the ferries uses the viaduct. From the Draft EIS and Transportation
Discipline Report (TDR), it appears that no surveys of cars and trucks boarding the ferry to see what
proportion used the viaduct for access. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments)

As indicated above, the recent initiation of by WSDOT of a comprehensive study of Interstate 5 through
most of the City of Seattle provides an opportunity to examine these two parallel facilities and determine
what package of integrated improvements provides the best transportation system at the best price. The
Draft EIS states that “Other Features of the Alternatives concepts such as adding ramps at specific
locations (like S. Spokane Street to Fourth or Sixth Avenues), extending the AW Corridor to I-5 or SR
520, and providing grade separation in specific areas. These ideas are not evaluated in this Draft EIS
because many of these could be built as separate projects or they are marginally related to the purpose of
this project and therefore could not be logically included. There are two design features included in the
Draft EIS that could be built as separate projects, are marginally related to the purpose and should be
eliminated. In addition, these features obscure the functional impacts of the viaduct alternatives and add
costs that inflate the true cost of the alternatives for meeting the regions transportation needs.

These features which should be eliminated are: a) options for crossing SR 99 north of the Battery Street
Tunnel, and b) relocating the SR 99 surface highway west of the railroad yard south of Holgate Street.
The inclusion in the alternatives of east-west crossing of SR-99, specifically the Mercer Street Underpass
options that include significant changes to east-west crossings of SR 99 appear to not meet the purpose
and need of the project. These options bear little or no relation to the replacement of the viaduct.
The elimination of 4 lanes of traffic crossing under Aurora Avenue using Broad Street and replacing them
by two additional lanes on Mercer Street will have pervasive changes in traffic circulation and operations.
Including these features provides a confusing factor that make it impossible to determine the effects of
the alternatives for viaduct replacement for the area south of Holgate. It is likely that changes in
east-west traffic patterns with resulting changes in intersection demand characteristics, especially left-
turns demand confounds an accurate comparison of effects of the viaduct replacement alternatives. In
addition, this features appears to benefit only by the development interests in the South Lake Union Area
and perhaps the City of Seattle has no relevance to the transportation goals of WSDOT, and adds cost to
the alternatives in which it is included that skews the decision-making process.

In addition, if these east-west crossing alternatives are to be properly analyzed, the analysis area needs to
extend to the entire corridor from Elliott Avenue to I-5 where traffic patterns will be changed. What is
the increase in east-west traffic on Denny Way and other east-west connections, as a result of viaduct
alternatives with no change in east-west crossings of SR 99? What is the change in levels of service at
intersections north of the Battery Street Tunnel at a result of viaduct alternatives with no change in east-
west crossings of SR 99? The second feature that bears little or no relation to the purpose and need of the
project is moving the SR 99 right of way to the west south of Holgate Street. This features appears to
benefit only the railroads and perhaps the Port of Seattle by allowing a larger railroad classification yard.
It has no benefits for vehicular transportation. It is a substantial expense that is proposed to be borne by
the public which receives no direct benefit. What benefit to transportation circulation is provided by
relocating the SR 99 right-of-way to the west of the exiting route south of Holgate Street? What is the
cost of the changes without relocation of SR 99 south of Holgate? As indicated above, these features of
the alternatives should be eliminated for the reason given in DEIS, they can be implemented independently
of the replacement of the viaduct and bear little relevance to the purpose and needs of a
state highway.

Transportation Analysis The description of the function of the Alaskan Way Viaduct in the
Transportation Discipline Report (TDR) in Appendix C is extremely weak and does not
consideration.

Other Washington State highways with freight classifications can be
found on the Washington State Department of Transportation website at
http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/. FHWA freight classification information can be
found the Federal Highway Administration website at

I-278-008
Please see Chapter 5, Permanent Effects, and Chapter 6, Construction
Effects, in the Final EIS for updated information regarding the project's
potential effects on access to the ferry terminal.

I-278-009
Yes, WSDOT is studying ways to improve traffic flow and reduce
congestion along I-5 through downtown Seattle. The current planning
and design efforts for I-5 that are underway are not the result of the
Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project or any of its alternatives.
Please see the I-5 Pavement Reconstruction and Bottleneck
Improvement Project's website at
http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/I5/Rehab/ for more information about
what WSDOT is doing along the I-5 corridor in Seattle.

As previously noted, the project has evolved since the publication of the
Draft EIS in 2004. Please see the Final EIS for the current configuration
of each build alternative.

I-278-010
State Route 99 (SR 99) extends between Everett to the north and Fife to
the south. As SR 99 passes through downtown Seattle, it travels along
the Alaskan Way Viaduct, the elevated two-level structure adjacent to
the downtown Seattle waterfront. The Alaskan Way Viaduct comprises a
In this context, the terms local trips and regional trips were applied generally. A local trip is one where the origin and destination are relatively close, usually within the same city. An example of a local trip along the viaduct would be a trip from downtown Seattle to West Seattle. A regional trip has an origin and a destination that are further apart, either in different cities or counties. A trip on SR 99 that begins in Edmonds and ends in downtown Seattle (King County) would be considered a regional trip.

The methodology used to forecast year 2030 trips was established using standard traffic engineering and transportation planning principles and is consistent with the methodology that you have suggested. Adjustments are necessary to balance out the ramp and mainline volumes and are also employed to correct obvious model assignment anomalies.

I-278-011
Traffic analysis, modeling, and methodology have been updated since the 2004 Draft EIS. Updated information can be found in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.
Uniform delay progression, which accounts for the effects of coordinated signals, is just one factor that informs delay at individual signalized intersections. Vehicular traffic volumes, vehicle queue lengths, intersection geometry, and signal timing/phasing are some other factors that affect average intersection delay. These factors differ at each intersection along Second Avenue; therefore, average delay is expected to differ at each intersection as well. Optimization of signal timings for future conditions was accounted for in the analysis.

Traffic analysis, modeling, and methodology have been updated since the 2004 Draft EIS. Updated information can be found in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on this project. Please refer to the responses provided by above as they address your specific comments about incorporating capacity improvements to I-5 into the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project.
I urge that the planning for the viaduct replacement be integrated with the recently initiated WSDOT program in identifying capacity improvements to I-5. Thank you for your consideration.

*Jack* Johnson, 500 Wall Street Seattle, WA 98121

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
I-279-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

---Original Message---

From: Ben Johnson [mailto:johnson@starbucks.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2004 11:30 AM
To: awdocomments@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: Viaduct Replacement

To the DOT:

My suggestion is to take the viaduct out and replace it with a tunnel below sea-level.

My vision for the future of the Alaskan Way viaduct is integrated with my vision of the potential that the Seattle waterfront has as a civic institution. With the necessary removal of the Alaskan way viaduct, I think the city has a genuine opportunity to improve the quality of the waterfront by increasing the natural light along the waterfront as well as reduce noise pollution. Ultimately the vision for the waterfront would be a park type atmosphere that had businesses and shops along it.

I’d love to see the seawall removed to help improve the natural conditions for the sea life in Puget Sound, as well as improve the quality of the feel of the waterfront. This would probably require the construction of a graded (sloped) seawall that isn’t quite natural either; however it would drastically improve the habitat of marine invertebrates.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. However, if the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative or Elevated Structure Alternative is chosen, the seawall will be replaced as part of that alternative. The west wall of the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would replace the seawall. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.
The S. Holgate Street to S. King Street portion of the project has become its own project: S. Holgate Street to S. King Street Viaduct Replacement Project. Construction for this project began during the summer of 2010. The engineering team considered the idea of constructing a tunnel as far south as S. Holgate; however, geotechnical investigations indicated that the soils in this area are poor. As a result, a tunnel in this area would have high construction risks and be expensive to build.

I wish you the very best.

Carl R. Johnson
4735 35th Ave. N. E
Seattle, 98105
(206) 525 8412
The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. If this alternative is selected, SR 99 would remain open for most of the construction period, but would be closed for several weeks to connect SR 99 to the bored tunnel. Periodic night or weekend closures of SR 99 would also be required.

Please see the Final EIS for details about the construction plans for all the build alternatives.

Comment noted. Improvements to the access from the West Seattle Bridge to SR 99 are not included in the scope of this project.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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-284-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Aerial or 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel 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.

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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
The 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives have evaluated a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would include direct access to the Pike Street Hillclimb as well as the Victor Steinbrueck Park. The lid structure is described in the Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

A general discussion of neighborhood connections and detailed description of existing and potential operation and construction effects on local access between neighborhoods (including trails, pedestrian bridges, and shoreline access) is described in Appendix H, Social Discipline Report. Local street access is described in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. In particular, this report discusses proposed improvements to reconnect local streets across Aurora Avenue N. to improve local access between the Uptown and South Lake Union neighborhoods.

All of the alternatives would have fewer than eight lanes on the Alaskan Way surface street through the Central Section of the project area. The City of Seattle is leading the design effort for the Alaskan Way surface street.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-285-003

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

The alternatives analyzed did not include items other than those directly relating to replacement of the existing viaduct. High-capacity transit (HCT) developments are being addressed by other agencies, specifically Sound Transit. Potential HCT alignments that have been developed in the long-range plans for these agencies did not include the SR 99/Alaskan Way Viaduct corridor. HCT is not precluded from each alternative, but long-range state, regional, and local transportation plans do not envision HCT being deployed in this corridor.
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 tunnel alternatives. The project has evolved since the publication of the 2004 Draft EIS. In 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. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.

I-287-001

I feel that either of the tunnel alternatives would be the best solution to this project.
I-288-001
The 2004 transportation funding bill passed by the state legislature includes a provision that prohibits WSDOT from funding any alternative which reduces capacity in the project corridor. Since the publication of the 2004 Draft EIS the project's alternatives have evolved. Please see the Final EIS for current project information. All alternatives under consideration in the Final EIS meet this requirement.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.
Construction, I envision new bridge supports built between the existing supports. Then, by use of temporary spans, similar to the adjusting spans at the Puget Sound ferry docks, we should be able to continue using the old part that remains as we build the new from one end to the other. This would require deck heights fairly near the heights of the existing deck.

Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts on this matter.
I-290-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-291-001

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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. If this alternative is selected, the City of Seattle would lead the redevelopment of the waterfront under a separate project, the Central Waterfront Project. As the project has evolved since 2004, please see the Final EIS for current project information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-294-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-294-002

The ideas and concepts provided in your comment are noted. Specific construction mitigation measures related to traffic rerouting and downtown capacity are being developed as part of the Final EIS. Various strategies are being developed to balance the duration of construction with the level of access to, from, and through the downtown area.

More information about construction traffic mitigation strategies being considered for the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project can be found in the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C, of the Final EIS.
I-295-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and ranking of issues. Your ideas regarding the connection of the waterfront to downtown and the waterfront’s importance as a destination are noted.
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Your objection to the Aerial Alternative is noted.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. The Bypass Tunnel and Surface Alternatives are no longer alternatives under consideration. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the build alternatives considered for this project.

Your comment regarding the importance of considering impacts to future generations is noted.

Please see Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) in the Final EIS for a comparison of trade-offs and benefits between the three current build alternatives.
How many times a week do you use the Viaduct?
3 to 4

I use the viaduct to:
bypass access

tell us a little about your background. please check any of the following categories that apply to you and your connection to the viaduct:
  [ ] Commuter
  [ ] Cyclist/Pedestrian
  [ ] Freight
  [on] Neighborhood Advocate
  [ ] Port
  [ ] Rail
  [on] Urban Design Advocate
  [ ] Waterfront business
I-296-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

May 30, 2004

Ms. Allison Ray
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Office
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

SR 99 - Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment – May 30, 2004

I live and work at Hillclimb Court, which is located at 1425 Western Avenue and is directly adjacent to the Viaduct project site. Hillclimb Court condominium complex is a mixed use residential/commercial building.

My concerns for the Alaskan Way Viaduct project are as follows:

1. I am deeply concerned about the structural integrity of the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct structure and the seawall, and I implore you to take immediate action to adopt an alternative and move forward with it.

2. I feel that the tunnel alternative is the best alternative of those cited in the EIS. I think it is important that WSDOT preserve an alternate north-south highway corridor between Elliott Bay and Lake Washington and the tunnel allows for that most effectively. The surface alternative does not allow for that at all and the bypass tunnel compromises that capability.
The project team uses several communication and public involvement tools (outlined in Appendix A, Public Involvement Discipline Report) to gather input and help shape the project throughout design and construction. There are opportunities to attend public meetings and community events to learn more about the project and multiple ways to contact the project team with any questions or concerns including hotline (1-888-AWV-LINE) or e-mail (viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov).

In addition, many forums are in place to provide feedback to the project team:

- North and south portal working groups exist today. They have been meeting since May 2009, and they do not have a firm end date.
- Maintenance of traffic meeting in the south end discusses upcoming construction and potential traffic impacts. This includes stakeholders as well as the contractor and staff from the project office.
- Construction outreach tools such as distributing (often in person) notices to adjacent businesses and residents about upcoming work, regular construction reports on the website, and e-mail updates.
- Other resources: 24-hour hotline, the website, viaduct e-mail for comments or questions, community briefings, information booths and community events. Many of these tools are used as opportunities to have dialogue or discuss any issues with stakeholders or neighbors.

Several individuals and organizations have made the suggestion that construction noise associated with the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project that exceeds the City of Seattle residential nighttime noise regulations should be limited to non-residential areas. The construction plans evaluated for noise and vibration are described in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods.
Discipline Report, of the Final EIS. While actual construction plans and activity sequencing could differ from this evaluation, the locations and types of activities would be similar under the final sequence. This means that there is some flexibility in the proposed construction plans.

Construction of the project may require nighttime construction activities, and the City may require a Major Public Project Construction Noise Variance. Construction noise mitigation requirements would be developed and specified in the noise variance.

I-298-004
The project team recognizes the sensitivity of the Pike Place market area and is developing traffic management plans with that in mind. Subsequent construction transportation management planning, described in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS, identifies the impacts of construction and evaluates different mitigation measures. Analysis of the various proposed detour plans shows that traffic will primarily shift to city arterials other than Western Avenue, such as First, Second, Fourth, and Fifth Avenues. More information will be available as construction staging plans are further developed.

I-298-005
The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city’s parking resources. SDOT’s studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking. Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over
the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been
determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking
mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in
coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures
under consideration and refinement include:

- Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
- Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront
  piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
- Implement electronic parking guidance system
- Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading
  activities
- Develop a Center City parking marketing program
- Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide
  frequent parking updates
- Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented
  by the Contractor

Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6
of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for
additional information.

I-298-006
WSDOT is currently preparing a claims process that would address any
damage to property directly related to the Bored Tunnel Alternative. This
information will be given to individual property owners that may be
affected by the project. WSDOT plans to install an array of monitoring
equipment to alert the construction team of any settlement which would
be used in the claims process.

I-298-007
The lead agencies plan to maintain access to businesses and
residences throughout construction. Temporary limitations and any required changes to access during construction will be mitigated to the extent practicable. Mitigation measures for parking, pedestrian and vehicle access, and business assistance are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. The project team will continue their coordination and mitigation activities with local businesses and residents, freight/delivery companies, the Port of Seattle, neighborhood groups, and other affected groups.

I-298-008
Dust will be controlled during construction using applicable best management practices (BMPs). Specific mitigation measures for air quality are presented in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.

I-298-009
Mitigation measures to address construction effects on businesses are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.

I-298-010
An exhaust stack near Pike Place Market is no longer included in any of the alternatives. The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would have two tunnel operations buildings that include exhaust stacks. One building would be located in the south portal area near Alaskan Way S. and Railroad Way S., and a second building would be located in the north portal area near 6th Avenue and Harrison Street.
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

I-299-001

why do we need a tunnel? the only folks who will prosper from this will be the wealthy land developers and the years of construction workers...

Those of us who will use the viaduct will be underground, unhappy and unable to change anything.

I think it stinks that the beauty of the overhead road with it's gorgeous view of the sound is being fought, and again, it smells of money and not what really is best for the people.

Comments apply to:
Rebuild Alternative
Aerial Alternative
I-300-001
The lead agencies agree there is an urgent need to make the facility safe for public use. Federal funding is a substantial part of the total funding package.

I-300-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
The project alternatives have been changed and refined since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. Please see the Final EIS for information about how each build alternative addresses improvements to the area north of the Battery Street Tunnel.
Thank you for your suggestion. Many options were looked at during the initial phases of the project’s screening process. This process involved early analysis by the project team and discussions with community groups at more than 140 community meetings and community interviews, including businesses along the corridor. A total of 76 initial viaduct replacement concepts and seven seawall concepts were considered, and concepts that were not feasible, or were outside the purpose of the project were dropped from further consideration. The most workable ideas were shaped into the alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS. Further screening and analyses were conducted for the Supplemental Draft EISs and Final EIS. The alternatives analyzed include a range of viaduct repair and replacement designs with some elements of earlier concepts combined with other design structures as the engineering team looked at feasibility, cost, and other criteria.

I-304-001

Description: Mayor, Perhaps I simply missed it among the alternatives considered for rebuilding the viaduct, but has a combination viaduct/tunnel been considered? Rather than an “all above the surface” or “all below the surface,” construct one level of viaduct with traffic going in one direction and one depth of tunnel with traffic going in the other direction, both within the existing footprint of the current viaduct. It reduces the height of the double viaduct option and reduces the cost of the tunnel only option, while not impinging on lateral uses. With current technology, a new viaduct does not have to seem so “big” and intrusive. In fact, the surface area under the viaduct could be landscaped/shaped in a way that enhances its use and brightens up the area currently in the shadows of the current structure. Seems to me it mitigates some of the view and cost concerns. Sincerely, Karl Kraber

Thank you very much!
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.

Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS provides updated information about long-term traffic impacts (once the project is built) and short-term construction impacts.
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an opportunity for Seattle. The end of the useful life of the Alaskan Way Viaduct offers us a chance to reconnect our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle’s central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar cost of a megaproject for a very short stretch of road. We owe it to ourselves to rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle’s waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a “no-highway” alternative in the Viaduct EIS.

Karen Merola

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Karen Merola
Address:
City:
State:
Zip Code:
Email: ksm44@aol.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an opportunity for Seattle. The end of the useful life of the Alaskan Way Viaduct offers us a chance to reconnect the city to Elliott Bay. Other cities have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle’s central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar cost of this megaproject. We owe it to ourselves to rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle’s waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a “no-highway” alternative in the Viaduct EIS.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild or Aerial Alternative. While rebuilding the viaduct is not prudent, 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.
We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.

The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city’s parking resources. SDOT’s studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking. Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures under consideration and refinement include:

- Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
- Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
• Implement electronic parking guidance system
• Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading activities
• Develop a Center City parking marketing program
• Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide frequent parking updates
• Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented by the Contractor

Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for additional information.

I-308-003
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

The project has evolved since 2004. Please see the Final EIS for current information about potential effects of the project in Chapters 5 and 6 and the mitigation measures proposed to address these effects in Chapter 8.

I-308-004
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing
the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Thank you for your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comment.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Leanne Leith
Address: 894 James St. Apt. C-405
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98104
Email: sullengrr6@msn.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
-------------------------------------------------
Yes

Project Comments:
-------------------------------------------------
It's time to connect Seattle to the waterfront!

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-314-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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-314-002
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Thank you for your comments. Please note that the Seattle Monorail Project has been cancelled.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Your comments are noted. FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle (the lead agencies), along with a host of transit agencies, are endeavoring to improve our local and regional transportation system.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. If either the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative or Elevated Structure Alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of the alternative because the outer wall of the cut-and-cover tunnel would serve as part of the new seawall and for the elevated structure, the new seawall is needed to support the soils in which the new foundations would be placed. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Aerial and 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The Aerial Alternative is no longer under consideration, but elements of this alternative have been incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative in the Final EIS. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

**AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:**

**Name:** Ned Logan  
**Address:**  
**City:**  
**State:**  
**Zip Code:** 98103  
**Email:** nedls6@hotmail.com  
**Affiliation (optional):**  

**Would like to be added to the project mailing list?**  
---  
**Yes**  

**Project Comments:**  
---  
After reviewing the choices on the wsdot web site I feel there are two choices that are far superior, Aerial and Tunnel. I have lived in Seattle my entire life and the Alaskan way viaduct is easily one of my favorite roads, the fresh sea air and views are amazing. I think it might be time to go underground now though; the tunnel plan seems the best. My only fear is the City handing the open space created by the tunnel project to developers. The open space should be public, either a greenbelt or a park or something public. No more condoa!  

**Comments apply to:**  
**Tunnel Alternative**  
**All of the Alternatives**  
**Aerial Alternative**
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-325-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Robert Lynn
Address: 12819 NE 38th St, #227
City: Bellevue
State: WA
Zip Code: 98006
Email: millenniumquest84@earthlink.net
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list? Yes

Project Comments:

I-325-001

It is my longstanding belief that the Tunnel Alternative is the best alternative for traffic improvement of the downtown Seattle area and in the long run, the most efficient use of funds.

Unlike many large cities, the downtown area of Seattle is NOT its best feature. There are many competing interests along Alaska Way. This project offers the opportunity to develop a beautiful link between the downtown area and the waterfront. It’s time that seeing downtown Seattle closeup is better than seeing it from a ferry in the middle of the Sound. While I have to admit that there are some beautiful views from the Alaska Way viaduct, it is quite obvious that sightseeing in the middle of a highway is an extreme hazard.

Placing the highway underground will allow for much better use of the surface, and elevated viewing sites can be developed to make a visit to the Seattle waterfront a genuinely enjoyable experience.

Comments apply to: Tunnel Alternative
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.
The purpose and need of the project was revised to include improving SR 99 from the Battery Street Tunnel north to Roy Street in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. This revision to the purpose and need addresses safety and access issues within the SR 99 corridor and in adjacent neighborhoods.

The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the configurations of the proposed build alternatives.

The lead agencies understand the importance of maintaining adequate connections to Ballard, Interbay, and Magnolia. The preferred alternative, the Bored Tunnel Alternative, provides these connections.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comment.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Full tunnel will enhance waterfront

BRIAN STEINBURG
Guest columnist

With every mega-project comes a "nega-document." Such is the case of the "Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seattle Waterfront Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement" (DEIS).

The DEIS presents multiple viaduct and seawall replacement alternatives for civic comment. Now is the time to provide the guidance that will shape our waterfront for future generations. It is time to ask, "What should the central waterfront be like when we replace the viaduct?"

To answer this, we must address two main questions: What option should be selected as the viaduct's replacement and how should the waterfront be designed once the project is complete?

If we are to spend $3 billion to $4 billion to replace the viaduct, the waterfront should be better off when construction is finished. Five replacement options are being studied: rebuild, new metal, bypass tunnel, full tunnel and surface. The surface alternative will make the central waterfront another traffic-choked Ansley; the aerial alternative is even worse, scaling in at 1.5 times longer than the current viaduct's and further encroaching upon the pier with a wall of concrete, noise and shadow. Only the full sit-and-savor tunnel would allow the waterfront to become a great public, regional asset.

Public design sessions sponsored by Allied Arts and the city have highlighted some common themes for an improved waterfront:

1. Neighborhood connection: Providing active workspaces, residences and recreational activities that bring the character of each neighborhood to the waterfront day and night.

2. A grand market terminator: A lid over the viaduct at its southern terminus at Pike Street and dressed northward will enable a direct pedestrian connection from the waterfront to the Pike Place Market. Landscaped terraces that slope to the market, to the waterfront, would make you forget a major freeway is below. This would allow Seattleites to expand, providing new downtown open space and stunning views. The high-speed 99-step whiplash view from the viaduct would pale in comparison to this uniquely pedestrian experience.

3. A place for parks: Alaskan Way should be configured to create a wide ribbon of park space over Pike Street and south of Colman Dock. These parks could be linked with a wide promenade and series of plazas through the central waterfront.

4. Reach the water: There is an innate human desire to access the water. In a city surrounded with water, it is vital to our identity to physically connect to and interact with this precious resource.

5. No net increase of roadway: It doesn't make sense to fill up all the newly liberated land on the waterfront with traffic lanes.

Currently, all viaduct replacement options from the same and city show more than 70 percent of the Alaskan Way Viaduct is dedicated by utility, ancillary lands are dedicated to uses and delivery routes. We need to eliminate these special-purpose lanes and move the roadway to Western Avenue where it can become a part of Seattle's transportation system instead of a tourist ride. By doing this, we provide more open space and destinations for people, humanizing the waterfront.

When developers frequented Pioneer Square and the Market with parking lots and slab office towers, Seattle said no. Today, another Seattle treasure is threatened. We must raise our voices and proclaim we want and deserve more from our tax dollars than an ugly freeway and a blighted waterfront. With a little vision, a single investment could improve traffic and create a social and economic asset on our waterfront.

Now is the time to write your desires for the waterfront and critique of the DEIS. Contact the mayor's Department of Transportation by Tuesday to record your comments. Access the comment form at www.seattle.gov/projects/viaduct/chapter3.htm.

Brian Steinburg is a member of Active: Better City and producer/director of the film "Viaduct? What Viaduct?" which can be seen on the Seattle Channel Web site: www.seattlechannel.org/teams/viaduct.htm.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Tolling is being considered in the Final EIS. Please refer to the Final EIS and its appendices for further information.
Thank you for your comments. Please see the Final EIS for current project information about the Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and the Elevated Structure Alternatives.

Most importantly to me is that the Sea Wall be deep enough so that SR99 can be built next to access for Puget Sound while making building sites available above. For example in Boston, MA from the Airport pas the city one travel under a series of different hotela and corporations along with roads between them. Of course I would like to see green spaces city owned parking stalls for water front enthusiasts. That have meters for 5 hours of parking. This is an opportunity that we have to make an impact so that the environment and that our historical Seattle is not disrupted or torn down.

Comments apply to:
All of the Alternatives
Thank you for your comment. FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are also interested in maintaining the SR 99 corridor. The Bored Tunnel Alternative has been identified as the preferred alternative. This alternative will maintain the north-south corridor, and access to West Seattle, currently provided by the viaduct. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.

Your objections to the monorail project are noted. The monorail project was led by another agency and is no longer active.

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.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. If either the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative or Elevated Structure Alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of the alternative because the outer wall of the cut-and-cover...
tunnel would serve as part of the new seawall and, for the elevated structure, the new seawall is needed to support the soils in which the new foundations would be placed. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

**I-331-005**

Construction to replace the viaduct between S. Holgate Street and S. King Street began in 2010. The purpose of this proposed project is to replace the remaining portion of the viaduct.
Like all large infrastructure projects, transportation facilities benefit a much wider population of users than just local residents. Funding for this project comes from a variety of federal, state, and local sources.

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.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

Planning and design for the current tunnel alternatives does not include a separate access road parallel to Alaskan Way.

The alternatives currently being considered would have two lanes in each direction on Alaskan Way through the central waterfront. Lanes would be the same width as today, with the exception of a few areas where width would be added to safely accommodate bicycle traffic.
The speed limit along the Alaskan Way surface street is currently 30 mph, the standard speed limit for arterial streets in the City of Seattle. The Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives, the three build alternatives carried forward to the Final EIS, do not propose to change the speed limit along the Alaskan Way surface street. Traffic signals on Alaskan Way for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives would be designed to help facilitate safe and efficient traffic flow along the corridor. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the Alaskan Way surface street as part of the project.

Overall, traffic that diverts to use surface streets and I-5 is expected to distribute based on the available capacity of these various roadways. At this time, there are no plans to increase capacity along I-5 through the downtown core.

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each
alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.
I-336-001

My recommendation is to forget about replacing the viaducts in the immediate future. It will become a political football with the city wanting to go underground and the State not wanting to spend what that would cost. It will go on for years spending lots of money on studies like the 3rd Lake Bridge, Third runway at SeaTac and the Monorail.

Although there is potential for major damage to the viaduct during a severe earthquake so is there to other structures in Seattle. The Alaska Way viaduct has better details than the one in Oakland, that failed, which should make it hold together better. Life is a gamble.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate your comment. This project plans to replace the viaduct because it is at risk of failure from earthquakes (with unacceptable risk to lives as well as property) and irreversible loss of use from age and deterioration.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the project.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs.

Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The idea of attaching a pedestrian walkway to the elevated structure has not been incorporated in any of the alternatives. In addition to safety concerns, the effort needed to climb the walkway and the noise impacts associated with the highway would likely limit its appeal to most pedestrians. Some parking will still be located along Alaskan Way as described in the Final EIS and Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.
I-341-003
The purpose and need of the project was revised in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS to include improving SR 99 from the Battery Street Tunnel north to Roy Street. This revision of the purpose and need addresses safety and access issues within the SR 99 corridor and in adjacent neighborhoods.
I-342-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments regarding the existing Western Avenue on-ramp. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Access to and from SR 99 would be provided by new ramps near the stadiums and near Seattle Center. The project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current alternatives.

-----Original Message-----
From: Diane Mathers [mailto:dymathers@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2004 8:18 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: Our preferences

As Magnolia residents who use the viaduct regularly, we urge you to keep the Western avenue on-ramp available in the tunnel alternative. The number of vehicles that use this ramp has grown steadily as I-5 traffic becomes worse. This is a unique, albeit expensive project, but the funds must be found to do it right. Thank you, Bill and Diane Mathers
I-343-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild Alternative, followed by the Aerial Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-345-001

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mary McCann</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>206 N 60th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>98103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmarcinn@msn.com">mmarcinn@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>(optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of letters</td>
<td>(optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
Members of my household use the viaduct every day - to commute for work by ferry from Seattle to PSNS in Bremerton, for frequent trips to the airport, to access the stadiums, to shop in Pioneer Square, Costco, Esquin, Sears and the home furnishings stores in SODO, and to dine in West Seattle. We SUPPORT minimizing the cost and construction disruption, maximizing capacity and efficiency, retaining the parking under the viaduct, and retaining the view from the viaduct. We STRONGLY prefer the REBUILD Alternative and urge you to select it.

Comments apply to:
Rebuild Alternative
I-346-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for a pedestrian-friendly environment along the waterfront. The alternatives currently being considered add to the public open space along the waterfront, either through the City's Central Waterfront Project or with the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel or Elevated Structure Alternatives. Additionally, pedestrian and bicycle facilities along the waterfront would be enhanced and expanded, making it easier and safer for people to travel along the waterfront by foot or on bike.

I-346-002
While it is likely that some waterfront business traffic may use Western Avenue as an alternative access corridor, Alaskan Way will remain an important travel corridor for all alternatives. Pedestrian connections have been assessed in greater detail in the Final EIS. Additional follow-up work will occur to incorporate urban designs that minimize traffic impacts to pedestrians.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-347-001

I think the way the surface option opens up the area between downtown and its waterfront is amazing. It is so dark there now.

What I am curious about is:

1. where are we going to replace the parking and how are we going to deal with how the city streets enter into the new surface alternative?

2. If we decide to get rid of this efficient thoroughfare, how will we maintain or improve it (efficiently: i.e. maintain non stopping) on the surface safely while still keeping the pier and downtown connected for pedestrians and drivers?

Thank you for asking.

Comments apply to:
Surface Alternative
I-348-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:
Name: Mary A. McGovern
Address: 3839 50th Ave. SW
City: Seattle
State: wa
Zip Code: 98116
Email: nobrukenformmary@aol.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
I think the aerial alternative is best - first choice - fits the traveling needs best and allows auto traffic to see the best drive in town.

Comments apply to:
Aerial Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild or Aerial 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.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. However, if another build alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of this project and its design will be carefully considered. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

Since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004, the Seattle Monorail Project has been cancelled.
I-351-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The Surface Alternative is no longer under consideration because it does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle.

I-351-001

I am adamantly opposed to the surface alternative or any other alternative that would decrease the flow of traffic provided by the existing viaduct. I live in Magnolia and the viaduct is a vital link for those in my neighborhood, individuals and businesses. Decreasing traffic flow and rerouting into already clogged downtown streets and I-5 makes no sense. The cost savings do not justify the loss. The issues regarding the other alternatives are not as troubling to me. Thank you.

Comments apply to:

All of the Alternatives
The lead agencies are committed to preparing careful and complete cost estimates. However, it is impossible to project costs with 100 percent accuracy. Your concerns are recognized by the lead agencies.
The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. However, if another build alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of this project and its design will be carefully considered. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each proposed build alternative.
I-353-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-353-002
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

I-353-003
WSDOT is currently preparing a claims process that would address any damage to property directly related to the Bored Tunnel Alternative. This information will be given to individual property owners that may be affected by the project. WSDOT plans to install an array of monitoring equipment to alert the construction team of any settlement which would be used in the claims process.

Please refer to the Final EIS Appendix L, Economics Discipline Report, where you will find discussion related the potential economic effects of the project. WSDOT cannot speculate as to how the various factors that influence property values will come together at some future time.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the Rebuild Alternative, and your order of preference for other alternatives. 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. Your comments regarding personal use of the viaduct are appreciated.
Thank you for your suggestion. Many options were looked at during the initial phases of the project's screening process. This process involved early analysis by the project team and discussions with community groups at more than 140 community meetings and community interviews, including businesses along the corridor. A total of 76 initial viaduct replacement concepts and seven seawall concepts were considered, and concepts that were not feasible, or were outside the purpose of the project, were dropped from further consideration. The most workable ideas were shaped into the alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS. Further screening and analyses were conducted for the Supplemental Draft EISs and Final EIS. The alternatives analyzed include a range of viaduct repair and replacement designs with some elements of earlier concepts combined with other design structures as the engineering team looked at feasibility, cost, and other criteria.
The lead agencies appreciate your comment. The Bored Tunnel Alternative has been identified as the preferred alternative. Land on top of the tunnel could be used for public open space, opening up scenic views to and from the waterfront for people who live, work, and recreate in and near downtown; for people visiting Seattle; and for the many local people making day trips to the waterfront. The City of Seattle is leading the project, Seattle Waterfront Project, to plan and redevelop the waterfront. The Bored Tunnel Alternative would provide new opportunities for all members of the public to enjoy the Seattle waterfront.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. The Final EIS contains current information about all the build alternatives proposed for this project.

The existing structure is over 50 years old. While strengthening and refurbishing would add a few more years of life (up to 25), due to the extent of repairs and current condition of the viaduct, the cost of doing so would approach the replacement costs. This is not considered a cost-effective approach especially in light of the disruption along the waterfront that would need to be repeated again. The intent is to replace the viaduct south of Pine Street. North of Pine Street, a retrofit approach may work depending on the alternative. Current information on the alternatives is presented in the Final EIS.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. While rebuilding the viaduct is not prudent, 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.
After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

I-361-004
Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current alternatives. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Access to and from SR 99 would be provided by new ramps near the stadiums and near Seattle Center. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the City of Seattle would
construct a new road between Alaskan Way and the Elliott/Western corridor.
I-362-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-363-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. This alternative, as well as the other build alternatives, would maintain access to the neighborhoods north of downtown. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Original Message:
From: maryam.mohit@state.wa.us
Sent: Sunday, May 9, 2004 9:45 PM
To: viaducts@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: opinion on viaduct options

I strongly support replacing the current viaduct with a tunnel and having access to the "north areas" such as Queen Anne and Ballard.

We should spend a little more now to have a better long-term solution.

It would be tragic to spend so many millions and still have a noisy eyesore like the current viaduct. Any surface street or rail option just reduces the long term competitiveness of our city as a wonderful place to live and visit. We need to use the rebuilding opportunity to create a wonderful business/recreation area on our waterfront.

Maryam Mohit
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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.

The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan. Compared to the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative 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.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs.

Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and the Aerial Alternative. 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-367-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Dan Morris
Address: 8340 24th Ave NW
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98117
Email: d.morris@healthybuilding.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
Please make sure this project works for the entire west side of Puget Sound and not just consider downtown Seattle. Please plan for the FUTURE need of the area. Let’s avoid the mistakes made with I-5, 520 & I-90 where they were inadequate to handle the increased traffic in just a few short years. Make a tunnel with 5 (FIVE) lanes in each direction stacked with two on/off ramps to downtown. Make some people friendly green park spaces with seating, as well as spaces for flower, coffee, hot dog, etc. stands.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-369-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-371-001

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

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The project has already received some federal funding to aid with design, and some additional federal funding is expected for construction, although the majority of funds will be from state and local sources. Please see the Final EIS for current information.

Thank you for submitting your comment and request for more information about the Mayor’s vision for the City of Seattle. Your comment specifically refers to projects the City of Seattle is undertaking separately from the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project. For more information on the Mayor’s vision for the City, please refer to the City’s website at: http://www.seattle.gov/

Information on the topics you specifically mention in your letter can be found at:
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
I-375-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-375-001

I recently moved into a downtown water-view apartment. While the view from my apartment is amazing, it is quite an eyecore to see the I-99 Viaduct out the window of my apartment. In addition to the appearance, there is also the issue of noise created by the viaduct. If you are looking for a way to re-vitalize the downtown area and attract a wide range of people, you should definitely choose the tunnel option. Don’t clutter the scenic Seattle Waterfront by rebuilding the same old double-stacked interstate. Instead, place the 6 lanes underground and turn the above-ground part of the project into a well-groomed park-like street that provides access to the downtown area. Many may argue that the cost is prohibitive, or that the well-to-do are the only ones worried about appearance. However, Seattle boasts a strong tourism industry and should be conscious of the appearance of downtown. If you think building the full tunnel is expensive, implement one of the other decisions and see how long it is before people demand even more capacity. At least this way, once the tunnels are constructed all of the above-ground land can be turned into whatever is needed. Perhaps some day there Alaskan Way will be double stacked on top of 6 lanes of tunnels, it’s always easier to build from the bottom up.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Tunnel Alternative
I-376-001
The City of Seattle, as a lead agency, thanks you for your comments on the University Way project and support for funding for the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement project.

I-376-002
Thank you for providing your support for the project and for federal funding.

---

I-376-001
Mr. John K. Naden
3818 43rd Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105
March 31, 2004

Mayor Greg Nickels
Mayor's Office
Seattle City Hall
Seattle, WA 98105

Dear Mayor Nickels:

I am an 18 year old senior at Bishop Blanchet High School here in Seattle. I am writing to you to express my appreciation for your support of two different issues that are important to me. First of all, I think that the cleaning up of the University Ave. is very important, and I also think that your push for federal funding to fix the Alaskan Way viaduct is very important.

I live very close to the University Ave and have spent a lot of time there when growing up and it hasn’t been in great shape lately. Along with fixing it up though, I think that it’s important to try and keep the culture. This means not making the buildings too nice so stores like “The Wooly Mammoth” and “Red Light Vintage Clothing” cannot afford to stay there anymore. Still, I can already see some changes, like re-paving of the roads, which is making a huge difference.

I-376-002

The Alaskan Way Viaduct is the best place to be stuck in traffic on the entire earth. The view of Puget Sound makes you forget your road rage. After the Nisqually earthquake in 2001 the viaduct and the Alaskan Way Sea Wall were both damaged and might not hold up in case of another large earthquake. For this reason I think that it is very important that the Federal Government does give the $1 billion you are asking for. If the Alaskan Way Viaduct does suffer another earthquake, it could not only be dangerous. Also, our traffic is pretty bad as it is, and if the viaduct had to close at times it would be hard to get anywhere.

I really appreciate what you are doing for the city. I can see that you truly care about making Seattle a better place for all that live here.

Sincerely yours,

John K. Naden
The 2004 Draft EIS did not contain information on changes to the seawall to improve juvenile salmon passage, other than moving the seawall landward, and the conceptual habitat improvements identified in Appendix R, Attachment D. The seawall design team evaluated means to improve habitat conditions for migrating juvenile salmonids along the Seattle shoreline. However, returning the shoreline to historic natural conditions is not compatible with existing land and water uses and land ownership, nor is it a purpose of the project or warranted to mitigate for project effects.

Please note that the lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. However, if another build alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of this project and its design will be carefully considered. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each proposed build alternative for the project.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

With the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, the southbound on-ramp at Columbia Street and the northbound off-ramp at Seneca Street will be removed. Traffic patterns are expected to alter slightly with removal of these ramps, and the Alaskan Way surface street is expected to carry additional traffic to and from the central business district. To provide similar capacity levels as currently exists today, six lanes of traffic on the Alaskan Way surface street are necessary south of Yesler Way. With the Elevated Structure Alternative, additional lanes proposed on portions of Alaskan Way are for the purpose of improving traffic circulation and flow, especially in the vicinity of Colman Dock. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the Alaskan Way surface street as part of the project. Overall, it is expected that traffic that diverts to use surface streets and I-5 will distribute based on available capacity of these various roadways. At this time, there are no plans to substantially increase capacity along I-5 through the downtown core.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where
SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

I-378-004

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on rebuilding the viaduct with Roman architectural elements.

The design and final configuration of the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project will be developed through the use of the best information and tools available. This includes application of current local, state, and federal design and safety standards, making the project as safe and serviceable as possible.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

*** eSafe scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***
I-382-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Re: Draft EIS for the Options Involving Viaducts

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

There is so much good material in the draft EIS on the various possible ways to deal with the certainty that the viaduct must be replaced. I will eschew rehearsing the details of the report and stick to the big picture.

The most important thing to recognize, I feel, is that the way the viaduct is dealt with can and should be the defining moment for the "boomer" generation that is at its crest and soon to be on the way gradually to retirement. (While all generations will be involved with this decision, I say this because we currently represent the largest age cohort.) We've enjoyed the benefits of those who came before us and created Arboretums and lovely University of Washington campus vistas, cleaned up Lake Washington waters, created the Seattle Center, and many other items in our built infrastructure too numerous to mention. Our generation has built a lot of office towers and shopping centers, condos and sports stadiums, but nothing that by itself seems to count as a true legacy to future generations. We are running out of time to do so.

It is not everlastingly to say, I believe, that at least one of the viaduct "fixes" can transform the very way Seattle sees itself and is perceived by others. That relates to the fact that even though we are a seaport and our Emerald City fronts the shores of Puget Sound, our waterfront is largely an embarrassment, someplace we hide our visitors from instead of making sure they see it. If we can find a way to go with the "Cut and cover tunnel" alternative, we have the opportunity to create a true heart to the city, a place where people live, shop, recreate and where there is enough space to call it a civic space. This new place will connect the heart of the urban downtown with the soft edge of the water. All great seaports find a way to do this.

I hope the "cut and cover" alternative can be modified a bit to cut down the number of lanes of traffic that will still seem to dominate Alaskan Way. Can't a portion of the flow be diverted to other streets in the north south grid? And we should make sure the tunnel is long enough that we create a truly worthwhile space, not some Westlake "PARK" postage stamp dump space.

The key things here are not let our scoffing "process" bog us down till the damn viaduct falls down, and the other is to decide at the beginning that where for many items we need to be very cost sensitive, in this case we have to realize that there is a difficult to quantify (but very real) upside that will accrue to making a truly vibrant, beautiful heart to our city that will pay dividends 100's of times over the course of time. Yes, it will be difficult to find the money, but all involved must be passionately identified in adhering to the vision that this is something we HAVE to figure out and make happen. Nay-sayers turned 96% Federal financing for an underground Metro for the region, and crushed the opportunity for us to have a beautiful city sized park of The Commons, why not this time see the yeasayers have their day??

Cut and Cover Tunnel is the way to go. The new space created will have the potential to make Seattle a much more special place to live. The new library is an inspiration, if we can create this space the way it should, it can have 50 times the impact the dazzling new library will have on our lives and for the lives of those who will follow us.

Kerry Nicholson
2341 Rosedale Pl.W.
Seattle, WA 98119

6/26/2004
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

The project is coordinating closely with Washington State Ferries. Improvements north of the Battery Street Tunnel have been proposed as described in the Final EIS. On- and off-ramps for the preferred alternative are described in the Final EIS as well as Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report, and Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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.

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.
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.
I-386-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-387-001

I think the ideal option is the Tunnel Alternative, because that would open the waterfront up for people to use and make the whole area from Pike Place Market through Pioneer Square quiet and livable and human. The tunnel would also increase businesses along the waterfront and turn Seattle into The Most Livable City again. If the Tunnel Alternative is not approved I vote for Bypass Tunnel Alternative, as that would decrease the traffic noise significantly and still allow the waterfront area to be opened up more than it is now.
Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Construction activities, especially along the central waterfront, would interfere with access to businesses and properties adjacent to the project on either side of the right-of-way. A primary goal of construction planning is to maintain adequate access to all businesses so they can continue to operate. If adequate access cannot be maintained, impacts to affected businesses will be mitigated under policies identified in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. If provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act are met, then relocation assistance would be provided. The type and ownership of businesses that will be operating on the central waterfront after construction cannot be reasonably predicted.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-392-001
The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. The Bored Tunnel Alternative's alignment is similar to what you suggest in this comment and could be built while the existing viaduct remains standing. Please see the Final EIS for more information about the preferred alternative.

I-392-002
The City of Seattle, as both an Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project lead agency and as the lead for the Central Waterfront Project, is serving as the liaison between those two efforts and keeps both projects informed as to decisions that affect the projects. The purpose of the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project is to provide a replacement transportation facility. The environmental analysis on the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project examines compatibility with adopted land use and neighborhood plans. This analysis is found in the Final EIS and its Appendix G, Land Use Discipline Report.
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.
The Bridge is designed to support six lanes of car/truck traffic and two monorail tracks under the bridge superstructure for a personal rapid transit (PRT) public monorail transportation service to the bridge towers and the city's new waterfront development.

The bridge towers will be mirror-like and at times their silhouettes will disappear and reappear like a mirage with reflections and shadows in the waters of Elliott Bay.

The bridge cable-stayed suspension system is a new and inventive structure and is supported by the two towers anchored approximately 220 feet below the surface of the water by means of a foundation system that will harness the unique geology of the Elliott Bay estuary and resolves the ecological impact of the bridge construction in a new and meaningful way.

The Elliott Bay Bridge will be the longest cable-stayed bridge in the world and perhaps a new signature for the City of Seattle.

Some engineers believe the Alaskan Way Viaduct is too dangerous to use and should be shut down. Remember the California Northridge Earthquake of January 17, 1994 and the catastrophic events to the transportation system of L.A.

Now is the time to build!

Roger Patten AIA
AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Clare O'Regan
Address: 8223 20th Ave NE
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98115
Email: megorgan@aol.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

Last year there was a proposal by Roger Patten AIA to build a bridge over Elliot Bay to replace the viaduct. It would cost one billion dollars and be completed in 5 years. It takes the noise and traffic away from downtown and creates a beautiful structure to admire along with the mountains and sea and can be done with a minimum of disruption to traffic. You already have the planning done for the approaches. You owe it to the taxpayers to consider a less expensive alternative to tunneling, and rebuilding the viaduct is unacceptable.

Comments apply to:
Other Topic: Bridge over Elliot Bay
The lead agencies recognize the importance of maintaining mobility during construction. The analysis of construction plans, described in the Final EIS and Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, compares the extent of traffic impacts and access constraints associated with each construction plan for each proposed build alternative.

Also, the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative avoids substantial closure of SR 99 during construction.
I-395-001

As part of the alternatives development process for this project, concepts were considered that would replace the viaduct with a bridge over Elliott Bay. However, these concepts were not advanced for reasons listed below:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.

Since 2004, the lead agencies have worked with the public, other agencies, and decision-makers to develop, refine, and evaluate possible viaduct replacement alternatives. Please see the Final EIS for a description of the currently proposed alternatives, their effects, and proposed mitigation.
ADVANTAGES TO THE "SEATTLE GATEWAY BRIDGE" SOLUTION TO THE ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT PROBLEM

1. The existing viaduct is completely removed from the waterfront allowing the best development for the area.
2. Can be almost entirely constructed without interrupting present traffic on route 99.
3. Can be built on a fast-track construction schedule, proceeding 24/7, taking possibly half the time of the other schemes.
4. Pending valid construction site, the cost should be equal to or less than the lowest cost alternative, particularly when factoring in the minimum interruption and earlier completion date.
5. Provides a true alternative route around/thru the downtown to supplement I-5 Freeway.
6. Rather than blocking views of the Olympics and the water would frame then. The view for motorists would be enhanced.
7. Would add to the city's magic with a beautiful gateway.
8. In comparison with the projections for "travel times; average speed; in tons of passenger".
9. Could reasonably be made a toll bridge to help pay the cost. The toll users - ie travelers - full price, commute a minimum amount. Occasional resident users nowhere in between.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
In the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative, removing the viaduct would create large areas of open space. This new space could be converted into a variety of new uses, like a waterfront promenade, bike and pedestrian paths, and expanded streetcar service. The exact configuration and types of activities provided on the waterfront will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Also, 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.

Please refer to the Final EIS for more information on how the alternatives have developed since the 2004 Draft EIS and how the preferred alternative was selected.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in the Final EIS. The Surface Alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it reduced roadway capacity, which does not meet the project's purpose. Please see Chapter 2 in the Final EIS for more information about the alternatives development process.

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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.

Changing container cargo shipping facilities is outside the scope of this project.

Thank you for your suggestion about using the viaduct to build a new seawall and water retention facility. New materials would be used to build the new seawall, and the old viaduct structure would be removed and not available for other uses under all the proposed build alternatives.
Under the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, improvements to Alaskan Way are included as project elements. For the Bored Tunnel Alternative, Alaskan Way improvements are not part of the project and will be analyzed under separate environmental documentation by the City of Seattle. In all cases, the City of Seattle owns the property located under the viaduct structure.

A system of floating public spaces and walkways would be extremely difficult to obtain permits from public resource agencies that safeguard shoreline areas along the project corridor. Because of space restrictions within the project corridor, and requirements for maintaining current capacity, separated HOV facilities will not be incorporated into the alternatives being considered.
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Roger Patten AIA
Proposed Elliot Bay Bridge

Imagine a bridge built over Elliot Bay that removes the high speed traffic and noise of highway 99 away from the waterfront and returns the waterfront back to the city of Seattle for development.

Picture a cable-stayed suspension bridge with a main span of 3,490 feet for a total bridge length of 6,900 feet with approaches for a total length of two miles. It can be built within five years at a cost of about one billion dollars. The bridge would be the same length as the Alaskan Way Viaduct and replace it forever.

The bridge’s main span is supported by two bridge towers that are approximately 1,000 feet above sea level and support the cable stayed bridge span 246 feet above the water.

The towers will have a Viewing/Restaurant platform at the 800 feet level for the south tower and Security facilities for the Port of Seattle and US Coast Guard at the north tower.

The bridge deck has a curve designed into it to allow for expansion and contraction of the superstructure between the approaches and will curve outward from the waterfront to afford a greater space for Seattle to have its Inner Harbor. This curved deck will also move the highway traffic a half mile off the waterfront, far enough away so you can see the vitality of the traffic but not hear it.

The curve in the bridge deck will also allow for the bridge alignment with the Battery Street Tunnel and when traveling north on the bridge the Space Needle will appear centered between the suspension cables and when traveling south (on a good day), Mt. Rainier will appear centered between the suspension cables.

The Bridge is designed to support six lanes of cartrack traffic and two monorail tracks under the bridge superstructure for a personal rapid transit (PRT) public monorail transportation service to the bridge towers and the new waterfront development.

The bridge towers will be mirror like, and at times their silhouettes will disappear and reappear like a mirage with reflections and shadows in the waters of Elliot Bay.

The bridge cable-stayed suspension system is a new and inventive structure and is supported by the two towers anchored approximately 280 feet below the surface of the water by means of a foundation system that will harness the unique geology of the Elliot Bay estuary and resolve the ecological impact of the bridge construction in a new and meaningful way.

The Elliot Bay Bridge will be the longest cable stayed bridge in the world and perhaps a new signature for the City of Seattle.

Some engineers believe the Alaskan Way Viaduct is too dangerous to use and should be shut down. Remember the California Northridge Earthquake of January 17, 1994 and the catastrophic events to the transportation system of L.A.

Now is the time to build!

Roger Patten AIA
I-402-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Shan Pei
Address: 11048 SE 27th PL
City: Bellevue
State: WA
Zip Code: 98004
Email:
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

I-402-001

This project should offer opportunity to beautify Seattle. No elevated roadways and minimize traffic on waterfront. Tunnel proposal with six lane of traffic is best plan. City can be responsible for above ground plans.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments.

Many people have expressed how much they enjoy the views when traveling northbound on the viaduct. Views from the existing viaduct, the visual character and quality of the views, as well as the likely viewer response of drivers and passengers, are discussed in the Final EIS and Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. If this alternative is selected, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project led by the City of Seattle. There will be many opportunities for the public to participate in that master planning effort and to determine the future of their waterfront.

The lead agencies have continued to work diligently to move this project forward.

The lead agencies have worked, and will continue to work, extensively with the railroads to ensure their needs are considered in the development of the final project design as well as plans to manage traffic during project construction.

Mitigation measures will be in place during construction to protect Elliott Bay. Measures related to the removal of soil and contaminated materials...
are described in Appendix P, Earth Discipline Report, and Appendix Q, Hazardous Materials Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

I-403-006
The project's purpose is to provide a replacement transportation facility that will, among other things, provide capacity for automobiles, freight, and transit to efficiently move people and goods to and through downtown Seattle and to provide linkages to the regional transportation system. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-404-003
Thank you for your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. With this alternative, the downtown waterfront would be viaduct-free.

Chapter 8 (Comparison of Alternatives) of the Final EIS does acknowledge that the current views from the viaduct would be lost as a result of constructing the preferred alternative. Victor Steinbrueck Park does provide similar views towards the west as the top deck of the existing viaduct and would remain after the project is completed to continue to provide similar views.
The Surface Alternative does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. For this reason, the Surface Alternative is no longer being considered. See the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. 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.

We also recognize your concerns about the high cost of building a tunnel. Access to and from SR 99 would be provided by new ramps near the stadiums and near Seattle Center. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the City of Seattle would construct a new road between Alaskan Way and the Elliott/Western corridor.
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.
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.
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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.

Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. The aerial structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report. All of these factors were weighed by decision-makers when choosing the preferred alternative.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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.
Comment acknowledged. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Full access to and from the tunnel would occur between S. Royal Brougham Way and S. King Street at the south portal and near Harrison and Republican Streets at the north portal.

The proposed stadium area ramps (between S. Royal Brougham Way and S. King Street) would improve access in the south end by adding connections that will help improve overall circulation in the immediate area. Providing these additional connections to SR 99 will help improve the congested traffic conditions that occur along surface streets when events take place in the stadiums. Please see the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, for more information about how traffic would operate in this area.

The lead agencies have worked hard to propose ways to minimize the amount of time of any SR 99 closures and restrictions. The preferred alternative, the Bored Tunnel Alternative, requires fewer SR 99 closures and lane restrictions than alternatives evaluated in the 2004 Draft EIS. Please see the Final EIS for an updated description of the alternatives, their effects, and proposed mitigation.
I-412-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:
Name: Robert M. Pierce
Address: 3414 NW 62nd Street
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98107
Email: bobpierce@seanet.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
I believe the seawall replacement and tunnel under Alaskan Way is by far the most desirable alternative. First it is the best aesthetically IF the land above the tunnel and that below the existing viaduct is converted to open space for the public with good access and parking from the new roadway. Second there appears to be an advantage for simultaneous use of the viaduct during a large part of the construction. The negatives of higher cost and loss of the view (mostly single drivers which should be eyes on the road) are greatly outweighed by the potentially magnificent public space. I support only minimal (5%) use of the land for income production to offset costs. Not billboards or similar advertising.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

I-413-001

May 27, 2004

I lived in the Seattle area for the first 60 years of my life, and am sure became immune to its beauty. I don't get back very often, but when I do I always drive the Alaskan viaduct. I defy anyone to find a more beautiful sight. The big buildings, the port, the mountains, and Puget Sound are awesome to behold, and unique to Seattle. Millions of people observe this beauty, and am sure include it in their visiting itinerary. Exchanging the viaduct for a tunnel will make Seattle less desirable for tourists, and for those Seattle citizens that really appreciate the beauty the city offers. For those living along the viaduct suffering the noise, and lack of view sorry it was there first.

Earl Pilgrim
105 S.E. Arcadia Pt Rd.
Shelton, Wa.98584
The lead agencies appreciate receiving your comments on removing the viaduct entirely. Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Constituent: Bruce Pollock
Home Phone: Business Phone: 206-544-9949
E-mail: buschcarol@link.com
Address: 2111 First Ave Suite 116, Seattle, WA 98121.

Subject: AWV
Location: None
Workflow ID: 119302

Description: [Arrived to Mayor's Office, 5/26/04, 11:49am]
Mr. Mayor, they say that politicians don't attend to email as they do to postal mail. I hope they are wrong. I urge you to reject the idea of rebuilding the high-speed viaduct through the waterfront corridor. We can't afford it, nor can our kids. It will kill my neighborhood and the waterfront for years--and the tourist trade along with them. Any of the alternatives described in the draft EIS will be incredibly expensive, incredibly disruptive to the heart of the city, will generate short and long term new traffic problems, and will be ugly. I think the people's waterfront coalition has some great ideas -- I just viewed their website this evening -- about renewing the waterfront and connecting it with the city by eliminating the high-speed viaduct. Let me say that I did read the draft EIS in March, and was depressed by what I saw. All of the alternatives are expensive, complicated, and disruptive. Please consider another way for Seattle. Bruce Pollock

Thank you very much!
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

**I-415-002**

The SR 519 Phase 2 Project is complete.

The connection between I-5 and SR 99 is only available through surface street connections. The Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project does not propose to connect I-5 and SR 99 via grade separated routes.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Aerial and Rebuild Alternatives. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

Your opinions about the waterfront planning process have been forwarded to the City's Department of Planning and Development for consideration, because the City is leading the Central Waterfront Project.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Your preference for no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way has been noted.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The roadway and ramp geometries at both the on- and off-ramps at the south portal of the Battery Street Tunnel do not meet current design and safety standards. In addition, traffic volumes on these ramps are low compared to other ramps due to the constrained geometrics and safety issues. The ramps will remain open to emergency vehicles for the Bored Tunnel Alternative and would remain open to traffic in the Cut-and Cover Alternative and Elevated Structure Alternative.

The purpose and need of the project were revised to include improving SR 99 from the Battery Street Tunnel north to Roy Street in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. The improvements included enhancements to Mercer Street, reconnecting Thomas and Harrison Streets across SR 99, and improving the street grid in that area. These additions to the purpose and need address safety and access issues within the SR 99 corridor and in adjacent neighborhoods. Depending on the alternative chosen, improvements to the Battery Street Tunnel would be made as part of the project. Please see the Final EIS for the current configuration of each build alternative.
Since the 2004 Draft EIS, the lead agencies have continued to work on developing readable information for the public. We hope that you found the information presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, and the Final EIS clear.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Access to and from SR 99 would be provided by new ramps near the stadiums to the south and near Harrison Street to the north. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the City of Seattle would construct a new road between Alaskan Way and the Elliott/Western corridor. Magnolia would not be cut off from downtown.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
we all avoid a decade of irritation
to businesses and residents, and
avoid the billion dollar liabilities
of a megaproject. We owe it to ourselves
and our children to rethink the way
we provide transportation to Seattle's
watershed. Therefore, I urge you to
consider the inclusion of a "no-
highway" alternative to the Viaduct EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

5100 NE 53rd St.
Seattle, WA 98105
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Gregg L. Rasmussen
Address: 520 W. Niceway Rd.
City: Granger
State: WA
Zip Code: 98932
Email: ggrasmussen@bentonrea.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

The tunnel alternative may be more costly, but generations to come will thank us for the unimpeded downtown to waterfront connection.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
I-425-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-425-001

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Jeff Reibman
Address: 7924 Pacific Ave N
City: Seattle
State: Wa
Zip Code: 98103
Email: jreibman@weberthompson.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

I want to express my support for the Tunnel Alternative and to encourage the city to minimize car traffic at the surface. I believe that we have an historic opportunity to recreate a connection to our waterfront. A tunnel will be an efficient traffic mover while the surface can create a pedestrian friendly environment which could be an economic windfall for the city. The possibilities for public and commercial space along our piers are incredible and unique. This is our chance to recapture an essential element in Seattle’s history and improve our city for everyone.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
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-426-001

I strongly favor the rebuild alternative. I am an occasional driver from Fremont to West Seattle. To me, the downtown waterfront is for tourists and I get no pleasure from it other than the views from the viaduct. The panorama out over Elliott Bay on a sunny afternoon or late at night are some of my happiest moments in Seattle. thank you. Joe Reiner

Comments apply to:
Rebuild Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-427-001

I believe that a tunnel is the only option that can allow for a dynamic and scenic waterfront. The viaduct is a blight and a nuisance, built in an era when Seattleites were so in love with the automobile that they thought nothing of scarring the natural beauty of this site. We need to have a vision for the future that recognizes the extraordinary potential of this area. If our waterfront were properly developed to include parks, gardens, paths, galleries and boutiques, it could draw millions more tourists into Seattle and demonstrate that we are a city that knows how to wisely manage its wonderful natural scenic resources. Let’s give Seattleites one more reason to visit downtown, and let’s give visitors one more reason to visit our beautiful city!

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

I am a homeowner of a waterfront condo unit in Waterfront Landing. I am appalled to see what would happen to my waterfront view, with a bridge built every above, and in front of my apartment, this year 4 to 6 years!! At age 50, I would never have my view again! The whole purpose of my purchase in 1998 was for the view of the harbor. Up to now, the value of my apt. has appreciated sharply. With the awful proposal of the Battery St. Flyover Detour, my beautiful waterfront property is ruined!!

(Mrs) Gloria R. Remy
2000 Alaskan Way, Apt. 456
(Waterfront Landing, "Minato" Bldg)
Seattle, WA 98121
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Bypass Tunnel Alternative. However, this alternative is no longer being considered. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments regarding costs and the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

---Original Message-----
From: Jerry Richard [mailto:writerich@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2004 3:11 PM
To: viaduct@wadot.wa.gov
Subject: Viaduct

It's important to keep in mind the long range costs of replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct. If people spend the next fifty years regretting a new barrier between the city and its waterfront, then patching up or resurrecting the present structure will not look like a bargain. A tunnel may be expensive now, but it will increase property values and it is the only solution that improves the city's livability. We didn't build rapid transit in the '60s because it was too expensive. We did build a Kingdome because it was cheap. This time, let's do it right.

Sincerely,
Jerry Richard
I-431-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

---Original Message-----
From: r2ar [mailto:ron.richardson@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2004 7:57 AM
To: awvcomments@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: viaduct plans

Thanks for the chance to comment on the plans being considered to replace the viaduct. I am definitely in favor of the plan to build the six lane tunnel. I assume this will include rebuilding the east wall as well. I live in West Seattle and use the viaduct all the time, so that the 7 to 9 years to build the tunnel will have an impact no doubt, but it has to be done. The project will give West Seattle folks a reason to ride the new monorail system and add significantly to the ridership of that project.
I say it is time to make a decision and get on with it. Delays will only add to the costs. Another benefit of the tunnel project is that it will open up the space between downtown and the waterfront. We may get some needed greenspace yet!!
Again, thanks for the chance to comment.
ron.richardson@comcast.net
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-435-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Bypass Tunnel Alternative. However, this alternative is no longer being considered. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.

**AMV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:**

Name: Dan Rodina
Address: 5044 Beach Drive S.W.
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98136
Email: 
Affiliation (optional): 

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

**I-435-001**

Project Comments:

I think the Bypass Tunnel Alternative is the best solution because it is a compromise between cost and effectiveness. I also like it because it addresses the problem with the sea wall. It is a solution that is not technically complex consequently I think planners should be able to reasonably estimate and manage the projected costs.

Comments apply to:

Bypass Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-437-001
Building a temporary viaduct along the waterfront during construction, as discussed with the Aerial Alternative in the 2004 Draft EIS, is no longer being considered. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.

I-437-002
The purpose and need for replacing the viaduct is to protect public safety and provide essential vehicle capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Addressing a "century plan" is outside the scope of the project.
A temporary structure along the waterfront is no longer being considered. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.
I-439-001

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-439-002

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternative.
Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.
I-440-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

---Original Message---
From: KEVIN ROSENFIELD [mailto:karosenfieldman.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2004 1:12 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: The Amazing Seattle Waterfront!!

The Seattle waterfront could be something spectacular...... DO NOT expand Alaskan Way. Do NOT rebuild the Viaduct. This is an opportunity that should not be passed up. I realize that a tunnel is the most expensive option, but the rewards of such a venture—connecting the waterfront to the city and providing seemingly limitless park, commercial, and residential development potential—would far exceed such a cost.

If the bypass option is selected, I believe it would be a mistake to expand Alaskan Way. Turning Alaskan Way into a quasi-highway would taint the waterfront. Forever. (Want an example? Check out Lake Shore Drive in Chicago.)

This project is certainly one of Seattle's biggest decisions—and certainly Mayor Nickels will forever be known by what he decides to do here. Don't go cheap. Don't allow for future regret. With a spectacular and untainted waterfront, the people of Seattle will forever thank you for it.

--Kevin
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-441-001

Name: Courtney Rosenstein
Address: 6709 24th Ave NW
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98117
Email: crosstein@weberthompson.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

I support the full tunnel alternative. This option gives Seattle a opportunity to reinvent its waterfront and create a city 'front door' that is beautiful, functional and it will create economic opportunity. It is worth the money. Put the noisy, stinky, fast traffic underground and leave the waterfront for pedestrians, parks, and businesses. The people who make this project happen will be remembered and appreciated as visionaries.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
April 28, 2004

WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Coordinator,

We are very excited about the possibility of putting the viaduct below ground in either the option Tunnel or Bypass Tunnel or Surface. Tunnel would be our preference. Our waterfront is some of the most beautiful in the world and we should do everything in our power to keep it that way. These options would make it usable while retaining its beauty. In our opinions, Seattle missed the opportunity of its lifetime when it lost the Commons Park. Let's not let it happen again by not looking far enough in the future. Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

Ellie Rosser
7830 SE 63rd Place
Mercer Island, WA 98040-4814

John M. Rosser
7830 SE 63rd Place
Mercer Island, WA 98040-4814

I-442-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, Bypass Tunnel Alternative, and Surface Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on 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. Improving the northbound on-ramp from the West Seattle Bridge to SR 99 is not part this project.
Comment noted. Improving the northbound on-ramp from the West Seattle Bridge to SR 99 is not part this project.
The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would construct the new SR 99 bored tunnel away from the central waterfront as described in the Final EIS. If this alternative is selected, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront planning process being led by the City of Seattle. The City recognizes the value of improving pedestrian connections and providing improved public space along the waterfront that will allow people to walk, bicycle, play, and view Elliott Bay and the mountains.

A lid up to Steinbrueck park is proposed as part of the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS.
Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.

Comments noted. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. If this alternative is selected, the final configuration of the waterfront would be determined through the Central Waterfront Project, led by the City of Seattle.

A complete closure of SR 99 during construction, called the shorter construction plan, was evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS contains current details about the construction plan for each build alternative.

Access to the Colman Dock ferry terminal for all travel modes will be maintained throughout all phases of project construction regardless of the alternative.
As part of the ongoing public involvement process, the project will continue to coordinate with the residents, businesses, and property owners along Alaskan Way through meetings, open houses, newsletter updates, and e-mail. The lead agencies will continue to refine construction mitigation for the preferred alternative's construction sequencing and methods. Mitigation measures addressing noise, parking, traffic, dust, and other factors are discussed in the Final EIS and appendices.
| Name: | Donald J. Rowe |
| Address: | 5610 S. Junett |
| City: | Tacoma |
| State: | WA |
| Zip Code: | 98409 |
| Email: | djrowe45@mrm.com |

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?  
----------------------------------------  
Yes

Project Comments:  
----------------------------------------  
Even though I live in Tacoma, I am in Seattle fairly regularly. I have lived in the area since 1972, and have always considered the AWV an eyesore born of transportation expediency over quality-of-life esthetic. Replacing one viaduct with another would be rejection of a golden opportunity to put the traffic UNDERGROUND and develop a human-friendly waterfront which would help to attract Seattleites and visitors alike. The city council need to study not what replacement option to pursue, but how to best utilize the open space which will be created when (may it be soon?) the AWV is torn down and given a proper burial. Which brings up another thought: recycle the concrete from viaduct to tunnel ala the Kingdome!

I-445-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and acknowledge your preference not to rebuild the viaduct. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives for the project.

The need to reduce the single-occupant vehicle trips is also acknowledged. Numerous measures to make that happen during the construction of the alternatives have been carefully considered in coordination with all of the local transit agencies. These measures are included in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-
and Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

I-447-003
Thank you for these mitigation suggestions. Please refer to Chapter 8 Mitigation of the Final EIS for information on the proposed mitigation measures for the project.

I-447-004
Comment noted. If the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the final configuration of the waterfront would be determined by a separate project, the Central Waterfront Project, led by the City of Seattle.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Aerial and Bypass Tunnel Alternatives. 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.

Your comments are noted. Please see the Final EIS for the current construction plan for each build alternative. Construction for all activities could occur up to 24 hours per day, 7 days per week within permitting requirements. The project would bring family-wage jobs to the region. Please see the Final EIS, Chapter 6, for current information about construction effects.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.
I-449-003
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments regarding views and the character of the waterfront. The City of Seattle is leading the Central Waterfront Project, which will help shape the urban design of the central waterfront area with the preferred alternative.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-450-001

Valerie Sargent
City: Seattle
State: WA
Email: sargentv4@hotmail.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I am writing to fully support the Tunnel Alternative. What a great and wonderful gift we could give to ourselves and to our downtown tourist industry if we had a waterfront that was available to all citizens. Please consider the Tunnel Alternative as the only alternative for the city of Seattle now and for the future generations.

Overall Project
I-451-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

--- Original Message ---
From: Kevin Schafer [mailto:kevin@kevinschafer.com]
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2004 8:55 PM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: COMMENTS

Dear WSDOT,

My wife and I attended the early neighborhood meetings on this project 2-3 years ago. We will have to miss them this time around and wanted to register our opinion.

We feel strongly the full tunnel option. It may be the most expensive but it offers so many advantages:

- Re-opening the downtown to the waterfront
- Removing a noisy eyesore (the current viaduct)
- Allows full, efficient replacement of the seawall.

We were frankly shocked that many people advocated rebuilding the viaduct, simply so they could enjoy the view on their commute. What nonsense... First of all, they should be driving; if they want to enjoy the view, they should get out of their cars! But mostly this ignores what we feel is an historic opportunity to rethink this city's relationship with the water.

Good luck with this difficult and time-consuming process.

Sincerely,

Kevin & Martha Schafer
West Seattle

Kevin Schafer Photography
2148 Halleck Avenue SW
Seattle, WA 98116-1830 USA
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-452-001

I would be very happy to see the tunnel alternative. We need to daylight the waterfront, return the above ground flow of traffic to pedestrian/bicycle/local auto access, and provide more greenspace for anyone coming to downtown to truly appreciate the waterfront. Although the process will be somewhat painful for most commuters and ferry users, I do believe that in the long term Seattle will benefit in manifold ways. And the bonus will be that the noise levels will drop considerably too.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The project’s public involvement process strives to be inclusive by having
numerous public meetings, briefings with community and other groups, and interviews with service providers.
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information. Additional information regarding permanent parking loss is provided in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.

I-455-001

I favor this solution as the best long term investment for the city. Opening the city to the waterfront brings incredible development opportunities and has the potential to increase the quality of life for downtown residents, visitors and employees. The loss of parking under the existing viaduct will be a hardship to the area businesses - but perhaps there is a plan in place for that. I will certainly miss the wonderful views from the top deck of the viaduct, but in the long run, it would be a service to the city to remove the vehicle traffic (and with it it's exhaust/particulates/noise pollution) from the waterfront.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
I-456-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-456-002
One of the purposes of the project is to provide capacity to efficiently move people and goods to and through downtown Seattle; the purpose is not to increase capacity as this comment states. Please refer to the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, which discusses the capacity and mobility for traffic for each build alternative. Strategies that improve transit access through downtown Seattle and minimize the impact of peak period traffic congestion for transit passengers and operators are being considered, particularly during construction.

---Original Message---
From: Jessyn Schor [mailto:jessyn@wshpg.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2004 3:04 PM
To: awvdeiscomments@wsp.wa.gov
Subject: Choose the Tunnel Option!

I-456-001
First, my compliments on a beautifully-laid out, easy-to-read Draft EIS.

I urge you to select the tunnel option as the preferred alternative for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall replacement project. This project presents us with a fantastic opportunity to reshape the face of the Seattle waterfront for the benefit of the whole region. Let’s think long term and pony up the cash to rebuild this thing the right way!

I-456-002
However, there is one major problem with the tunnel option as it is currently configured. We should not build a structure that increases the general traffic capacity of the corridor. This is at odds with the goals of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan and wrongly places emphasis on moving more cars instead of more people and goods. Instead, we should focus on transportation demand management techniques and increased transit service to cope with future demand.

Sincerely,
Jessyn Schor
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project

Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to give us comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. The comments you make will become part of the public record for this project. Your thoughts will help decision makers develop a preferred alternative. Responses to your comments will be provided in the Final EIS.

Contact Information: At a minimum, please provide your name and Zip Code. If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

Name: Mike Schuh
Organization/Membership Affiliation (optional):
Address:
City: State: Zip: 98117
E-mail:

☐ Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

1. Choose a topic:
☐ Overall Project ☐ Tunnel Alternative ☐ Construction Impacts and Mitigation
☐ All of the Alternatives ☐ Bypass Tunnel Alternative ☐ Other
☐ Rebuild Alternative ☐ Surface Alternative
☐ Aerial Alternative ☐ Seawall

What are your comments about the project?

(Please see "attached")

(Please use additional paper if you need further comment space)
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

We appreciate your comments regarding rerouting streets north of the Battery Street Tunnel to enhance traffic flow and connectivity. In the Final EIS, improvements north of the Battery Street Tunnel are proposed for each build alternative. These improvements would greatly enhance connections between the South Lake Union neighborhood and the lower Queen Anne neighborhood. Please see the Final EIS for the current configuration of each build alternative in this area.

Thank you for your creative suggestion. This type of approach to funding would require legislative action before it could be implemented. Please note that the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project is funded.

I-457-001
I-457-002
I-457-003


Mike Schuh

It's always a guess as to what price point to submit - too high, and it fails; too low, and if it passes... it won't provide enough money to do much.

How 'bout this: For the dollar amount, present a single budget question with several amounts ($0, $1 Billion, $2 Billion...). Each voter selects one amount. After the election, tally the votes starting from the highest amount working downward. The dollar amount that provides the votes to create a majority is the amount authorized. Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 голосы | сумма  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voters: 45% 80%

Advantage: the voters choose the amount, and most likely some amount is authorized (as opposed to zip from Referendum 51).

A similar process could be used to select which projects to build with the authorized funds.

- Mike Schuh

schuh@Formdale.com  POB 17005, Seattle 98127
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. Please see the Final EIS to see current views of each proposed build alternative.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

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. If this alternative is selected, the final configuration of Alaskan Way would be determined as part of the Central Waterfront Project led by the City of Seattle.

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite
suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. 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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies' decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

Parking, ferry service, and transit are discussed in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.
Thank you for your comments suggesting the project consider another alternative. The alternatives presented in the 2004 Draft EIS and the 2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs represent a reasonable range of approaches that can meet the purpose and need for the project. Many options were looked at during the initial phases of the project's screening process. The screening process involved early analysis by the project team and discussions with community groups at more than 140 community meetings and community interviews, including businesses along the corridor. A total of 76 initial viaduct replacement concepts and seven seawall concepts were considered, and concepts that were not feasible, or were outside the purpose of the project were dropped from further consideration. The most workable ideas were shaped into the alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS. Further screening and analyses were conducted for the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. In 2010, a second Supplemental Draft EIS was prepared to analyze the Bored Tunnel Alternative. The Final EIS contains descriptions and analysis of the current project alternatives.
I-463-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments proposing a gribble awareness campaign.

I-463-002
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle's container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City's existing land use and shoreline plans.
I-464-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-464-002

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel's north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

I-464-003

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of
Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.

**I-464-004**

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Aerial and Surface Alternatives. 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.

As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Ron Skarbo
Address: 16705 Southcenter Pkwy
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98188
Email: rskarbo@hotmail.com
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:

As a Seattle native, and waterfront resident for the past 5 or 6 years, I'm very aware of what a unique part of town the waterfront is. Through the ongoing conversation about the viaduct and seawall replacement, I've gotten a much clearer picture of what the waterfront MIGHT be in the future. I think most Seattleites view the central waterfront as a collection of tourist-oriented shops selling the same "gee-gaws" as most other major city waterfront areas. Some may pay the occasional visit for a concert or to enjoy one of Alaskan Way's three fine dining restaurants but, for most, the waterfront is a place to bring out-of-town visitors to shop for trinkets and pig out on hotdogs or deep fried fish and chips. I'm sure Seattle residents do occasionally succumb to the need for deep fried fish, though it's getting to be a pretty infrequent guilty pleasure. As for the trinket vendors, I doubt that many locals visit those shops in a given week...or year, for that matter. The point is, today's central waterfront is not a part of town that area residents have much reason to frequent. Any plan for replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct must take into account future public use of the central waterfront. The waterfront could be so much more than a tourist trap. With proper planning, it might be one of Seattle's most desirable areas serving the needs of locals and out of town visitors alike. The full tunnel approach, as opposed to the Bypass Tunnel Alternative, leaves Alaskan Way a 4 lane, local access street rather than a 6 lane Aurora-like thru-way. I think the Tunnel Alternative provides Seattle with the most options for future development of the waterfront.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the 2004-Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative as a replacement for the viaduct. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King
County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.

I-470-003
The opportunity for new public open space is one of the main advantages of the Bored Tunnel Alternative.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-472-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

In the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, the proposed grade coming northbound out of the waterfront tunnel at Pine Street is approximately 7 percent, which is within the prescribed WSDOT criteria for urban highways. The longitudinal distance is approximately 350 feet between where the bottom of the tunnel box breaks ground and the top of the BNSF railroad clearance envelope. The approximate 7 percent grade set for SR 99 maintains the preferred clearance over the BNSF railroad tracks and the tunnel liner.

See the Final EIS for current information about the build alternatives.
I-474-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for maintaining the current capacity of the existing viaduct.

I-474-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-474-003
Thank you for your comment suggesting inclusion of HOV lanes in the project. None of the proposed build alternatives include dedicated HOV lanes. The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative will include two lanes in each direction, both of which will be open to all traffic. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. This alternative would remove the existing viaduct and place traffic in a tunnel starting from around S. Royal Brougham Way to about Harrison Street, north of the Battery Street Tunnel. Noise mitigation measures are presented in Appendix F, Noise Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.
I-478-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

---Original Message---
From: Mark Spitzer [mailto:markspitzer@anajackson.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2004 10:11 AM
To: viaduct@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: Viaduct Replacement Comments

In the big picture, the difference in cost between rebuilding the viaduct, putting it at street level or putting it in a tunnel is not all that great.

In the big picture, the benefits to putting it in a tunnel are enormous:

- moves through traffic through
- keeps local traffic local
- dramatically reduces noise and pollution
- opens up the waterfront to downtown views and viewing
- opens up the waterfront facing properties to development
- opens up the waterfront to tourism and general enjoyment

It's clear: for our 50 year future, it's worth it to put the viaduct in a tunnel.

Mark Spitzer

---

Mark Spitzer, AIA
Principal
MARK SPITZER DESIGNS
3813 South Andover
Seattle, WA 98118
206 722 8786
206 722 7711 fax
mark@spitzers.net
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

I-481-002
If the existing viaduct is replaced with a similar elevated structure, every attempt will be made to make it both attractive and context-sensitive. Bridge architects will be used to come up with a visually appealing, yet cost-effective approach. Both steel and concrete will be studied for this
application. However, in a marine environment, steel may not be the preferred material, due to potential corrosion from saltwater and the marine air.

**I-481-003**

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-482-001

When making a decision on the alternatives, please do some site visits to other waterfront cities. I have not visited many, but one in particular - San Francisco - seems to be an ideal situation. The area is free from loud freeway noise, it's a pleasant and peaceful place for anybody to spend time. It's a great place to go for a bike ride or a run. There are trees, grass, and plenty of open space to enjoy. Can you imagine that waterfront with an overhead freeway? Or, what would it be like with a 6-lane surface freeway? Either situation would completely ruin the ambiance of that area. I often spend time on the Seattle waterfront and currently it's not a pleasant place to spend time due to the noise from the viaduct. I hope the decision is made to bury the traffic. Even if it costs more than a surface or elevated road, the decision to transform the waterfront into a peaceful location will be a major asset to the city in the years to come.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
All of the Alternatives
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The Alaskan Way surface street is designated as a principle arterial by the City of Seattle. It provides the only access to many businesses along the waterfront as well as to ferry operations at Colman Dock. Alaskan Way is also designated by the City of Seattle as a major truck street.

Reducing lane widths would likely lower travel speeds and provide an inducement to shift traffic to other downtown north-south streets, for example, 1st Avenue in Pioneer Square. North-south downtown arterials street intersections are already at peak capacity and some even exceed capacity during the peak commute hours. By diverting traffic from Alaskan Way, the downtown street network would experience even more congestion, causing further delay through downtown.

Potential sea level rise has been taken into account in the design of the build alternatives considered in the Final EIS.

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King
County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.

I-483-005
A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel's north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative is described in the Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report. The structure would not extend completely to the Battery Street Tunnel in part because that would require a more extensive ventilation system and buildings.

I-483-006
Facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians would be improved under all the build alternatives. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and Elevated Structure Alternative would each include a continuous sidewalk and promenade, a continuous route for bicyclists throughout the project corridor, and connections to existing bike/pedestrian routes. As part of the effort to improve bicycle and pedestrian travel, intersections on Alaskan Way and the side streets would be signalized, allowing people on bike and on foot to safely cross. For the preferred Bored Tunnel
Alternative, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.

I-483-007
The scope of the project does not include modification of the Colman Dock (Seattle Ferry Terminal) location. The project will maintain vehicle and pedestrian access at all times to Colman Dock at its current location during project construction.

I-483-008
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. The final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.

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-484-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:
Name: Valerie Stevens
Address:
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip Code: 98026
Email:
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

I-486-001
As a neighbor who travels through and spends a lot of time in the big city, I have to recommend the full tunnel option. We really need more public, waterfront space put to good use in our city, and this seems the time to make things better. We need a good north-south transportation route, but we also need attractive public spaces, parks, restaurants and shops. Let’s make better use of the natural resource we have available, the waterfront.

Comments apply to:
All of the Alternatives
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-488-001

To whom it may concern-

As an architect with experience in urban planning and citizen of Seattle I strongly support the tunnel alternative. The benefits of moving the traffic and noise under a lid and repairing the seawall at the same time are immense. The city has no promenade along the waterfront which will make it so much more enjoyable for Seattleites as well as tourists. I have worked downtown (Pioneer Square) for over 6 years and have a detailed knowledge of the area. Please do not let budgetary concerns alone drive the decision process here. Seattle needs a well designed edge to the water. The payoff is a long term one. A chance to do it right at an urban scale like this one doesn’t come along very often and I hope we won’t miss this opportunity.

Sincerely

Carsten Stinn

Comments apply to:

Overall Project

Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-492-001
As a daily commuter along the Alaskan Way Viaduct - but also a student of history - I strongly encourage the City to opt for the Tunnel Alternative. I'll lose my scenic drive, but the Tunnel is the best long term investment for Seattle. If we select the Aerial, Rebuild or Surface Alternatives, future generations will scorn us just as much as we plo insult today on the city planners who erected the Viaduct and cut off Seattle's waterfront from its downtown. Please make the best strategic decision and select the Tunnel Alternative!

Comments apply to: All of the Alternatives
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-493-001

I support the design that provides the best opportunity for future growth for downtown Seattle and a open waterfront.

I believe the tunnel design is the best option because it accomplishes both of these goals.

Although I am a supporter of historical landmarks, the Hwy 99 route is a physical barrier and fragments the city to sea relationship.

Vehicles drive much to fast on it to appreciate the view, cause excessive noise and pollution that contributes to the detriment of the waterfront. This provides all negative implications of any of the design solutions that resemble its stature on its replacement.

In my opinion, the best solution is one that makes it go away from anyone's 5 senses, sight, sound, smell, touch, taste.

The best solution is a tunnel design.

Comments apply to:

All of the Alternatives
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-494-001

Given the numerous factors involved in the decision-making process and the analysis illustrated in the summary and comparison of alternatives... The alternative with the highest and best value for the City of Seattle’s transportation system, the citizens of Seattle, and tourism is the Tunnel Alternative. Although this Alternative is the most costly, it’s other advantages outweigh the costs. The Tunnel Alternative would provide the fewest impacts to views and noise, which is a constant concern in downtown and along the waterfront. Tourists and citizens would be more interested in visiting the waterfront if there was less noise and more views. Consequently, the waterfront businesses would benefit economically from the Tunnel Alternative. Also, the waterfront would provide more of a civic experience and center for Seattle. Traffic speeds under the Tunnel Alternative are near the top, comparable with the Aerial Alternative. The Surface Alternative would worsen transportation and circulation through downtown, given the traffic speeds, impacts to other adjacent roadways, and congestion at nearby intersections. Safety is worst under the Surface Alternative, which should be a significant decision-making issue. Bypass Tunnel rates low on safety as well. The number of buildings, employees, and acres are most impacted by the Surface Alternative. The number of cubic yards to be excavated poses the question: where will it be moved under the Tunnel Alternative? When it comes to individual preference about what type of structure to build- I think it is best to weigh cumulative impacts- both positive and negative for the majority of people in the area. This means considering people who work in nearby buildings, take the ferry, tourists and pedestrians, drivers along SR99 and adjacent roads. As a result, drivers along SR99 are but a fraction of the total number of people affected. While views from the Viaduct are a legitimate benefit, the Viaduct conversely blocks views along the entire waterfront and is a noisy distraction to the beautiful scenery and pedestrian experience along the waterfront. The Surface Alternative is the least desirable, for many of the reasons stated above. Most importantly, it is the worst alternative because it degrades roadway capacity by 60%!!! For the good of Seattle, its citizens, and visitors, please DO NOT select this alternative. The most viable alternatives are the Tunnel and Bypass Tunnel after being analyzed considering a variety of factors. However, the Tunnel is preferable because of its fewer impacts on noise, higher traffic speeds, less traffic on Alaska Way, better safety, fewer congested intersections in adjacent areas, and overall character of the waterfront!

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
All of the Alternatives
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild Alternative. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives have been combined to form the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Project Comments:

Securing a decision that meets the practical and affordable is always paramount in decisions like this. However, due to the massive opportunity to finally open up the waterfront to the downtown core I believe we should invest the additional money for the tunnel option. Perhaps an electronic toll system would best be employed for this particular project as it would enable users to pay for the new tunnel over the long term. This is definitely a tough decision to make but I feel that the opportunity we have to shape the entrance of our entire waterfront is too great to try to rebuild a structure that most people, if money was not an option, would rather tear down and put underground.

Thank you for devoting your time, creativity, and energy to this very difficult decision.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Thank you for your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
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.
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.
I-501-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. The lead agencies are continuing to work together to move the project forward through construction. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.

I-501-001
I am not in favor of the Tunnel Alternative. I am very unhappy with how long it takes for a decision to be made on how the Viaduct will be replaced. It will be a big mess once the replacement starts, but it would be nice to see some progress being made.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
I-502-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

--- Original Message ---
From: Randal Thatcher [mailto:duckdolphins@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: May 23, 2004 9:44 AM
To: awvdeecomments@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: viaduct replacement

Hello Seattle City and King County Council members,

Thanks for all you do for the citizens of Seattle and King County.

I just wanted to make a quick e-appeal to all of you respecting the proposed replacement of the Alaskan Way viaduct. It seems our viaduct problem also presents us with a unique opportunity to give our Seattle waterfront a rejuvenating facelift.

I envision a vibrant, revitalized waterfront, without that cement, double-decker eyesore; I see a waterfront with less car traffic and more pedestrian and bicycle traffic, connecting downtown neighborhoods with Pike Place Market, Steinbrueck and Myrtle Edwards Parks.

[I bike from downtown (Western and Spring) to Magnolia via Alaskan Way and Myrtle Edwards bike trail at least twice a week, and would sorely grieve were that waterfront route to be swallowed up, or even compromised, by a major highway system along that corridor.]

It’s a lovely vision, but also—I realize—an expensive one. A tunnel alternative seems the ideal solution from the aesthetic and livability perspectives. The question, I suppose, is whether a tunnel is economically feasible. I sure hope so.

Thanks for your time and attention,
-R. Thatcher
I-503-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. After the 2004 Draft EIS was published, your comments along with others led to additional planning, analysis, and the revised alternatives presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Following publication of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.
I-504-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate your comment and
hope that you have found the additional information and graphics in the
2006 and 2010 Supplemental Draft EISs and Final EIS helpful.

April 2, 2004

Dear Sir:

I request a comment for one of the above items. I would like to discuss
the Alaska Way Viaduct, Seattle Waterfront Sea Wall, Seattle Monorail,
and the proposed development of the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

8295 Cherry Hill Road, West Linn, OR 98532
I-505-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference to construct an elevated structure that is much higher. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the project alternatives.

I-505-002
Under the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. 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.

I-505-003
If the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, replacement of the seawall would occur under a separate project, the Elliott Bay Seawall Project, led by the City of Seattle. The redevelopment of the central waterfront would occur under a separate project, the Central Waterfront Project, also led by the City of Seattle.

If the Elevated Structure Alternative or Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative is selected, the replacement of the seawall would be included as part of that alternative. For these alternatives, creating beaches is not proposed. Recreating a natural beach would require a gently-sloping intertidal area. To accomplish this, the shoreline would need to be pulled back well into the Alaskan Way corridor where streets, sidewalks, open space, and utilities would be located. Or it would require filling an area west of the seawall - an action strongly discouraged by natural resource agencies because of impacts to existing intertidal and nearshore habitat. Planning and design for project alternatives preserves salmon habitat by minimizing or avoiding digging or filling along the shoreline, and minimizing or avoiding new overwater structures that reduce the function
of habitat by shading them. Please see the Final EIS for current seawall replacement design information as it applies to the Elevated Structure Alternative and the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative.

I-505-004
The lead agencies are also concerned with the preservation of historic buildings within the project area. Vibration effects and the preservation of historic buildings are addressed in Chapters 6, Construction Effects, and Chapter 8, Mitigation, of the Final EIS. A more detailed discussion can be found in Appendix I, Section 106: Historic, Cultural, and Archaeological Resources Discipline Report.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people have expressed that they enjoy the views when traveling on the viaduct. The Final EIS analysis considers views in the SR 99 corridor, which is designated as a City of Seattle Scenic Route, and identifies and assesses designated view corridors largely along east-west streets. Views from the road and of the road are both evaluated. The visual quality analysis detailed in the Final EIS Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report, is taken into consideration by the lead agencies.

The Bypass Tunnel Alternative is no longer being considered. The Bored Tunnel Alternative has been identified as the preferred alternative.

Building heights and land uses are determined by City of Seattle Zoning Code regulations. Zoning varies along the project route. In the southern project area, much of the adjacent land is zoned IG1 or IG2 (Industrial General) and IC (Industrial Commercial) for industrial or commercial uses. This area has height limitations varying from 45 to 85 feet. A small part of the project route is near Pioneer Square parcels with zoning for less intensive uses and height limits between 100 and 120 feet. The central project area includes DH1 or DH2 (Downtown Harborfront) and DMC (Downtown Mixed Commercial zones) which allow waterfront uses and a variety of office, retail, and mixed residential uses. These zones have height limitations from a minimum of 45 feet to maximum heights of between 120 to 240 feet. A few parcels near the proposed route are in the PMM (Pike Place Market) zone where height limits are 85 feet. In the north, adjacent parcels are in DMC (Downtown Mixed Commercial), DMR (Downtown Mixed Residential), C1 or C2 (Commercial), and NC3 (Neighborhood Commercial) zones. These zones would generally allow numerous types of office/commercial, retail, and residential uses. Height limits for these zones vary from 65 to 240 feet.
The City recently adopted new height limits downtown, which generally support much taller structures there, including unlimited height potential for some uses. The new height regulations affect the downtown core area and do not apply to waterfront properties or parcels immediately adjacent to the project route. The nearest area to the project where these regulations would apply is along 1st Avenue between Union and Spring Streets.

I-507-003
The Surface Alternative does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Therefore, this alternative is no longer being considered.

I-507-004
Additions to or removal of pier structures along the section of waterfront in the project corridor is not part of the project scope. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

**I-508-001**

I strongly believe the tunnel alternative. Even though it is the most expensive, it would tie together the waterfront with downtown and create a more tourist friendly area which would help the economy in the long run and therefore make the money well spent. It seems logical that if you have to dig to replace the seawall you have already created one side of the tunnel.

Comments apply to:
Overall Project
Tunnel Alternative
I-509-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Building heights are determined by City of Seattle zoning codes, which will not be changed by the project. More information on land use can be found in Appendix G, Land Use Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. 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.

Since 2004 comments were submitted, the project has evolved. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes the current alternatives. The City of Seattle is leading separate projects to improve Mercer Street between Elliott Avenue W. and Fifth Avenue N., and from Dexter Avenue N. to I-5, which will accommodate two-way traffic. This project will work with the City on the Mercer Street improvements between Fifth Avenue N. and Dexter Avenue N. to coordinate the roadway design and construction.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal.
Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
With the Bored Tunnel Alternative, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. The City recognizes the value of improving pedestrian connections and providing improved public space along the waterfront that will allow people to walk, bicycle, play, and view Elliott Bay and the mountains. A Pike Place Market Lid has also been incorporated into the design of the Bored Tunnel Alternative.

Additionally, improvements north of the Battery Street Tunnel would build Aurora Avenue to grade level between Denny Way and John Street. John, Thomas, and Harrison Streets would be connected across Aurora Avenue with signalized intersections. These improvements would greatly enhance connections between the South Lake Union neighborhood and the lower Queen Anne neighborhood. See the Final EIS for more information.

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.

With the Bored Tunnel and Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives, the southbound on-ramp at Columbia Street and the northbound off-ramp at Seneca Street will be removed. Traffic patterns are expected to alter slightly with removal of these ramps, and the Alaskan Way surface street is expected to carry additional traffic to and from the central business district. Therefore, to provide similar capacity levels as currently exist today, six lanes of traffic on the Alaskan Way surface street are necessary south of Yesler Way. With the Elevated Structure Alternative, additional lanes proposed on portions of Alaskan Way are for the purpose of improving traffic circulation and flow, especially in the vicinity...
of Colman Dock. It is expected that, overall, traffic that diverts to use surface streets and I-5 will distribute based on available capacity of these various roadways. At this time, there are no plans to substantially increase capacity along I-5 through the downtown core.

I-513-003
A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

I-513-004
Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
I-513-005
Comments noted. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. If this alternative is selected, the final configuration of the waterfront would be determined through the Central Waterfront Project, led by the City of Seattle.

A complete closure of SR 99 during construction, called the shorter construction plan, was evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS contains current details about the construction plan for each build alternative.

I-513-006
The Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, contains discussions regarding roadway connectivity and access, transit services and facilities, and ferry services with regard to all the build alternatives. However, if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the final design of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle, and will be coordinated with Washington State Ferries.

I-513-007
As part of the ongoing public involvement process, the project will continue to coordinate with the residents, businesses, and property owners along Alaskan Way through meetings, open houses, newsletter updates, and e-mail. Mitigation measures addressing noise, parking, traffic, dust and other factors are included in the Final EIS and appendices. The lead agencies will continue to refine construction mitigation for the preferred alternative's construction sequencing and methods.
The Bored Tunnel or Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would provide the most pedestrian-friendly atmosphere by moving SR 99 traffic below-ground through the central waterfront area.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information. Additional information on pedestrian connections and facilities is provided in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS.

With the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, the southbound on-ramp at Columbia Street and the northbound off-ramp at Seneca Street will be removed. Traffic patterns are expected to alter slightly with removal of these ramps, and the Alaskan Way surface street is expected to carry additional traffic to and from the central business district. To provide similar capacity levels as currently exists today, six lanes of traffic on the Alaskan Way surface street are necessary south of Yesler Way. With the Elevated Structure Alternative, additional lanes proposed on portions of Alaskan Way are for the purpose of improving traffic circulation and flow, especially in the vicinity of Colman Dock. The Bored Tunnel Alternative does not include the Alaskan Way surface street as part of the project. Overall, it is expected that traffic that diverts to use surface streets and I-5 will distribute based on available capacity of these various roadways. At this time, there are no plans to substantially increase capacity along I-5 through the downtown core.

A lid was incorporated into the design of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. It was
included in the project, due in part to numerous 2004 Draft EIS public comments requesting the lead agencies to consider a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would extend north from where SR 99 emerges from the tunnel’s north portal near Pine Street to Victor Steinbrueck Park near Virginia Street. The design for this lid structure with the current Cut-and-Cover Alternative is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

I-515-004

Construction of the Olympic Sculpture Park in 2008 led to the indefinite suspension of the George Benson Line Waterfront Streetcar service because it displaced the vehicle storage and maintenance facility. King County Metro currently provides replacement service with fare-free bus service on the Route 99 Waterfront Streetcar Line. The routing and stop locations for this line do not exactly duplicate those of the waterfront streetcar; however, Route 99 serves the same neighborhoods—the waterfront, Pioneer Square, and Chinatown/International District. With the Bored Tunnel Alternative the final location of the streetcar will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. Both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives include the streetcar along Alaskan Way.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for preserving and enlarging the existing viaduct, and creating an aerial covered park on a new upper deck. The alternatives presented in the 2004 Draft EIS, 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, and Final EIS represent a reasonable range of approaches that can meet the purpose and need for the project. Many options were looked at during the initial phases of the AWV project's screening process. The screening process involved early analysis by the project team and discussions with community groups at more than 140 community meetings and community interviews, including businesses along the corridor. A total of 76 initial viaduct replacement concepts were considered, and concepts that were not feasible, or were outside the purpose of the project were dropped from further consideration. The most workable ideas were shaped into the alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS. Further screening and analyses were conducted for the two Supplemental Draft EISs and the Final EIS.
Thank you for your comments. Many options were looked at during the initial phases of the project's screening process. This process involved early analysis by the project team and discussions with community groups at more than 140 community meetings and community interviews, including businesses along the corridor. A total of 76 initial viaduct replacement concepts were considered, and concepts that were not feasible, or were outside the purpose of the project were dropped from further consideration. The most workable ideas were shaped into the alternatives analyzed in the 2004 Draft EIS. Further screening and analyses were conducted for the two Supplemental Draft EISs and the Final EIS. The alternatives analyzed include a range of viaduct repair and replacement designs with some elements of earlier concepts combined with other design structures as the engineering team looked at feasibility, cost, and other criteria.

The lead agencies plan to maintain access to businesses and residences throughout construction. Temporary limitations and any required changes to access during construction will be mitigated to the extent practicable. Mitigation measures for parking, pedestrian and vehicle access, and business assistance are discussed in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. The project team will continue their coordination and mitigation activities with local businesses and residents, freight/delivery companies, the Port of Seattle, neighborhood groups, and other affected groups.
Your comments on developing the waterfront district of Seattle are understandable; however, the stated purpose of the project is to provide a replacement transportation facility. The build alternatives advanced for consideration in the Final EIS are: the Bored Tunnel Alternative, the Cut-and-Cover Alternative, and the Elevated Structure Alternative. Land uses adjacent to the proposed alignments for these alternatives are addressed in the Land Use Discipline Report (Appendix G) for the Final EIS. Although the two tunnel alternatives may result in more new development opportunities than the Elevated Structure Alternative, none are expected to be directly responsible for substantial development in the project area.

The City is leading the Central Waterfront Project, which will guide future development in that area. The City is also working on a plan for the South Downtown area that will help determine future uses along much of the project route. Additionally, the amount and type of future land uses will also be influenced by other factors, especially future economic conditions that will affect the rate and timing of development that may take place along the viaduct and within nearby neighborhoods.

Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City's existing land use and shoreline plans.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-519-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-520-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
The seawall belongs to the City of Seattle, not the Port of Seattle. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. However, if another build alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of this project and its design will be carefully considered. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-523-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on a No Build alternative and a tunnel alternative. Not replacing the viaduct would entail either retrofitting the existing viaduct, or removing the viaduct and replacing it with a reconfigured Alaskan Way.

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. Therefore, the Rebuild Alternative is not reasonable.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would...
quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives. 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-527-001

The lead agencies appreciate receiving your comments requesting that another alternative be considered. The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004, and such an alternative was not added for evaluation. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current configurations of the proposed build alternatives for the project.

I-527-001

Please consider adding another option for central waterfront area with features of the bypass tunnel and surface options. In that segment, place the lanes going only one direction below grade and build the lanes going the other direction on a deck at grade with a concrete box around them. Along the concrete box new street local streets and pedestrian ways would be constructed. Skipped ramps would connect the top of the box with both the water and city sides of the box. Consider the redevelopment of the concrete boxes in Piers on either bank of the Sake. On the right bank, there is an express roadway. On the left bank, there is an RBR lane. On both sides there are pedestrian facilities on top. Some streets would connect Western Avenue with the top of the box. Others would link to pedestrian ways. Should free up more land for redevelopment. Would retain advantage of tunnel options to share concrete wall with seawall reconstruction.
Bicycle access will be maintained at all times during construction activities. At times, it will be necessary to reroute bicycles using temporary facilities or detours that will be designed to minimize user inconvenience. More information about bicycle facilities can be found in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

**I-529-001**

I believe that the Tunnel Alternative is the way to go. Yes, it may cost more and take slightly longer than the others, but this alternative shows the most VISION. The downtown waterfront is one of Seattle’s best assets. This is an opportunity to restore Seattle’s waterfront properly, and it should not be squandered.

Comments apply to:

Tunnel Alternative
The lead agencies are working hard to begin construction as soon as possible and recognize the increase in costs over time.
I-531-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
The contractor selected to build the project will be required to follow strict safety regulations during all aspects of the project.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-534-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in the Final EIS. The Surface Alternative is no longer being considered, the reason for this is explained in Chapter 2 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-534-001

Obviously the tunnel is the best solution, but if that proves too expensive or difficult, please consider the surface alternative. It is the cheapest, easiest, and it would still open up the waterfront and get rid of that elevated freeway marred our beautiful city. I can’t conceive of actually rebuilding the viaduct -- as if it were a good thing that we want to keep! Please -- our neighbors in Portland and Vancouver have embarrassed us long enough by their superior urban planning. Let’s show that Seattle is also a progressive, forward-thinking city that puts livability and the needs of pedestrians over those of automobiles.

Comments apply to: Overall Project
I-535-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-536-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in the Final EIS. The Bypass Tunnel has been eliminated from further consideration, the reason for this is explained in Chapter 2 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
II-539-002
After the 2004 Draft EIS was issued, numerous comments were received relating to the visual impacts and other negative effects of the Battery Street Flyover Detour. As the design plans for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and the Elevated Structure Alternatives evolved, the Battery Street Flyover Detour was eliminated.

II-539-003
Thank you for your comment. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.
Thank you for your comments. The project and the proposed alternatives have changed substantially since the 2004 Draft EIS. Please see the Final EIS for updated information, including how parking will be affected during project operation in Chapter 5 and construction in Chapter 6. Proposed mitigation for parking effects are discussed in Chapter 8.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-542-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Pamela Wyngate
Address: 214 Summit Ave, East #407
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98102
Email: pwynagat@earthlink.net
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?
Yes

Project Comments:
The Tunnel Alternative is the most forward-thinking alternative. Let's remedy the greed and stupidity of our tax-paying predecessors. (They've all retired to the peace of the San Juans after selling us their run-down houses for exorbitant prices.) The Tunnel reduces noise and puts the most traffic underground. It also creates the most open space on the central waterfront. Boo-hoo-hoo for the drivers and passengers who would not have views of downtown, Elliott Bay, and the Olympic Mountains. They can get out of their vehicles and enjoy a park with other human beings on foot. We all needed the exercise, last time I checked.

Comments apply to:
Tunnel Alternative
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle recognize your preference for the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The project has evolved since the publication of the Draft EIS in 2004. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the proposed build alternatives.
I-544-001

The project alternatives have evolved since the publication of the 2004 Draft EIS. The Final EIS analyzes three build alternatives: Bored Tunnel Alternative, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, and the Elevated Structure Alternative. The configurations of these alternatives, including how the Battery Street Tunnel is addressed, are presented in the Final EIS in Chapter 3. Please refer to the Final EIS for specific information about locations of ramps, lane configurations, and other design elements for each alternative. The proposed temporary Battery Street Flyover Detour is no longer part of any alternative. Chapter 5 discusses permanent effects and Chapter 6 discusses effects during construction. Chapter 8 describes the proposed mitigation to address project effects, including effects to parking.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2004 Draft and 2006 Supplemental Draft EISs, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies’ decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

The preferred alternative was selected 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
Chapters 5 and 6 in the Final EIS provides a more in-depth comparison of trade-offs for the three alternatives.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2004 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

If another build alternative is selected, which would include the replacement of the seawall, habitat value would be added by increasing the amount of aquatic habitat, relative to the area and volume of Elliott Bay, as discussed in the Wildlife, Fish, and Vegetation Discipline Report, Appendix N of the Final EIS.
An exhaust stack near Pike Place Market is no longer included in any of the alternatives. The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would have two tunnel operations buildings that include exhaust stacks. One building would be located in the south portal area near Alaskan Way S. and Railroad Way S., and a second building would be located in the north portal area near 6th Avenue and Harrison Street.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

I-547-001

I don't feel it is appropriate to invest billions to either build the elevated structure or to put the thoroughfare in a tunnel. Instead, I'd argue that we have reached a point where atypical responses are required. Much more appropriate is to implement a range of smaller, less expensive enhancements to streets and transit to make adjusting to life without a waterfront highway easier. Many of these have already been identified in some detail in preparation for the years-long period when the highway would be out of commission.

Not only would this approach save money and avoid the financial hardships to downtown businesses during years of construction, we stand to gain so much in terms of economic and ecological value along the Seattle waterfront. I sincerely hope that Seattle can see the futility of committing so many resources to an outmoded response to a transportation problem and instead seize the viaduct "crisis" as an opportunity for a progressive and holistic response. We can address the needs of dislocated viaduct users populations with a variety of lower-cost solutions instead of betting it all on one solution whose cost overruns and complications are likely to be unbearable.

David Atcheson
8029 38th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115
I-548-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

From: kwar@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2006 1:37 PM
To: WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct
Subject: AWV Feedback

Sent from:
Karin Baer
Address:
City:
Seattle
State:
WA
County:
King County
Zip:
98177
Email:
kwar@comcast.net
Phone:
206-361-6141

Comments:
Re the viaduct tunnel vs replacement?: I would favor the replacement. I like the view. Its one of the great pleasures of the city. I don’t want more visitors, I think there are way too many already, like the cruise people. I think the land would be given to developers who support the mayor. If it is open, it would be another habitat for the homeless. I think the tunnel has much more potential to be the Seattle Big Dig. There aren’t enough lights in the tunnels we do have.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-549-001

Best alternative, best value for our investment is the tunnel.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

From: Gloria Bailey
To: AWV SDEIS Comments
CC:
Subject: SDEIS comments
Date: Thursday, September 07, 2006 6:16:27 PM
Attachments:

I want to register my comments for the replacement for the viaduct.

We will be living with the replacement for a long time. We need to do it right and not regret our decision. That means we should spend what it takes and put in the tunnel.

I work in Seattle every day. I cross under the viaduct on foot near the ferry dock in order to reach the waterfront during the nice weather so I can eat my lunch and see the view. I get frustrated that the ugly viaduct blocks the view for most people working in Seattle and just traveling through.

Please put in one concerned citizen for a tunnel, even if it costs twice as much. It will be better, safer, easier to live with.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Bailey
14925 58th Drive SE
Everett, WA 98208
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-551-001

Comments: I strongly support the Tunnel Alternative. There is an intense need for open space in the city center, particularly as downtown residential density is increasing. Burying the viaduct would reconnect the city to its waterfront and improve quality of life immensely for city residents. The Elevated Structure will have a horrendous impact on the urban environment. The elevated structure will impede view corridors on downtown streets, blight the areas underneath, and harm the pedestrian environment. It will result in high levels of noise pollution and air pollution. It will negatively impact tourism on the waterfront, reduce property values, and probably badly damage local business. The Elevated Structure is totally unacceptable!!!!
We understand that members of the public may prefer different ways to share their comments. In order to encourage as much feedback as possible, we provided several options. At the hearings, attendees could submit comments on a written form, on a computer using an electronic form, or verbally to a court reporter. In addition to the meetings, the public could submit comments by mail or e-mail to the program team. The program team often holds open house-format public meetings to provide as much flexibility as possible to the public. With an open house format, hearing participants are able to come and go to the meetings as their schedules allow, making the meetings more convenient for many people.

I-552-001

Comments: I had hoped to hear what other residents of the Ballard and North Seattle area had to say about this project and its possible or probable impacts on their communities, jobs, etc. during construction and after. I work with some aspects of this project and also use this route for my work and to access the Seattle Waterfront and downtown. I have attended 3 open houses like this in the Fremont-Ballard area over the past 4 years, and although they are interesting, at some point people need to hear what others have to say about the potential or probably impacts of a project. This project needs to be discussed out in the open because it seems to have gotten quite polarized between the elevated alternatives and the tunnels. There must be many designs for a new elevated structure, but they don't appear to be up on the boards. I hope there actually a public hearing with information sharing regarding potential impacts before it goes to a vote or whatever its fate is.
Thank you for your comments. A large earthquake could cause damage to either the existing or a new viaduct, but designing the structure to current standards would result in less damage and could save many lives.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
I-554-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-554-001

We need a seawall/tunnel combination. If you wait for a disaster to happen first, and then act, it will always cost more, both financially and in terms of lives. We’ve seen this with Katrina, where proper levee upgrades and replacements were completely ignored and put off, even though lawmakers knew full well that a Cat 3 hurricane would topple them. The 3 billion it would have cost to build new levees turned into 50 billion after the storm, plus a thousand human lives. Learn lessons from others’ mistakes. PLEASE.

We need a tunnel, a tunnel that is also a seawall. We need it now, before the earthquake, before the tsunami. This is the best solution.
Thank you for attending the public hearing.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

From: Dave Broda
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
Subject: Please don’I waste our tax money on viaduct replacement
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2006 9:48:03 AM
Attachments:

Dear Kate,

As a business leader in Seattle, I am often confused by how state and local government seems to complain about budgets – then turns around and selects plans that are a complete waste of tax payer dollars.

The viaduct replacement is clearly a big sink hole of our children’s future. The cost difference between the viaduct replacement and no build option would fund so many other wonderful things or – simply improve our local and national standards of living by not taxing us for a mile “section” of a worthless “highway” from nowhere to nowhere.

Please don’t let this stupidity continue. I urge you to not hold an advisory vote on the viaduct alternatives. Neither of the two options on the table is affordable. We need to identify new alternatives Seattle can afford. Please fully consider a Transit + Streets proposal that invests in transit, improves the street grid to handle redistributed traffic, and builds a four-lane pedestrian-friendly street on the waterfront. It is affordable, experts have concluded it is feasible, and it is gentler on the environment and existing businesses. We have to live without any viaduct for 2-4 years anyway, so let’s see if we can make this approach work long-term.

Whatever City and State leaders ultimately decide as a permanent solution, I urge you to use existing funds to take care of public safety first. Improve the street grid and add more transit, as recommended in the Construction Transportation Management Plan, close and
remove the viaduct, and fix the seawall. Consensus on a final solution may take a while, and removing the public safety threat should not be held hostage to this political process.

Regards,

Dave Brede
I-557-001
The comment period exceeded the time required by NEPA and SEPA regulations and was not extended.

I-557-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your objections to a tunnel alternative.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

I-557-003
The lead agencies are endeavoring to complete the project in as cost-effective a manner as possible. Project funding is discussed in the Summary chapter of the Final EIS.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
One of the major benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is its ability to maintain the operation of SR 99 throughout the construction period. The current construction plan calls for only a short (several weeks) closure of SR 99 when the tunnel is connected to the other portions of SR 99. Details regarding construction plans and effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

Throughout the construction period and after the completion of the project, there will continue to be transit options from West Seattle that provide connectivity to the east side either through transfers in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel, the International District or via direct routes such as the Sound Transit Express Bus #560.

The sea level is projected to rise approximately 1 foot over the design life of the facility, which is approximately 100 years. The potential rise in sea level has been taken into account in the design of all the build alternatives considered for this project.

The Rebuild Alternative is no longer under consideration because the lead agencies determined it would not be wise to make such a substantial investment to build a narrow roadway that would not meet today's safety standards. Also, 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. Please see Chapter 2 in the Final EIS for more information about the alternatives considered and why they were screened out.
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

Please note that the Elevated Structure Alternative is expected to take longer to construct than the Bored Tunnel and Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives. The construction duration for the Elevated Structure would be about 10 years; 5.4 years for the Bored Tunnel Alternative; and 8.75 years for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative.
Thank you for your comment regarding transit service for West Seattle residents. During construction, additional King County Metro service will be provided between West Seattle and downtown Seattle. This augmented service will be complemented by transit priority treatments that will improve the speed and reliability of bus service.

A West Seattle park and ride location was not considered due to the Coordinated Human Services Transit Plans and City of Seattle’s policy that discourages new park-and-ride lots in the city.
The lead agencies appreciate receiving your suggestions to improve traffic conditions in the study area. One of the main benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operations on the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct through construction. Anticipated closure of SR 99 is planned to occur for a short (several weeks) period at the end of the construction period when the tunnel is connected with SR 99. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities.

The Final EIS contains current project information, including the configurations for each build alternative considered.

---

I-562-001

The comments received on this page were: 1. Close I-5's sewer off ramp during construction & expand I-5 at this point to 3 lanes. Need to keep traffic moving on Spokane St & not be backed up from I-5. 2. No trucks on the ramp from lower Spokane to I-5. 3. More green time on lower Spokane St. as bridge openings during rush hour. 4. Open temp off ramps as each piece of SR-99 is built. (over)
Adjacent property owners could potentially receive indirect economic benefits associated with increased property values and increased potential for redevelopment. The City of Seattle may consider a Local Improvement District (LID) in the future but it is not part of this project. The tax structure that the City of Seattle chooses to implement is not the purview of WSDOT or any of its projects. We encourage you to contact your City Council to discuss these types of issues related to property taxes.

The lead agencies appreciate receiving your suggestions to improve traffic conditions in the study area. One of the main benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operations on the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct through construction. Anticipated closure of SR 99 is planned to occur for a short (several weeks) period at the end of the construction period when the tunnel is connected with SR 99. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities.

The Final EIS contains current project information, including the configurations for each build alternative considered.
There are no plans at this time to close any ramps along I-5. Any improvements to I-5 would be undertaken as a separate project.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in the Final EIS. The Surface Alternative is no longer being considered because it does not meet the project's purpose and need statement; for more information about the alternatives development process see Chapter 2 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
The City of Seattle Police and Fire Departments, Washington State Patrol, and other county and state emergency personnel are continuously working to be prepared in the event of an attack on our region. If a tunnel is built, it would be included in the attack preparations.

All of the proposed build alternatives use current design standards and common engineering methods of ground strengthening improvement that would reduce the impacts of liquefaction. Using these methods, the ground would be stabilized to the extent that the tunnels or elevated structure would be capable of withstanding a "Rare Earthquake," which occur approximately every 2,500 years.

Library funding is not connected with this project. Your concerns have been forwarded to the Mayor's office.
I-566-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

From: Winn Cody
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
CC: 
Subject: Viaduct Comment
Date: Friday, September 22, 2006 11:44:38 AM
Attachments:

To Whom It May Concern,

While I realize I am no expert, I have (briefly) reviewed most of the documents on your website regarding the viaduct and I would at least like to voice my opinion. To me, the tunnel option represents the best choice for both transportation and our city. We get to keep a vital piece of the transportation puzzle while reconnecting Seattle to its waterfront, something that is often overlooked in the discussion. As for construction, the intermediate option makes the most sense, as it’s a compromise between down-time for SR 99 and cost.

As an aside, I grew up near Boston and lived with the city divided from its waterfront. I visited this summer and now that the Big Dig is (mostly) complete the change is amazing. It’s an easy and pleasant walk to the waterfront, not a loud, noisy one. I hope to see this for Seattle. Also, I realize that mentioning the Big Dig is sometimes taboo these days, but the reality is, is that the Big Dig’s goal was achieved, it just leaves something to be desired with regards to its execution. This is a problem that I don’t see happening in Seattle.

Thanks for your consideration,

Winn Cody
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for an alternative that has one elevated level or uses the surface street.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
I-568-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

From: Crummy49@Comcast.net
Sent: Friday, September 08, 2006 5:14 AM
To: WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct
Subject: AWV Feedback

Sent from:
Jeffrey R Croom
Address:
7510 Agate Dr SW
City:
Lakewood
State:
WA
County:
Pierce County
Zip:
98498
Email:
Crummy49@Comcast.net
Phone:
253 267-0793

Comments:
I hate the old viaduct and will not ever drive on it so in need arises I always use an alternate route. I would prefer the tunnel and feel much safer and when we take our friends and family to the Waterfront I would also rather think tourism would be better with the tunnel also. So my vote is TUNNEL!
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

Greetings,

Clearly the viaduct is a dangerous structure and needs to come down. However, the need to replace it with either the cut-and-cover tunnel or a new elevated structure are proving to be outrageously expensive and environmentally questionable.

The realistic means of achieving goals of people mobility in this area of Seattle can be obtained by focusing resources on a multi-pronged approach to achieving the desired mobility. This can be best achieved by not obsessing and focusing on a ‘one corridor solution vis-a-vis a new viaduct or tunnel, but instead focus money and resources on the Transit + Streets approach.

The Construction Traffic Management Plan should be implemented ASAP so as to start the adaptation process of the area residents to change their behavior and ready them for the day that the viaduct is gone, for good, and not replaced.

Save the money that would be spent on the one 'big fix of a tunnel/new viaduct’, and instead, spread it out and have many little fixes to move people and goods through this area of the city and state.

Sincerely,
Michael Dady
4805 23rd Ave SW
West Seattle WA 98106
I-571-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The tunnel alternative is clearly preferable to a new elevated structure. For a project the impacts from which will be felt for so long, it is clearly worth the added cost to design a better urban environment. The Steinbrueck Park lid should be wide and long (as shown in the video), as this will be a heavily used pedestrian corridor.

As a Washington state voter and taxpayer, I do not support the use of state funds to build a new elevated freeway along Seattle's waterfront.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

I urge you to modify the EIS to include alternatives the we can afford.

Transportation is important, but we cannot bankrupt the public treasury for a short stretch of highway. Neither the tunnel plan nor the elevated plan is affordable, and neither is an environmentally friendly choice.

I urge you to develop a range of lower cost alternatives for consideration for viaduct replacement. Include the Transit + Streets approach, where all the available capacity in the transportation network is considered and employed to provide mobility in this corridor.

There are a number of obstacles to resolving the transportation issues in this corridor, and one of the greatest is DOT’s single minded insistence that no alternatives be considered acceptable unless they carry as many or more cars in the same space as the viaduct. Your refusal to fully examine other nearby streets and other means of transportation is shameful.

Thank you for your kind consideration of my comments.

Very truly yours,

Lee Daneker

3304 South Dose Terrace

Seattle WA 98144
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.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

NO Tunnel, I / We (me and the wife) want the Elevated Structure Alternative, its part of Seattle History and we all will end up sooner or later underground won't we ... no need to rush it
Hummmmmmmmmmm. Thank you ... Gary Davis 10702 39th Ave NE Seattle Wa. 98125
I-575-001
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that
would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface
roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without
a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way
would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than
the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs.
Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing
the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase
congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through
downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown
streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to
specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30
percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would
quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about
10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the
busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does
today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times
worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets
largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen
Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would
face longer commute times.

Dear Ms. Stenberg:

I am writing to express my support for the elimination of the Alaskan Way
Viaduct and for traffic to be rerouted elsewhere. Neither the tunnel option
nor the elevated option are fiscally or environmentally appropriate. My hope
is that the waterfront can be reclaimed in a more pedestrian-friendly way,
with the emphasis on ease of movement for mass transit as well. This seems
like the perfect opportunity for Washington State and the City of Seattle to
be more forward thinking in their approach to city planning, focusing less
on the primacy of the automobile, and saving crucial money as well.
Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Christine Deavel
2318 NE 105th St.
Seattle, WA 98125
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.
Midtown ramps would not be added to either of the tunnel alternatives due to geometric limitations. On- and off-ramps would be provided at S. Royal Brougham and S. Dearborn Street. Traffic exiting SR 99 would then use downtown streets to reach their destination. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes the current alternatives.

Removing the Columbia and Seneca Street ramps under the tunnel alternatives would help alleviate much of the congestion that is seen under existing conditions due to the redistribution of traffic accessing SR 99 to several east-west streets, rather than to a single street (Columbia Street).
In January 2007, at the urging of the Governor, the Seattle City Council voted to place two ballot proposals on the ballot for a special election held on March 13, 2007. The first advisory proposal called for an up-or-down vote on a hybrid tunnel alternative (with four lanes). The second advisory proposal called for an up-or-down vote on an elevated structure alternative. The election resulted in a rejection of both alternatives. Seattle voters rejected the elevated structure alternative by a 55 percent majority, and the City's four-lane tunnel alternative was opposed by a 70 percent majority.

After the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS was published, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative since the existing viaduct cannot be refurbished. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative.

The 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative have evaluated a lid in the Pike Place/Belltown area. The proposed lid would include direct access to the Pike Street Hillclimb as well as the Victor Steinbrueck Park. The lid structure is described in this Final EIS and in Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.
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.

The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city’s parking resources. SDOT’s studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking. Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures under consideration and refinement include:
• Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
• Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
• Implement electronic parking guidance system
• Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading activities
• Develop a Center City parking marketing program
• Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide frequent parking updates
• Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented by the Contractor

Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for additional information.

I-580-003
Comment noted. Under the Bored Tunnel Alternative, the Columbia Street and Seneca ramps will be removed. Access to downtown would be provided with the proposed Stadium Area ramps. The Bored Tunnel Alternative is anticipated to offer some improvement overall to traffic operations in the downtown area due to the redistribution of traffic accessing SR 99 to several east-west streets, rather than to a single street (Columbia Street). Please see the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report for updated analysis.

I-580-004
The bored tunnel would be located partially or completely below the water table along the entire alignment. The tunnel is being designed with tight joints between the concrete liner segments to restrict potential water leaks in the areas where the tunnel is closer to the water table. Long-term monitoring and maintenance of the tunnel liner would be performed
to evaluate whether openings are developing between the liner segments and whether groundwater seepage are occurring through the openings. If an opening is noted, grouting of the opening could be performed to mitigate potential groundwater seepage and migration of soil from behind the tunnel liner.

**I-580-005**

The cost estimates were developed taking into account the expected rates of inflation. The funding plan includes a variety of sources, including state, local, and federal funds.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your concern for the high cost of the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the Preferred Alternative. It would provide the City of Seattle with the opportunity to open up the waterfront for public use. The project would not change the City of Seattle zoning regulations that are required for any future development.

Comments: I think the tunnel is too expensive for Seattle at this time, although I would like to see our waterfront opened up for public use. I am suspicious that a tunnel will mainly serve developers and not the public at large. We need to fund public health clinics before we fund things like public buildings for yacht owners, stadiums & tunnels that serve developers.
The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-585-001

The people in the State of Washington need to stop being so short-sighted. Everyone wants nice public facilities, but no one wants to pay for them. All cities that work well at one point had to bite the bullet and pay for expensive projects that improved the quality of life for residents into the future. Now is such a time for Seattle. We cannot replace the viaduct with another above-ground eyesore. We must think to the future, value our open spaces and our views of the bay, and construct a tunnel.
I-586-001
The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. This structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.

The Final EIS considers tolling for all the proposed build alternatives.

I-586-002
Security is being addressed through design and discussions with the first responders (Police, Homeland Security, Fire Department, etc.). The operations and maintenance plan includes cost of staffing and maintaining the facility. Additional details regarding security expenses can be developed once the tunnel operator has been identified.
The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes the current construction approach for each of the build alternatives. Replacing the viaduct will be a major undertaking that will involve years of construction. The project area is constrained by natural features and a dense built environment. During construction of the new road and associated structures (tunnel or elevated), ramp and lane closures would reduce the amount of traffic that the corridor could accommodate.
One important trade-off between the alternatives is the ability to maintain traffic on SR 99. Construction of the Bored Tunnel Alternative would keep SR 99 open for all but about 3 weeks of its nearly 5.4-year construction period. The Elevated Structure would close SR 99 to all traffic for 5 to 7 months during its 10 year construction period. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would close SR 99 for the longest period of time during its 8.75-year construction period. This alternative would first close southbound SR 99 to traffic for 15 months before closing SR 99 in both directions for a period of 27 months. Then northbound SR 99 would be closed to traffic for an additional 12 months. During full closures, traffic would be detoured to parallel city streets and I-5. Chapter 6 of the Final EIS discusses the construction effects for each of the build alternatives.
Thank you for your comment regarding transit in the Alaskan Way corridor. Currently, transit bus and light rail transit service serve four stations in the vicinity of the project corridor (International District/Chinatown, Pioneer Square, University Street, and Westlake). The light rail service operates between Sea-Tac International Airport and downtown Seattle, with expansion planned to the Eastside, Snohomish County and Federal Way.

Additional transit options along the Alaskan Way corridor are outside the scope of this project. Further, such transit service additions would be the responsibility of the local transit agencies, such as King County Metro and Sound Transit.
Upgrades to I-5 are not included as part of this project or as mitigation. However, one of the major benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operation of the Alaskan Way Viaduct during construction. The only planned closure to the corridor would be for several weeks at the end of the construction period to connect the tunnel with the rest of SR 99. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities.

I-587-002
Are there upgrades to I-5 considered to more effectively move people through the downtown core?
Thank you for your suggestion. A lid connecting all the way up to the Battery Street Tunnel would be very costly, not only because of the distance, but because of the ventilation scheme required if the tunnel was extended all the way through the Battery Street Tunnel. Structurally supporting a lid in the area around the Elliott and Western Avenue ramps would be challenging because the right-of-way is extremely constrained in that location. A lid connecting the waterfront to Victor Steinbrueck Park is part of the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative discussed in the Final EIS.
As stated in Chapter 3 Question 10 and Chapter 6 Question 2 of the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, both the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives could be built under any of the three construction plans (the shorter, intermediate, or longer construction plan). Since 2006, the project has evolved. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

Numerous methods for replacing the seawall have been explored. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would replace the seawall with the outer wall of the tunnel from S. Washington Street up to Pine Street. From just north of Pine to Broad Street the seawall would be replaced by strengthening the soils and replacing the existing seawall with a new face panel and L-wall support structure. Under the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, the piers along the seawall would remain open for business with temporary access and utilities provided during the construction period.

No. If the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel or Elevated Structure Alternative is
selected, detours would be necessary to route traffic off of the viaduct at various times during construction. Restricting traffic access to the viaduct during construction gives construction crews unrestricted access to the facility, which shortens the project construction time and fosters workplace safety. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, operations on SR 99 would be maintained throughout the construction period, with the exception of a several-week closure during the end of construction to connect the tunnel with the remainder of SR 99.

A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities.

I-588-004
If the Elevated Structure Alternative is selected, the railing height will be per state standards in order to provide a safe and reliable deterrent to errant vehicles. Standard barrier heights vary from 2 feet 8 inches up to 3 feet 6 inches but are generally less than 3 feet. The height of the barrier will be set during final design.

I-588-005
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-588-006
I do not like the way the SDEIS options were presented. Linking shorter & intermediate times to tunnel and longer time to elevated is misleading to the casual observer. Next time, present the shorter & intermediate times for the elevated and the longer time for the tunnel. Better yet, present all 6: no need to appear biased.

I-588-007
With regard to the seawall, has repair been thought of only with the tunnel option, or have alternatives with less impact on the waterfront traffic been considered? It seems to me that using CAISONS (drydocks) a section (street block?) at a time would be a practical way to repair the seawall without closing the entire waterfront. Is a way still being looked at to rebuild/replace the elevated viaduct without having to reroute traffic more than a block or so at a time as in earlier ODT presentations? Has the structural integrity of buildings to the east of the viaduct right-of-way been studied as to how they would survive in an earthquake powerful enough to knock down the viaduct? If these buildings would also fail, there would probably be enough weight to collapse the trenched tunnel/seawall also. I'd rather take my chances on viaduct.

I-588-008
Are project engineers allowed to correct incomplete and misleading statements by Deputy Mayor Tim Ceis? Ceis acknowledges that fantastic views from the current viaduct are important to many Seattleites and visitors but tries to counteract this by claiming that federal safety standards such as the railing height would obstruct views for cars. I learned that minimum standard is 2'8" which would only be problem for sports cars.

I-588-009
The whole Seattle waterfront corridor needs the SR99 ELEVATED roadway. Taking the S4/S5 bus to downtown from West Seattle provides a spectacular view of thriving seaport unmatched by few if any cities in this country. Why take this view away from the common folk? 100,000+ people live within Seattle city limits. Probably less than 50,000 live downtown and less than that in the viaduct corridor view area. I thought government tries to provide the most benefit for the most people. Maybe the mayor really is innumerate. Or maybe money is more important than people.

People ask if we would build elevated roadway if it wasn't already there. That is wrong question. Seattle doesn't have to buy private property (as other cities would have to) to have viaduct so it is already much less expensive than starting anew.

Why the insistence on removing the viaduct rather than improving both the viaduct and the waterfront? To showcase our area for the 1962 World's Fair, Seattle didn't dig a Space Trench, but rather erected a Space Needle.

Why do I get the impression that certain city council members and the mayor want to replace the elevated structure with a tunnel at any cost? It seems that if tunnel cost $20 billion and elevated only $5 billion, that they would still vote for tunnel. When is practicality finally going to supercede questionable aesthetics (after all, beauty or ugliness is in the eye of the beholder)? The slogan "waterfront for people, not cars" seems to imply they want to get rid of waterfront businesses (and aquarium and ferries?) and replace with their grassy park as if it were just a backyard pond. I ask what is next, "waterfront for people, not ships"?

Finally, to use part of a quote on page 11 in the "Seattle Weekly" of 20September2006 about Martin Selig's Columbia Center by the late esteemed architect, Victor Steinbrueck, replacing an existing elevated roadway with a tunnel would be a "symbol of greed and egolism" and arrogance.

NO TUNNEL.

Harvey Friedman Seattle (206)784-2774

I-588-006
Please see the response to I-588-001 above.

I-588-007
Please see the response to I-588-002 above.

I-588-008
Please see the response to I-588-003 above.

I-588-009
It is likely that a severe earthquake would result in damage and the possible collapse of buildings immediately to the east of the existing viaduct between S. King Street and Pike Street. The collapse of these buildings could potentially impact an elevated structure built in the place of the existing structure. As the Bored Tunnel Alternative would be well below the building foundations, it is not thought that the collapse of any of these buildings would affect the tunnel.

I-588-010
Please see the response to I-588-004 above.

I-588-011
Please see the response to I-588-005 above.
I-589-001

Improvements north of the Battery Street Tunnel are a part of all three build alternatives discussed in the Final EIS, and they vary depending on the alternative. In general, Thomas and Harrison Streets would be modified to cross above SR 99 and Mercer Street would be widened and converted to a two-way street. Depending on the alternative, SR 99 would be below grade or at grade. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes the improvements north of the Battery Street Tunnel for each build alternative and their construction cycles. These improvements would greatly enhance connections between the South Lake Union neighborhood and the lower Queen Anne neighborhood.
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.

I-590-001

Please add another alternative - repairing the existing structure. Any money saved should go toward other regional transportation projects.
Thank you for your comments. 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.

The views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Olympic Mountains are prized by many. Views are currently enjoyed by motorists and passengers traveling on the upper deck of the existing viaduct. However, the views for motorists and pedestrians using downtown streets in the vicinity of the waterfront are interrupted by the existing viaduct structure. The aerial structure is considered by some to be a substantial visual intrusion as well as a source of noise and shadow for the Pioneer Square Historic District and the Central Waterfront. Impacts to views are discussed in the Final EIS and considered in detail in Appendix D, Visual Quality Discipline Report.
accommodations. It needs reinforcement, and surfacing which would alleviate most of the vehicular stress and cosmetic objections.

The view would be retained on behalf of ALL and the danger of flood eliminated. A seawall is vital to the city, but does not necessitate compromising our best working transportation artery of Seattle.

Spokane Street Viaduct similarly needs resurfacing to reduce vehicular bouncing, by the way.

Thanks for reading this.
Ellen Gaynor
ellen.gaynor@gmail.com
425-222-7374

~~~~~~~~~
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle considered many issues when selecting the preferred alternative, including addressing the seismic deficiencies, mobility for all modes of transportation in the corridor, supporting land use plans, supporting the environment, as well as construction and operational costs.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

Thank you for your input on the design concepts. Several of the components you mentioned, such as SR 99 traveling under Elliott and Western Avenues, are a part of the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, which is one of the three build alternatives discussed in the Final EIS.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

The project would include a bus-only ramp on northbound SR 99 between S. Holgate Street and S. Royal Brougham Way. Bus-only lanes would also be provided at the north end. The project also would connect the street grid in the south and north ends of the corridor thereby enhancing access to transit and potentially added transit coverage. The City of Seattle’s Central Waterfront Project could potentially identify further transit improvements, particularly along Alaskan Way.
Replacing the current elevated roadway with a tunnel is a waste of added time and money. The elevated roadway is a symbol of Seattle as much as the Space Needle, and a much more useful one. It is one of the most scenic drives along the city skyline a night that I have ever experienced. The tunnel is nothing more than an attempt by greedy land developers and politicians to open more space for their political contributors to develop. Replacing the elevated roadway with anything other than another elevated roadway destroys the cityscape, plays into special interests, and creates a major deterrence, both economic and visual, to the City of Seattle and the State of Washington. I am a voter and I say keep the viaduct a elevated road way. Besides legal challenges and political action can keep the tunnel from ever starting. I will volunteer to stop any tunnel project for decades if need be. It is that important.

Thank you for your time in listening to my input and view on this issue.

Rev. David C. Green
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

We acknowledge that a tunnel alternative has the potential to significantly increase public and private revenue. The Final EIS will include qualitative economic analysis of the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative to more fully describe the project's indirect benefits. However, quantitative estimates of indirect benefits are beyond the scope of project-related analysis.

We agree with your emphasis on integrating transportation demand management (TDM), and cost reduction with project planning. TDM has been an integral part of the project's planning and design. For example the Project Transportation Team, consisting of representatives of the three lead agencies and project team staff, was created to help coordinate and counsel on transportation planning and analysis for the project. Staff members from local and regional transportation agencies—including Sound Transit, King County Metro, the WSDOT Urban Corridors Office and Office of Transit Mobility, Washington State Ferries, City of Seattle, FHWA, and Community Transit—participated in this effort. As part of this effort, the TDM subcommittee was formed to support the Project Transportation Team, focusing on developing TDM strategies that will help enhance project related mobility.

Like TDM, the consideration of cost has been an integral part of project
planning and design, and evaluation of alternatives will continue to focus on demonstrating cost-effectiveness.

The Final EIS considers tolling for all the proposed build alternatives.

I-596-003

Thank you for your comment. The Western and Elliott Avenue ramps will be removed for the Bored Tunnel Alternative. For the Elevated and Cut-and-Cover Alternatives, three lanes are proposed in each direction south of the Elliott Avenue on-ramp in order to safely accommodate the expected future traffic forecasted for the design year of 2030. Similar to today, approximately 20 to 25 percent of all southbound traffic traveling along the viaduct enters the corridor at the southbound Elliott on-ramp.

Three travel lanes are needed to accommodate the traffic coming from the Battery Street Tunnel as well as those entering the corridor via the southbound Elliott on-ramp.

I-596-004

The Bored Tunnel Alternative, selected by the lead agencies as the preferred alternative, is a four-lane option.

I-596-005

Not included in the DEIS, but also important is the need to prepare a long-term “Corridor Management Agreement and Plan” for the SR 99 corridor between WSDOT and with adjacent public agencies and the major employers, whose users/employees must use the AWV corridor. The goal is to achieve a sustainable corridor. We manage other scarce public services such as energy through financial incentives and WSDOT’s staff have prepared Corridor Management plans for other state highway such as I-90 and SR 520 to manage and reduce the corridor’s auto trips. Developing a Sustainable Corridor Plan, would start with using the “lessons learned” from the implementation of the city and WSDOT’s Construction Mitigation Plan, and build on it. Regular monitoring of the system’s performance is needed to ensure that the overall corridor (i.e. stays at level), to meet performance objectives of the corridor. This oversight will ensure that the adjacent land uses, and future development and traffic counts and comprehensive oversight is consistent and compatible with WSDOT’s SR 99 Corridor Management Agreement, and coordinated with the city of Seattle’s Waterfront Plan. Monitoring will also indicate the clues to making changes needed for maintaining the trip reduction strategies and adjacent land uses and surface transit routes, bike, and pedestrian paths to support and to reinforce a healthy, pedestrian-friendly Waterfront community as well as a sustainable SR 99 corridor. State highways need to implement concurrency fee plan to gain funding for their facilities, and not be exempt from this GMA transportation funding technique.

The Viaduct replacement must be a positive contribution to revitalizing the city waterfront and region and to increasing the region’s advantage as an internationally economically successful and competitive seaport.

1. Is the south end of the Viaduct from Spokane Street north bisecting the rail yards damaged to the point that it also needs immediate replacement now? Or can it be “Phased” into segments, to complete when more funds from tolls or other revenue are available?

2. Could the first Phase of SR 99 begin with the section from north from the SR 99 connection with SR 519 to the Battery Street tunnel, to replace the most earthquake-damaged area?

The conflict between Seattle and the Port over new freight connection/access from the south part of SR 99 onto SR 519 connecting with I-5 or I-50 need to be resolved. The benefits of the rebuilt SR 99 to the Port need to be calculated. If they are higher than the $200 million that have said they will contribute, they should be asked to pay more of the share of the project. The section the Port needs could be built with their funds now so that freight trucks can use the new interchange connector from SR 99 to access SR 519. If the southern section were delayed, this interchange could be built early in the construction schedule, and this project would help to mitigate problems caused during the later construction of the northern segment of SR 99, for a number of other corridors. Assisting the freight train yards and movement of all freight to and from our seaport should be done too, but isn’t as critical.
The approaches and interchanges on the south end of the project corridor are integral to the structure, function, and construction process of the project and cannot be phased.

The construction approaches discussed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS have been updated. An additional construction plan was also evaluated for the Bored Tunnel Alternative in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. Details about the Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure construction plans are presented in Chapters 3 and 6 of the Final EIS and Appendix B, Alternatives Description and Construction Methods Discipline Report.

Thank you for your comment. To determine the design of the stadium interchange, the project team has been working with lead agencies including the City of Seattle and the Port of Seattle, along with representatives from the freight community, the Mariners, and the Seahawks. The proposed Stadium Area design can be found in Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, of the Final EIS. Ramp options in the stadium area are extremely limited due in part to the railroad tracks (i.e., SIG yard) just south of Massachusetts Street. Also, the need to serve the largest generators effectively (Port of Seattle, Safeco Field, Qwest Field, etc.) was a significant factor in determining where to place the ramps.

WSDOT and the other lead agencies are working to reduce the cost of the project while still providing good value for the public. The higher cost estimate is largely due to higher inflation in major construction than in the other sectors of the economy.
The Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project is coordinating with the City of Seattle’s waterfront planning efforts. If the viaduct was replaced by a tunnel, large areas of open space would become available. This new space could be converted into a variety of new uses like a waterfront promenade, bike and pedestrian paths, and expanded streetcar service. Also, 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.

One of the main benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operations on SR 99 throughout the construction period. Current construction plans call for a relatively short (several-week) closure during the end of construction to connect the tunnel with the remainder of SR 99. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities.

The Waterfront Coalition. If the choice is between the Elevated and the No-build options, we would very reluctantly select the No-build as our second choice, if funding is limited for only to the elevated SR 99 option.

Even though the columns on the proposed elevated alternative are spaced wider apart, the elevated roadway would be 50% wider and the columns would be 100% larger. The higher, solid side rails of the roadway would block the views from the viaduct of Puget Sound and other scenery. It should not be an option.

Both proposed SR 99 options would connect with SR 520 a major north/south truck freight corridor from and to I-5 South near Tukwila, if it is extended with RTID funds.

The “tunnel” alternative opens up new economic opportunities on the waterfront as a more inviting tourist destination, and would increase property values, and therefore the city and state annual collection of sales and property taxes.

Any option selected for the Waterfront should be a public tool used to implement the planned for long-term waterfront development goals. Remember a transportation facility is not an end in itself. Therefore we urge that it be designed to improve the quality of life and livability of Seattle and help to jointly meet the city and state’s growth management policies and goals and the needs of future generations. We need to build it right, or tear it down and manage to live without it!

Thanks you for the excellent, succinct and clearly written and presented SDEIS on the SR 99 plans and future alternatives. It meets SEPA and NEPA guidelines very well, just as did your first award winning 2004 AW DEIS. We urge you to work to expedite the funding issues and the decision-making, and include involvement and communication with the public about your progress and problems, so that this project is built as soon as possible.

cc: Mayor Greg Nickels
File:AW5DEISComments91906
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
The project has endeavored to make current, accurate information available to the news media; however, we cannot control their coverage or content.

From: Mike Haggard
To: AWV SDEIS Comments
CC:
Subject: Cost of Options
Date: Friday, August 18, 2006 12:40:25 PM
Attachments:

Please get with the news media and do a campaign that explains that about 2/3 of the cost for each option is required for elements that are common to all option, i.e. replacing the sea wall and the connection to the 520 bridge. In addition, do a very good job to explain how much is being required, spent to maintain traffic flow through the city during construction.

These are issues that have a major impact on how the voters perceive the options and cost of the project. And I can not stress enough that the voters need to know how they are going to get to work during construction and what the cost for maintaining traffic flow is.

Come on people. Communicate the whole story.

I think if people know that the sea wall has to be replaced even if we do nothing with the viaduct, and that the connecting to 520 has to be worked with all options, most of the voters will think as I do that the tunnel with a waterfront part area will be the best alternative; investment for the future of the city.

Wm. H. "Mike" Haggard, Jr.
The 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS have considered the Gates Foundation site that is scheduled to open in the Spring of 2011. The lead agencies have been coordinating with the Gates Foundation and the alignment of Sixth Avenue N. with the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative, curves around the west side of this property, and all call for building out Sixth Avenue. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has purchased the property for constructing its new global headquarters, which should be a significant architectural addition to the Seattle Center area.
I-600-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Current data on global warming and possible sea level increases are being used to ensure that the tunnel would be protected from rising sea levels. The Final EIS Summary Chapter contains updated information on funding for the preferred alternative.

Inasmuch as the extra cost of replacing the Alaska Way viaduct with a tunnel rather than an elevated road similar to the existing structure, which will benefit few other than Seattle property owners, I believe the entire cost should be born by Seattle. Not a dime should come from the state, the federal government or King County.

The public three times voted FOR a monorail (before it was rejected over a financial fiasco) thus showing the public’s acceptance of elevated transportation. But our state’s Department of Transportation ignored the signal and is giving us a light rail system with tunnels, at greater cost per mile, although light rail never faced a vote on its own. It was part of a large package like a congressional pork item.

If global warming continues and the sea rises as environmentalists predict, how long will the tunnel below sea level survive?

Seattle’s waterfront now works. It has worthy
attractions, which will not suffer much from a direct viaduct replacement – or an adequate repair job.

Mayor Nickels wants to make a monument to his administration like the Seattle Library which may be grand but added great cost that did nothing to improve its function as a library. Seattle chose Nickels; let Seattle and its waterfront property owners who hope to benefit from the extravagant tunnel system, pay ALL the cost for his monument.

**I do not wish to ride or drive in any tunnels.**

I have written my state and federal representatives with these comments.

Spencer M. Higley
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Thank you for your suggestions. The final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle as a separate project. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

During construction of the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel or Elevated Structure Alternatives temporary vehicle access bridge between Pier 48 and Colman Dock would be needed to facilitate ferry operations during construction. This bridge would be removed when construction is completed.
I-602-001
One of the main benefits of the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operations on SR 99 throughout the construction period. Current construction plans call for a relatively short (several week) closure during the end of construction to connect the tunnel with the remainder of SR 99. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes the construction plans for each build alternative, and Chapter 6 summarizes construction effects. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.

I-602-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

---

From: milhorst@w-link.net
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
CC: 
Subject: Viaduct Replacement Comments
Date: Thursday, September 07, 2006 10:06:53 AM
Attachments:

It is imperative that we give priority to maintaining traffic on SR 99 during construction. My wife and I live in West Seattle, and SR 99 provides our primary access to downtown Seattle. My wife commutes daily on the Metro express buses that use the viaduct, and her commute would be significantly lengthened if the viaduct were closed.

Let me also express our strong preference for the elevated solution. Only this alternative preserves the downtown access via Columbia and Seneca streets that we desperately need.

Thanks,

Milton & Gertrud Horst
10118 44th Ave. SW
Seattle, WA 98146
I-603-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle are working together to make progress on the project. Since the publication of the Supplemental Draft EIS in 2006, the lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please see the Final EIS for current project information.

---

From: Ron Jay
To: AWV SDEIS Comments;
CC: 
Subject: viaduct
Date: Friday, August 18, 2006 11:55:40 AM
Attachments:

I am getting very tired of hearing about what should or shouldn’t be done to save hundreds or maybe thousands of lives. Is there anyone who really cares about correcting a serious problem which eventually will affect the entire region.

You better start talking about the emergency relief plan that will be needed when the structure collapses and human life will be ended.

I drive home on it everyday and if the majority of the people who can’t make decisions used the viaduct on a regular basis, I’m sure a decision would of been made by now and work would be under way.

It’s a sorry situation when people can’t work together to resolve a very serious issue.

Ron
I-604-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-604-002

One of the main benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operations on SR 99 throughout the construction period. Current construction plans call for a relatively short (several week) closure during the end of construction to connect the tunnel with the remainder of SR 99. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities. The current mitigation list does not include the construction of a park-and-ride lot in West Seattle. Current City of Seattle policy does not promote the construction of park-and-ride lots within the city limits.
Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored or cut-and-cover tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. Emergency exits would be provided approximately every 650 feet. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect a tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

Dear Ms. Kate Stenberg,

I hope that the Transit + Streets approach could be reconsidered for the Viaduct, as it is more affordable and environmentally friendly. I am concerned that the money could be more wisely spent for transit and transportation demand management, as well as for bicycles, pedestrians, and freight mobility. I am very concerned about global warming, and this alternative would cause less emissions.

I think it is very telling that the tunnel and elevated proposals would have the Construction Management Traffic Management Plan, and think that whatever solutions proposed for the construction time could be extended and enhanced over time into the Transit + Streets proposal. I urge you to get started on that plan immediately, as the viaduct is unsafe. I believe you may know about the expert report from the Congress for the New Urbanism:


They conclude that the analysis of traffic capacity and needs by WSDOT is inadequate, and strongly recommend more work on the Transit + Streets approach.

I hope you will take this opportunity to examine the Transit + Streets approach again.

Sincerely yours,
Margaret Kitchell
1410 E. Pine St, #312
Seattle WA 98122
206-324-3522 home
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
One of the main benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operations on SR 99 throughout the construction period. Current construction plans call for a relatively short (several week) closure during the end of construction to connect the tunnel with the remainder of SR 99. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction transportation mitigation activities. Several of these mitigation actions would stay in operation after construction has been completed and would provide longer term benefits. Separate from this project, WSDOT is looking into ways to improve traffic flow along I-5, and the City of Seattle is working on the Central Waterfront Project. Both of these projects will consider access for all types of transportation modes throughout the Seattle area.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does.
today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-608-001

From: Karen Lang
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
CC: 
Subject: Alaska Way Viaduct Project
Date: Friday, August 18, 2006 12:27:32 PM
Attachments:

Dear Sirs,

I have, with keen interest, been closely watching the debate over what to do with the viaduct. As a new resident of Seattle, I have lived here for just 5 years, originating from London, I am appalled at the traffic conditions and overall state of the downtown roads. I thought London was bad, and indeed it is, but Seattle is much smaller.

Seattle is, in my opinion, beginning to look a little shabby. On top of this, we have a structure that is, for all intents and purposes, becoming more unsafe and congested, as time passes. This, of course, is the viaduct, plus it is ugly and an eye sore.

Admittedly I do not commute using Alaska Way and I am sure that more traffic congestion is the last thing that most Seattle residents want. However, as has been seen in the past with other proposed transportation projects, the Seattle residents, can at times, be a little short sighted and closed minded. The monorail project is a good example.

A cut and cover new Alaskan Way is the way to go. Oh my goodness, what an instant uplift on the aesthetics of the city whilst providing more traffic lanes and safety in the event of an earthquake. Our waterfront pales in comparison to other US cities waterfront areas. We need to invest $$$ on the waterfront and by ridding ourselves of that concrete monstrosity is a step in the right direction.

I have been witness to and subject to the traffic delays of a cut and cover tunnel whilst living in my bone area. There is an old English town, Wanstead London E11, that was "in the way" of the new A406 extension from West London to East London. The proposal was to extend the road to ease congestion, but it went straight through this old English village, complete with couple of hundred year old Oak tree that had stood the test of time.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
It is astounding what modern architecture, structural and civil design engineers can achieve. You would never know that tunnel is there, they even saved the Oak tree. Wanstead looks exactly like it used to, if not better, because the traffic that is heading to Central London no longer cuts straight through this residential village in the suburbs of London.

Seattle residents need to actually see this kind of enhancement for their own eyes to fully appreciate what you are proposing with the cut and cover option. Perhaps you could present a slide show of what was done in Wanstead to ease their minds. For once, I believe that common sense, safety and aesthetics should prevail. If you have the budget and the dollars for the cut and cover, go for it, please, please please.

The cut and cover tunnel will provide leisure areas as well as retail, it will open up the views our wonderful city and potentially be the start of a re-vamping of our waterfront.

I totally support the cut and cover option. I wish I could do more to show the residents of Seattle that it is the way to go. A little disruption in the short time for much longer term gain.

Yours faithfully,

Karen Lang

Karen Lang
Senior Vice President
Strategic Resources

(425) 688-1151 ext 104

(206) 372-4428 mobile
klytton-lang@strategicresources.com
www.strategicresources.com

This e-mail is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It may contain information that is confidential and/or legally privileged. All candidates are submitted on a for fee basis. If you believe that it has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by someone other than the intended recipient is prohibited.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments supporting the shorter construction period. Please see Chapter 6 of the Final EIS for current information about the construction plan proposed for each build alternative.

From: Dave Leaf
To: Kucharski, Margaret
Subject: RE: viaduct
Date: Wednesday, July 26, 2006 10:03:47 AM

I probably should have added to my statement that I live downtown (Belltown) so I am directly impacted by the project. I am not an outsider who doesn't venture into Seattle once a year. I commute from Seattle to Renton and back every Monday thru Friday.

Thanks, dave

From: Dave Leaf [mailto:Dave.Leaf@PACCAR.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2006 9:22 AM
To: AWV SDEIS Comments
Subject: viaduct

Closing the viaduct during construction will certainly be interesting. I think it is best to do this to shorten the length of construction and it will also have the added benefit of forcing people to look for other ways (commute) to get around besides their vehicles. With the high price of gas, greenhouse gases, etc I don’t see how this could all be bad in the long run.

Thanks for letting me comment,
dave leaf
dleafsr@yahoo.com
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize that you do not prefer a tunnel alternative.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe alternative. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect the tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.

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.

Compared to the current viaduct and the Elevated Structure Alternative, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative and preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative would have fewer noise impacts. See Chapter 5 of the Final EIS and Appendix F, Noise Discipline Report, for more information on noise impacts.

I-610-003
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.

I-610-004
Implementing parking lots within the city is restricted by policy and ordinance. However, the project is investigating a number of parking mitigation strategies that are described in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.

Public transit is an important part of the city's long-range transportation future. Today, the central part of Seattle, including downtown area, is
served by an extensive network of bus services and commuter rail. In 2009, Central Link Light Rail began service between downtown and the airport. A local streetcar line operates in the South Lake Union area. Implementation of bus rapid transit services into downtown from West Seattle, Ballard, and North Seattle has begun. In summary, public transit services are plentiful today, but will be much more in the future.

Finally, shutting down the downtown core to most auto traffic may not be feasible to maintain a vibrant downtown. While the city is encouraging more people to use transit, bike, carpool, or vanpool, there will still be a need to provide for short-term access for autos to maintain commercial and business activities.
I-611-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments and recognize your preference for the longer construction plan. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the construction plan for each proposed build alternative.

I-611-002
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.

I-611-003
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the
taxpayers” enjoy the views from our viaduct and consider the ride on the structure to be one of the enjoyments and benefits of living in this dense urban environment. I guarantee that the preferred route of driving out of town visitors into Seattle (from our airport) is the Alaskan Way Viaduct.

A tunnel (no matter the method of its construction) will benefit only those affluent downtown property owners whose views will be unobstructed, the majority of our populace will find it unmanageable, unaffordable and inconvenient to access the waterfront and the plazas that are proposed—when parking meters are removed and expensive parking lots are our only option except for public buses. Many of us will be unable to afford downtown “amenities” because we will be struggling to pay the huge property taxes used to finance extravagant projects such as:

- A Tunnel (b) a 2-way Mercer St. (with Valley Street closed to cars or having reduced lanes) (c) A lowered Aurora with connections that will primarily benefit the rich developers of the South Lake Union area.

You have a picture of a part of our current viaduct—what’s covered with greenery and provides an attractive visual image as a person looks down Alaskan Way.

Engineer a new viaduct in a way to allow for its coverage in vegetation so that the structure itself can be “park-like” and enhance our environment.

I am adamantly opposed to any tunnel option.

A two-way Mercer if Valley Street is to be diminished in any way for auto passage, a short construction corridor that creates maximum impacts and to a recessed Aurora with overpasses (if a tunnel is built).

The financial, aesthetic (loss of Puget Sound views to most citizens) and quality of life impacts of a tunnel are negative for most of Seattle’s taxpayers. The worries and uncertainties of how a tunnel would withstand a major environmental disaster (earthquake/tsunami) would also impact people’s decision on whether to use and support a tunnel.

Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

Any enhancement in property values that may occur would take place after the construction period. And because construction would be completed several years in the future, it is difficult to predict events and condition at that time. Economic conditions are often one of the strongest influences on market values, and these conditions may vary greatly from one year to another. If for example, the Seattle area economy continues to decline substantially as the viaduct is being replaced, completion of the project would likely have less immediate influence on the price of real estate. Because of all the considerations that go into the purchase of property, the EIS does not speculate on how the project might influence the value of land or buildings in the area.

Parking along Alaskan Way will be determined by the City of Seattle’s Central Waterfront Project. The city has allocated money to address mitigation for parking; see Chapter 8 of the Final EIS for details.

Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Although replacing the viaduct with a new elevated structure would provide scenic views for motorists passing through the waterfront area, it would also cause serious impacts to views for people down below on the waterfront and in nearby business, retail, and residential areas. The elevated structure would block views of the waterfront and the Seattle skyline, and the height, width, and scale of the elevated structure would make it a dominant part of the view for people at ground level. Planting vegetation on the proposed structure would only partially mitigate these impacts.
The preferred Bored Tunnel and Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives are a safe alternatives. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake, because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

Both tunnels would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided approximately every 650 feet in the tunnel. Project engineers have studied current data on global warming and possible sea level rise and concluded that the seawall provides enough room to protect either tunnel from rising sea levels. The engineers also considered the possible threat of tsunamis during the design process.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
use goals, nor guide development accordingly, now that the bypass is set in concrete.

Following these widely respected, progressive planning guidelines, I am certain that the light rail tunnel extension to Husky Stadium and further north is a mistake. The best route north from downtown may actually be the Express lanes of I-5, which was their original intent. Those who adamantly think otherwise, do not understand the principles based upon which I make this claim. It bothers me that my efforts always seemed to fall on deaf ears.

Art Lewellan
1020 NW 9th
Portland Oregon
author, "The Seattle Circulator Plan"

*blacklisted in Seattle*
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
yet if I were a guessing man, I'd venture there's a significant overlap between these people and those who vociferously demanded the construction of two stadium facilities for 700 million dollars, facilities used but a few times each year by a select group. Further, any discussion of cost must necessarily address overall economic impact, and it is transparently clear that removing the viaduct would lead to a tremendous amount of waterfront development and greatly increased tax base, while simultaneously blessing all future generations with a much finer city. This is a no-brainer; it is unimaginable that a repeat of the viaduct urban tragedy is even being considered as a viable option. A tunnel option is the only reasonable one, and Mayor Nickels deserves admiration in these cynical and political times for being willing to put his name behind this. Anything short of a tunnel would be a mindless tragedy.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

The lead agencies recognize that businesses along the central waterfront, Western Avenue, and Pioneer Square rely on the short-term parking in the area. The City of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), in coordination with the project, has conducted parking studies as part of the process to develop mitigation strategies and better manage the city’s parking resources. SDOT’s studies identified a number of strategies to offset the loss of short-term parking in this area, including new or leased parking and the increased utilization of existing parking. Although the mitigation measures would be most needed during construction, many of them could be retained and provide benefits over the longer term. Specific parking mitigation strategies have not yet been determined, but the project has allocated $30 million for parking mitigation. The parking mitigation strategies will continue to evolve in coordination with the project and community partners. Parking measures under consideration and refinement include:

- Encourage shift from long-term parking to short-term parking
- Provide short-term parking (off-street), especially serving waterfront piers, downtown retail, and other heavy retail/commercial corridors
- Implement electronic parking guidance system
- Provide alternate opportunities to facilitate commercial loading activities
• Develop a Center City parking marketing program
• Use existing and new social media and blog outlets to provide frequent parking updates
• Establish a construction worker parking policy that is implemented by the Contractor

Refer to the Parking Mitigation during Construction section in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Appendix C of the Final EIS) for additional information.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

The preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is a safe option. Generally, structural engineers agree that tunnels are one of the safest places to be during an earthquake because the tunnel moves with the earth. No Seattle tunnels were damaged during the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, including the Mt. Baker and Mercer Island I-90 tunnels, Battery Street Tunnel, Third Avenue Bus Tunnel, and Burlington Northern Tunnel.

The bored tunnel would be built to current seismic standards, which are considerably more stringent than what was in place when the viaduct was built in the early 1950s. The bored tunnel design includes improving...
relatively soft, liquefiable soils found near the south tunnel portal. Emergency exits would be provided every 650 feet in the tunnel. In addition, current data on global warming and possible sea level rise are being used in the design process to ensure that the tunnel would be protected from rising sea levels and the possible threat of tsunamis.
I-616-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on a surface option. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Hi Kristy, I vote for a tunnel. 50 years ago Seattle made a mistake by putting an ugly eyesore on it's waterfront. Now it's our chance to right that wrong, and building a tunnel is the right decision. Although the tunnel option costs about a billion dollars more, it's definitely a wise investment that will reap great returns in the future. I'm 20 years old, and 50 years from now I'd love to be able to say that I was there when Seattle began a new era in city beautification. I'm a conservative who looks for all opportunities to cut taxes, but this is one project where I wouldn't mind the extra cost if necessary. If we can spend nearly a billion dollars on our stadiums (which was a waste), why can't we spend another billion on a project that will actually benefit every Seattleite?

Thanks, Chris Maynard
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

I-619-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

I-619-001

Please do not hold a vote at this time on the viaduct alternatives. Neither of the two options is affordable. It is an excessive expenditure of billions of dollars for a very limited amount of roadway, which does NOT include a public transportation system. More roads, inevitably, lead to more automobile congestion. It's a never-ending scenario. We need to identify new alternatives Seattle can afford, and I support a Transit + Streets proposal that invests in transit, improves multiple street interchanges, and reclaims the waterfront. It is affordable and will finally get Seattle 'moving' on the mass transit front. The Viaduct will be closed anyway, for several years, and it will become clearly apparent where that traffic goes, and where new and reconfigured interchanges and transit will be the best solution. In addition, from a broader perspective, a viaduct, or tunnel, does not serve a large enough percentage of the population to justify the expense. Transit and Streets is a more equitable solution for everyone.

Both the tunnel plan and the replacement plan are obscenely costly, and it still leaves Seattle without a viable public transit system. The taxpayers, who will ultimately foot the bill for this, should at least be given the Transit & Streets option in any vote about this issue. Please do NOT put this vote forth with only these two astronomically expensive choices. Streets and Transit MUST be included in the voting options.

Sincerely,
Karen Merola
I-620-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Several concepts were considered that would construct a bridge over Elliott Bay as an alternative to reconstructing the viaduct in its current location. However, these concepts were screened out for several reasons:

- A bridge over Elliott Bay would restrict navigation within Elliott Bay, which would affect both the Port of Seattle’s container terminal operations and the Washington State Ferry operations at Colman Dock.
- Obtaining the necessary permits for in-water bridge construction would be extremely difficult.
- The bridge concept has visual quality impacts that are not consistent with the City’s existing land use and shoreline plans.

Adjacent property owners could potentially receive indirect economic benefits associated with increased property values and increased potential for redevelopment. The City of Seattle may consider a Local Improvement District (LID) in the future but it is not part of this project. The tax structure that the City of Seattle chooses to implement is not the purview of WSDOT or any of its projects. We encourage you to contact your City Council to discuss these types of issues related property taxes.
Although the viaduct is eligible for historic designation, the structure is weak in many places, including the frames, columns, foundations, and soil under the structure. The lead agencies have extensively studied various retrofitting concepts. All of these concepts fail to provide a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the weakened state of the viaduct.

Construction impacts to the bulk of downtown Seattle will revolve primarily around the increase in congestion as traffic is displaced from the immediate corridor and is absorbed on the surface street network. By extension, this would impact the residents of West Seattle that typically use the Alaskan Way corridor but would be forced to use alternative routes. The increase in congestion will have a resultant loss in productivity, which is discussed in the Economics Discipline Report, Appendix L, of the Final EIS as a cost of congestion.

It is anticipated that Water Taxi service would be maintained during project construction. However, please note that the Water Taxi is operated by King County.

It is not within Seattle's authority to regulate working hours.

The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. The City of Seattle is already planning for the
replacement of the seawall under the Elliott Bay Seawall Project. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

I-623-006
Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project if the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment.

However, if another build alternative is selected, the new seawall would be located either landward of, or at the same location as the existing seawall. This would result in an increase in shallow water habitat in the project area, compared to the alternatives analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. In addition to this increase in shallow water habitat, the improvements to the quality of stormwater runoff from SR 99 as a result of the project is expected to provide some benefit to the aquatic and wildlife species that occupy or rely on the aquatic environment of Elliott Bay and Lake Union.
I-624-001

We can get the job done in less than 1/3 the time and cost. And it will care for a lot of the problems that have been brought up in the past while doing so. Let’s get started.

Starting from the South end of the current Alaska Way Viaduct, drop the whole structure to the ground. Then starting from the south end, build a connection of rail from the current area up thought the rubble using two machines to pick up the rubble and place them on rail equipment to be hauled away to a land fill.

When you get to the North end, the rail will be there for now a ”trench dig” going South this time using digging equipment. Making an open trench as wide and high that is needed for the roadway. At the same time, off site, have the sides and bottom made into sections (like was done for the Tacoma Bridge this summer). As the North end dig becomes completed moving South, have the off site U frame shipped in and placed into the open trench. The U frame system will also act as the waterfront bulkhead solving that problem.

As the North end going South is finished placed, then a top can be placed onto the U and the street level plans can be started. In doing so, you will start to get going North to South the use of the area again.

The key is to work from North to South and the rail system used, open ditch digging is easy and fast and the building of the structure off site saves time.
and $$$ You will also have the area in the South end when work is started still in use by the ferry for it will be cleared land and only a rail to drive over. As the work proceeds South, then the cross over can move a little north over the new covered over part.

You can contact me at:

Stafford-Ames Morse
12522 Corliss Ave N
Seattle, Wash 98133
I-625-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Name: Gail Nagy
Address: 1525 NW 57th St, Unit #327
City: Seattle State: WA Zip: 98107
E-mail Address: gail.nagy@comcast.com
Affiliation (optional):

I-625-001 Comments: Please add me to your mailing list. I want a viaduct rebuild, absolutely no tunnel. After discussing this project during the 9/13 meeting in Ballard, I would prefer the 7 yr plan. The cost of a tunnel is prohibitive, I don't like the idea of losing parking near the waterfront (under and near the viaduct). I am having trouble using this laptop, I will study at home AND e-mail you (from papers I picked up tonight).
The videos are intended to give viewers an idea of what the proposed alternatives would look like and are not a tool to evaluate traffic operations or impacts. Several other models and methodologies were used to evaluate traffic operations effects for each build alternative. Updated descriptions of the methodology and analysis tools used, as well as the expected traffic effects for each alternative, are shown in the updated Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS.

Lighting that is consistent with current lighting and safety standards will be provided for each build alternative.

The Elevated Structure Alternative described in the 2006 Supplemental Draft and Final EIS has a similar look to the existing viaduct because it is a stacked aerial structure. However, the Elevated Structure Alternative would be designed to current earthquake standards and would be larger, with wider lanes and shoulders, than the existing viaduct. Please see the Final EIS for current information about each build alternative for this project.

A few of the Roman aqueducts and roadways, constructed approximately 2,000 years ago, are still standing – though not in areas subject to strong earthquakes. The Roman arch was essentially a gravity structure and relied on the compressive strength of the rock utilized for the arch. These structures were not capable of resisting tension such as that imposed by the shaking of an earthquake. With the advent of concrete and steel reinforcing, structures are able to resist much higher tensile and compressive loads than those carried by Roman Arches.
The final design and aesthetic for the tunnel will comply with current design standards so that the tunnel will be visually safe for drivers.

Please see the response to comment I-626-001 above.
I-627-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comment. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative, which would be designed with emergency exits every 650 feet and equipped with ventilation, a fire detection and suppression system, and drainage. If the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives is selected, this tunnel would be equipped with similar safety features. Please see the Final EIS for more information about the safety measures proposed for this alternative and current project information.

From: MIKE T SANDE NOBLE [mailto:nobleworks2@msn.com]  
Sent: Friday, September 08, 2006 11:53 AM  
To: WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct  
Subject: No Tunnel

I-627-001

NO !! to the tunnel !! What a disaster in an emergency !!

2 Taxpayers
Sound Transit constructed the Central Link light rail line in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel, which opened in 2009. Sound Transit is working on extensions to this initial light rail segment.

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
need to be completed, but the additional costs of a tunnel or a raised viaduct are not worth it. By making a tough decision and saving money on this project, a true regional plan can take shape. The introduction of north/south and east/west mass transit options would lessen the need for new roadways.

Having lived and worked in the city of Boston, I’ve seen first hand the effects that the Big Dig project had on that city, from a day-to-day travel standpoint and by viewing the rift that was created between the government and its citizens. For years, politicians and planners in Boston promised a transformed urban metropolis which would be worth the high cost overruns and years of delay. Today, the city is transformed, but at a high cost, including the loss of innocent life due to lapses in oversight and shoddy construction. Seattle must learn from the mistakes of others: that while raised freeways are problematic, that certain solutions can be equally damming. By choosing a tunnel, the city risks the same cost overruns and years of construction nightmares that Boston suffered through. Please do not doom Seattle by not heeding history.

The State of Washington and the City should select a street level option, with increased pedestrian access and reduced traffic in mind, while saving necessary funds for the transit options that will benefit the city over the long term. A tunnel is unnecessary and will be too costly for the city and the region to absorb. Funding mass transit, bolstering the cross-lake bridges to support rail, and searching for options to take cars off of the streets should be the focus of the region, not new tunnels or problematic viaducts.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Brian Noyes
2116 N. 86th Street
Seattle, WA  98103
I-629-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Surface Alternative. As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle, and therefore is no longer being considered. Please refer to the Final EIS for current project information.

Pedestrian safety is an important component of the project and has been considered in the design process. Appendix C, the Transportation Discipline Report, contains a detailed description of how the alternatives would affect and benefit pedestrians along the project corridor.

From: ANDREA OKOMSKI
To: AWV SDEIS Comments;
CC: Desiree Douglass; jencorska; dixiedursteler; jennifer_messenger; Kris; cindy; Fourmier, Lorraine;
Subject: Viaduct and Pedestrians
Date: Friday, September 22, 2006 9:25:21 AM
Attachments:

Dear Kate Stenberg,

The surfacing of traffic onto Alaska Way and the city streets is being touted as an environmentally enlightened alternative to replacement of the viaduct. (I assume the tunnel is pricing itself out of the equation, but I shouldn’t underestimate the messianic fervor of some elected.)

I have read the reports and the press accounts and I find the work unsatisfactory as far as pedestrian safety is concerned. You know only too well how dangerous Aurora Ave is further north, where it cuts through neighborhoods at ground level. I am confused by the advocacy of organizations like Feet First. Maybe if something is ‘bad’ for cars, then it must be ‘good.’

My son was run over, and nearly killed, on one of our many 4 lane surface roads with stoplights every 4 blocks or so that bisect our neighborhoods. Pedestrian safety is not a priority in our transportation system, and I fear the fashionable view of a few will seal the fate of some unfortunate body welcomed to our sexy new waterfront and smashed on their way to the aquarium, lunch, or further uptown, to the market, or museum. If the design took pedestrians into account as the top priority from the start it could be beautiful. But as it hasn’t yet, why would it now?

I have copied my P-I letter to the editor published yesterday.

Thank you,
Andrea Okomski
Seattle P-I
September 21, 2006
Letters to the Editor
ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT

Surface streets mean more pedestrian accidents

It is unfortunate the P-I editorial supporting discussion of the "no replacement" option for the viaduct did not also demand detailed study of the impact on pedestrians. ("A third way," Monday editorial).

In light of the Editorial Board’s recent call for pedestrian safety, it is discouraging. The facts are sickening.

According to the Seattle & King County "Profile of Pedestrian Fatalities in King County 2000-2003," at least one person loses his life each month, on average, on the streets of Seattle and more than 100 pedestrians are hospitalized each year for serious injuries.

Serious injuries include permanent disabilities such as brain injury and paralysis and chronic pain. In King County, fully 20 percent of all crash fatalities are pedestrians.

I am horrified that we might consider funneling the tens of thousands of cars to surface level that currently move safely above the city. Even if 25 percent of the traffic "disappears," we are still making a profound change in the ground-level environment.

It is negligent to push for such a drastic change without considering the human toll.

Andrea Okomski
Seattle
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.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I-631-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative. Replacing the Elliott Bay Seawall would be a separate project led by the City of Seattle if the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, because the failing seawall does not have the potential to affect the seismic stability of this alignment. However, if another build alternative is selected, the seawall would be replaced as part of this project and its design will be carefully considered. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for a description of the current configuration for each alternative in the project area.

Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Name: Rhonda
Address: Peterson
City: Seattle State: WA Zip: 98109
E-mail Address: rpeters2@earthlink.net
Affiliation (optional):

I-631-001 Comments: Either option seems fine. I hope you continue to let people know that whatever choice we make, we have to fix the seawall!
I-632-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-632-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments supporting the shorter construction plan. The lead agencies have continued to refine the construction durations for each build alternative. Please see Chapter 3 in the Final EIS for current information about the construction plans proposed for each build alternative.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Thank you for attending the open house. We are glad that you were able to learn more about the project.
The 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative was designed to withstand what is termed a "Rare Earthquake," that is, an earthquake that would only be expected to occur once every 2,500 years. The tunnel alternatives currently being considered are being designed with current safety standards for lighting.

The tunnel lid would likely be landscaped and would provide pedestrian connections to the central waterfront from the Pike Place Market. Public access to the shoreline would be provided at those access points currently available along the waterfront.

The City of Seattle conducted a vote in March 2007. In addition to the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, which was available to the public, information was also presented on the project's website and in numerous newspaper articles.

Please see the response to I-634-002 above regarding cost overruns. If the Bored Tunnel Alternative is selected, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. The new space could become a wide waterfront promenade with bike and pedestrian paths.

Please see Chapter 8 in the Final EIS for mitigation measures proposed to address construction traffic effects and for a brief discussion in Chapter 1 of other projects in the area that complement the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement project.

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your
comments on a Surface Alternative. You are correct that the Surface Alternative is no longer being considered.
I-635-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

---

From: David Jenkins [mailto:pranddj@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, September 08, 2006 6:37 AM
To: WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct
Subject: Tunnel Option

Hello Kristy,

I am writing you this email because I heard on the local news that the state needs more input on what the citizens of Seattle want regarding the Viaduct. I, as well as about everyone I know, believe that the tunnel option is the best, despite the higher cost. The revitalization it would create for the waterfront, would increase tourism and make the city’s waterfront more inviting. Now, I make less than $25000 a year, and I am willing to front $100 to get the project going. If I can do that with my current income, anyone can. I think that building the tunnel with toll booths would also be a good idea and would pay for the project not only quicker, but by the people who use it.

One thing that really upset me is that people have forgotten that the current viaduct is the same (design and architecture) as the viaduct in San Francisco that pan caked and killed all of those people. Rebuilding a viaduct would be a mistake, if you ask me. Not only are they ugly, they're dangerous.

Thank you for your time.

Paul Racchetta
pranddj@earthlink.net
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.
The project does not have the ability to control or dictate the residential location for the workers on the project. Additionally, to exempt a single large neighborhood from property taxes for the duration of construction would severely limit the City and County's abilities to provide essential services. Within King County, property taxes are projected to account for 42 percent of the total taxes collected as General Fund revenue in 2011 (King County Budget Office 2010).

However, the avenue for temporary tax reduction would be to appeal the value placed on your property by the King County Department of Assessments. If you feel that the construction of the Viaduct project has decreased the value of your property, you can appeal the valuation to the King County Board of Equalizations/Appeals.

Comments: It seems that by witnessing past public projects...the viaduct is going to be torn down with or without public support. If the viaduct proceeds it will kill West Seattle for many years. Property values will plummet...therefore I recommend that the Mayor and City Council pass a temporary tax relief bill...All property taxes will be suspended...in total to West Seattle property owners for the duration of the viaduct project. AND Everyone working on the project, Government, Consulting, Labor, Suppliers of Materials MUST MOVE TO WEST SEATTLE AND LIVE THERE FOR THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT.
Hi,

I wanted to comment that I am for a tunnel plan to replace the viaduct. I think it is important to keep in mind safety and money spent, but also, and this is something that doesn't usually seem to merit equal consideration, aesthetics. Actually, I consider the aesthetic aspect to be more important than financial consideration. A tunnel would beautify the waterfront and the city as a whole, and I am sure would be the plan more appreciated by future generations.

Ellen Reitan
I-639-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative.

Extensive analysis was done for all of the alternatives. Visual simulations presented depicted the current level of design available. Please refer to Appendix E of the Final EIS for updated visual simulations. The economic analysis was conducted based on the comparison of the current economic picture of waterfront retail and commercial businesses and does not include speculations about future land use and taxation possibilities. Appendix L, the Economics Discipline Report, presents the updated analysis for the Final EIS.
tunnel, though very appealing, do not offset the negatives. In summary, the price tag is too high for the Tunnel. If we reduce the scope of the project to these fundamental parameters: 1. Which scheme that satisfies the needs at hand are the cheapest. 2. Which scheme that satisfies the needs at hand are the quickest, or rather are faster to implement and impact the existing the condition the least. Then the clear choice is the Elevated Alternative.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EI&Ss. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Improvements to the SR 99 northbound on-ramp from the Spokane Street Viaduct are not part of the scope of the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project.
Scale models were not produced for this project. Instead, video animations were produced for both the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives considered in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. The animations were shown at the September 2006 public hearings and are located on the project website's library, http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/Viaduct.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-644-001
The “side-by-side” comparative information you’ve requested for the alternatives under consideration was included in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. The information presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS is updated in the Final EIS. Specifically, please refer to the following chapters:

**Summary and Chapter 3 - Alternatives Description.** These chapters provide a clear and thorough “side-by-side” comparison of the alternatives currently being considered, including cost of each alternative.

**Chapter 6 - Construction Effects.** Provides a detailed description of the construction effects for each alternative.

I-644-002
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.
I-645-001

Thank you for your suggestion to allow traffic to use the existing viaduct during the construction of its replacement. The 2004 Draft EIS evaluated one construction plan that considered brief closures of SR 99 during construction, but otherwise assumed that at least two lanes would be provided in each direction on SR 99 or an alternate detour route. In comments received on the 2004 Draft EIS, many people asked the lead agencies to consider more than one construction plan. Specifically, many people wanted to know if closing the corridor would reduce the amount of time it takes to build the project. To respond to this question, three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

From: Gayle Sammons
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
CC:
Subject: Viaduct comments
Date: Wednesday, September 13, 2006 3:12:01 PM
Attachments:

I-645-001

Living in West Seattle I utilize the viaduct frequently as do many other people. I understand that it is suggested that surface streets and I-5 can take up the current viaduct traffic during construction. Have you driven those roads during rush hour of late? Buses are stuck as well as cars with the current traffic. I-5 is a parking lot more often than not...even on the weekends. I cannot imagine what is going to happen when the volume of traffic that daily travels the viaduct must go somewhere else.

I personally would like to see an option which allows the current viaduct to be used during construction of its replacement or retrofit. Additionally, I believe it is in the best interest of people who utilize the viaduct that the new one has access to our City Center.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my concerns.

Gayle Sammons
4842 46th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98116
206.933.0689
I-646-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your suggestions for an additional project alternative. The project has evolved since 2006, so please refer to the Final EIS for information about the current build alternatives being considered.

I believe there is an alternative Viaduct replacement plan which I have not seen reviewed and it would provide a cheaper, less painful solution to most issues. This plan would involve building a modern elevated connector from current 99 at Massachusetts Ave to the I-5/1-90 interchange, and surface connector from I-5 at Mercer St to current 99 route. Then pushing I-5 into the express lanes between I-90 and I-520, which may require further tunneling, but less troublesome and expensive than the waterfront area.

The advantages of this plan would be:

1. Viaduct would remain open during period of construction, reducing impact on traffic.
2. Revitalize waterfront between Massachusetts Ave and Pike Place.
3. Improvements to Alaskan Way and bike path.
4. Provide excellent corridor for light rail service from N. Seattle to S. Seattle/AW, Seattle along the old Viaduct route. This would include excellent access to Quest, Safeco, downtown and waterfront.
5. Improve traffic flow to/from Quest and Safeco via ramps to new 99.
6. Improve flow of N/S through traffic on I-5 due to local traffic being routed onto the new 99 which would utilize the current surface I-5 in downtown.
7. Possibly receive more federal funds for impact to I-5 and I-90.
8. Allow the already built rail spur adjacent to Terminal 46 to be utilized.
Attached are quick sketches of the plan.

Please feel free to contact me for more info.

Respectfully,
Jason T. Schmidt

jtschmidt20@men.com

206-217-8817 / 360-621-7980

*** oSafe scanned this email and found no malicious content ***
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I-647-001
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
There were several boards set up displaying the Elevated Structure Alternative and other information from the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. We apologize that you did not find the information you were looking for. The Elevated Structure Alternative is included in the Final EIS, so please see this document for current information about this alternative.

I-648-001

Comments: I expected this to be a public hearing where I could hear the opinions of other residents and users of the Alaskan Way Viaduct. I have been observing this process for quite a while and I expected to come and learn from my fellow citizens of Seattle and those who may also be using the Viaduct route for work, school, etc. The designs and photographs look pretty familiar and I think I saw them at other open houses over the past few years. But I don't see any new designs for a new elevated structure. I assume some new designs were made during the planning charades, but they are not here. What are people envisioning for elevated designs? It seems like it would be a waste of funds if there have only been tunnel-based designs done.
Thank you for your comments. One of the main benefits of the Bored Tunnel Alternative is the ability to maintain operations on SR 99 throughout the construction period. Current construction plans call for a relatively short (several week) closure during the end of construction to connect the tunnel with the remainder of SR 99. A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities.

Comment noted. The project would replace an existing roadway that is seismically vulnerable and at the end of its useful life. The project would not represent new infrastructure built to respond to unplanned growth.
The alternatives analyzed in Final EIS did not include items other than those directly relating to replacement of the existing viaduct. High capacity transit developments are being addressed by other agencies, specifically Seattle Department of Transportation (e.g., South Lake Union Streetcar), King County Metro (e.g., RapidRide), and Sound Transit (e.g., Link Light Rail, Sounder). Potential fixed guideway HCT alignments that have been developed in the long range plans for these agencies did not include the SR 99/Alaskan Way Viaduct corridor.

The Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project address replacement of a portion of the SR 99 corridor. A freeway east of I-405 is not part of this project.

Your comments are noted. Many roadways in Washington State likely need maintenance work right now. However, the purpose of this project is to replace a portion of SR 99. Please refer to Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, for information about traffic effects during project construction.
but does not want to address, because it will create our worst nightmares.

Maybe we should wait another 20 - 30 years to figure out we desperately need at least one more bypass freeway like I-605. By then the property values will be 4-5 times what they are now, and we will be desperate to buy the necessary property to build the roads we need now, and we will have to pay the outrageous prices then. Based on our past, that would be the typical way our government deals with the problem. Our "don't build any new roads" attitude over the past 30 years has now come back to haunt us.

Sincerely,

Patrick Scoccolo
Manager
SCI Infrastructure, LLC

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and
IM. All on demand. Always Free.
I-650-001

Tsunamis generated by earthquakes of sufficient magnitudes and specific types are rare events. Tsunamis that could adversely affect the Seattle waterfront are extremely rare. In fact, in the last 6,000 years, only one tsunami is known to have occurred with waves of sufficient height to overtop the Seattle seawall. To top the Seattle seawall, this tsunami would also have had to occur during the short time that the sea level happened to be at mean high tide or greater. Taking into account the short timeframe during which the water level would be at or above mean high tide on any given day, we reached the conclusion that a tsunami that could affect a future waterfront tunnel would be so improbable that it could only happen approximately every 60,000 years. This is well beyond the tunnel earthquake design standard and way outside the standard limits applied to civil engineering design. This finding is based on inundation maps produced by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) following computer modeling of maximum credible tsunamis in Puget Sound.

From: Keith Seinfeld
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
Subject: Viaduct seawall - tsunami and climate change scenarios
Date: Monday, August 07, 2006 4:35:56 PM

Hi -

I've been wondering if your engineers have discussed how a tunnel (or an elevated viaduct for that matter) would withstand rising sea levels and a minor tsunami. Global warming/climate change scenarios show sea levels could rise a lot in the next century. Anywhere from six inches to two feet is considered fairly likely. And beyond the year 2100, it's possible we'd see as much as a 6 foot rise.

How would the new seawall/tunnel do on high-tide if sea level is 2 feet higher? Would the seawall be higher than the current one? Would it be water tight if we got a minor tsunami in Elliott Bay?

Thanks

------------------
Keith Seinfeld
2601 4th Avenue, #150
Seattle, WA 98121
T/206-922-1024
We feel that replacing the viaduct with tunnel is not a good idea and we can not absorb any tax increase because of this option.

Thanks for your help
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

Selection of the preferred alternative was made after consideration of many factors, including the advisory vote. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, in the Final EIS for a summary of the project history.

Extensive modeling has been conducted to project future traffic volumes on SR 99 in the planning year 2030. The project will maintain the mobility, accessibility, and traffic safety in the corridor under all of the
will not need to be shut down to retrofit for mass-transit or shipping options? (see Downtown Bus Tunnel.)

Also the often mentioned "pedestrian-friendly waterfront environment" that the Nickels administration says will be created through the tunnel option has not been studied with an eye towards how the city can maintain services and safety in expanded public areas/parks. Seattle is not currently able to maintain and service its existing parks or keep them safe for the majority of its population.

I urge you to develop a range of lower cost alternatives for viaduct replacement. Open the discussion to experts and authorities without vested interest in the outcome, and determine through research a proper model for our future. This should include the Transit + Streets approach, where all the available capacity in the transportation network is considered. This is one alternative, that has already had initial study and independently verified support of the research, that will save us money, provide increased mobility for everyone in the area, improve transit service, and help meet greenhouse gas reduction goals, while allowing a more balanced budgetary approach to maintaining an open waterfront for all.

Without considering all the information or by taking the public’s direct vote out of the process you are unable to ensure a truly democratic process for this very important component of Seattle’s and the state of Washington’s, environmental and economic future.

best,
Philip Shaw
pj.shaw@100cameras.com

alternatives. Please see the Final EIS for the current transportation modeling analysis for all the proposed build alternatives.

I-652-004

With the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative, the final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle. This project is not studying the City of Seattle’s ability to maintain or keep its public open space facilities safe as part of the EIS.

I-652-005

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-652-006
An advisory vote took place in 2007 before the Partnership Process that led to development and recommendation of the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, for a summary of the project history and development of the build alternatives.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
Thank you for your interest in commenting on the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. The communications team e-mailed you on September 20 and 21, 2006, to follow up on your request for further information. Additional geotechnical and archaeological studies are being performed throughout the design process. This information can be requested from the project office.

With regard to liquefaction, the proposed structures will either be designed to withstand the liquefied conditions or soil improvement will be performed. Permeation grouting, compaction grouting, compensation grouting, ground freezing, and underpinning are all under consideration. Depending on the alternative selected, existing structures, utilities, and right-of-way, a combination of these techniques will likely be used. Please see the Final EIS for current information about the soil improvement methods proposed for the project.

The lead agencies developed an Unanticipated Discovery Plan to plan for the possibility of discovering archaeological resources during construction. The Final EIS Appendix I, Section 106: Historic, Cultural, and Archaeological Resources Discipline Report, describes the steps that would be taken if any archaeological resources are encountered.

The level of landscape design developed for an EIS is typically schematic. Specific details about many landscaping aspects of the project will not be addressed until later phases of the project. However, the City of Seattle has very specific standards and guidelines that will guide the design of landscapes within the project corridor. Elements such as plant species, spacing, size, and other specific character will be designed according to the city's standards. These standards encourage use of plants, materials, and methods that result in sustainable
landscapes, minimize maintenance, reduce the need for irrigation, and in general require the consumption of less energy than traditional landscapes.

I-654-004

Bats are very adaptable animals capable of utilizing man-made structures when there is a lack of natural habitat. Although there would be a potential decrease in the amount of habitat with the Bored Tunnel or Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives, there are a number of other alternative areas available in the general area, including the railroad tunnel, building alcoves, and overwater structures. A similar amount of habitat would likely be available under the Elevated Structure Alternative as currently exists along the waterfront. See the Final EIS and Appendix N, Wildlife, Fish, and Vegetation Discipline Report, for current information about project effects on wildlife and proposed mitigation measures.

I-654-005

Information about mitigation strategies can be found in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS. Strategies include addressing transit, bicyclists, pedestrians, and parking. The lead agencies plan to maintain access to the waterfront throughout construction. Temporary limitations and any required changes to access during construction will be mitigated to the extent practicable.

I-654-006

The tunnel used by trains is a separate tunnel from the tunnel proposed to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct. In cases where construction takes place near the railroads, the design and construction procedures will be coordinated closely with the railroads. These discussions have already begun. The coordination will include procedures for communicating and
responding to an accident on either the part of the railroad or the construction contractor.

**I-654-007**

Emergency procedures during tunnel operation have not been developed yet. However, the 8-foot shoulder would provide access to emergency tunnel exits, which would be provided every 650 feet. Also, the tunnel would be equipped with ventilation, a fire detection and suppression system, and drainage. Video cameras would provide real-time information to the operators at the tunnel control center, allowing them to respond quickly to changing conditions and emergencies.

Emergency procedures to be followed during construction have not been specifically developed as yet. This will occur once a final design is completed. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) will monitor construction for compliance with national safety standards. Emergency procedures will be developed, and the construction workers will be required to follow them. Specific disaster plans will be developed once an alternative is selected. For the safety of the workers, the plans may not be made available generally to the public.

**I-654-008**

As part of the ongoing public involvement process, the project will continue to coordinate with the residents, businesses, and property owners along Alaskan Way through meetings, open houses, newsletter updates, and e-mail. Mitigation measures addressing noise, parking, traffic, dust, and other factors are included in the Final EIS and appendices. The lead agencies will continue to refine construction mitigation for the preferred alternative's construction sequencing and methods.
I-654-009
Under the current project design, Fire Station 5, located at the west end of Madison Street, will remain where it is. Both the land-based emergency services and the fireboat service will remain in place at Pier 53. The means to maintain access to and from the fire station during construction will be developed prior to construction.

I-654-010
The communications team e-mailed you on September 20 and 21, 2006, to follow up on your request for further information.

I-654-011
Tunnel lighting is being designed with the concerns you have raised in mind.

I-654-012
Following the Nisqually earthquake of February 2001, weight restrictions requiring truck traffic to use only the outside lanes of the SR 99 corridor were established. These current weight restrictions are not expected to be carried forward under the Bored Tunnel Alternative, as this facility would be built to state design standards, which exceed those used for the current Alaskan Way Viaduct.

The bored tunnel would have state-of-the-art systems to help reduce fatalities, injuries, and property damage caused by traffic accidents. The tunnel would provide emergency access, evacuation routes, ventilation, and fire suppression systems in accordance with the National Fire Protection Association standards and other codes and regulations.

The Bored Tunnel Alternative would also include some intelligent transportation systems (ITS) components, such as electronic sign boards, signage, and related fixtures to provide real-time traveler
information to enhance safety. Improvements in the south and north portal areas could include the following ITS components:

- Variable message signs
- Overheight vehicle warning signs with flashing beacons
- Portal traffic signal
- Tunnel closure gate
- Tunnel closure sign
- Detection loops
- Surveillance cameras
- Ramp meters
- Tolling system equipment (if needed)

In the tunnel itself, the following ITS fixtures are likely to be installed:

- Variable message signs
- Detection loops
- Emergency telephones
- Incident detection cameras
- Surveillance cameras
- Maintenance telephones
The air quality impacts of the ventilation stack and tunnel portal releases are fully disclosed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Further analyses have been conducted and are included in the Final EIS and its Appendix M, Air Discipline Report. The tunnel's ventilation system is sized and designed to ensure that peak air quality levels within the tunnel will not exceed regulatory required levels, even under breakdown conditions. The electric power needed for the ventilation system will likely be a part of the city grid and would have back-up generators in case the power supply is interrupted.
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.

The 2004 Draft EIS included Rebuild and Surface Alternatives, and those alternatives were screened out in the project development process. 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 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.
I urge you to consider another option. Don't build a tunnel and don't build an elevated structure.

Neither the tunnel plan nor the elevated plan is affordable, and neither is an environmentally friendly choice. I urge you to develop a range of lower cost alternatives for viaduct replacement. Include the Transit + Streets approach, where all the available capacity in the transportation network is considered and employed to provide mobility in this corridor. This alternative will save us money, provide increased mobility for everyone in the area, not just a single corridor, improve transit service, help meet greenhouse gas reduction goals, and provide a true waterfront for all.

Thank you,
Michael Snyder
Resident of the Ballard neighborhood of Seattle
I-658-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Elevated Structure Alternative. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

I-658-001

I favor an ABOVE GROUND replacement for the Viaduct. The tunnel alternative is simply too expensive. There are other projects in King County that need attention and Seattle/King County does NOT have a good record of doing any type of public project well and within budget.
I-659-001
The lead agencies agree that the viaduct needs to be replaced in a timely and financially responsible manner. As you noted, construction will be disruptive to traffic. The Final EIS describes the temporary construction effects and mitigation in Chapters 6 and 8, respectively.

We have dragged this on long enough!!! Having this replaced will be a major disruption to traffic, duh? tell us something we don’t know.. But this disruption will be minor compare to the alternative. We ALL know this needs to be done and the longer we drag this on the more waste of tax payer dollars!!! This is beginning to sounds awfully familiar to another waste called the Monorail. We THE TAXPAYERS really got our MONEYS WORTH there didn’t we?

I guess when it’s someone else’s money... waste means nothing, but hey that is our government at its finest.

Rochelle
I-660-001
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the 2006 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative. The alignment for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative has been refined in 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. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

 Comments on my preferences since I can’t make any of the meetings this week:

Bury it and re-claim the water front!

It is important that we plan for the near and far future. Large and expensive infrastructure projects like the Viaduct replacement can often be outdated by the time they are complete. Only by doing something monumental, bold, and creative do we make real positive forward progress. Often this means the difficult, long, and more expensive approach. But this is the only money worth spending. It is the difference between a patch job and an improvement.

If necessary, selectively develop some of the key valuable water front parcels for appropriate projects and developments to make the financial picture work for Seattle. The worst thing we can do is to re-build a bigger wider, and more obscene freeway along our waterfront.

Make Seattle a special and visionary City by giving it a world class water front!

Robert Stephenson Project Manager - Jones Lang LaSalle
(425) 707-1729 (206) 901-1333 (cell) (425) 707-7329 (FAX)
robert.stephenson@jll.com
s-steph@jll.com
1 Microsoft Way, Redmond WA 98052
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

Thank you for sharing this article. The lead agencies have conducted a thorough analysis of alternatives as described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Please refer to Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, in the Final EIS for updated information regarding traffic analysis in the corridor.
different routes and destinations. The engineers conclude that downtown street network has additional capacity and that the impact of a no-replacement option on these streets "is likely to be manageable." In fact, WSDOT is already working on this challenge as it plans to manage traffic during Alaskan Way project construction, note the authors.

While Marshall and Gibson call the "no-replacement" alternative studied by WSDOT a "coarse" version of the option to replace the viaduct with improved streets and transit service, they say that existing data show even the coarse option to be viable.

The report has some strongly worded findings about WSDOT's misuse of data to create myths that have distorted the debate over what to do with the Alaskan Way viaduct. "In the debate on the Alaskan Way Viaduct, WSDOT has done the public a disservice by stressing in their communications simplistic and wrong-headed myths about the transportation system," write Marshall and Gibson. "The picture they put forward is that more than 100,000 vehicles use the AWV to pass through the downtown, that a large portion of these vehicles are trucks essential to the region's economy, and that without replacement, these vehicles would all divert onto downtown streets and cause catastrophic congestion. In fact, WSDOT's own data show that most current peak period AWV traffic is not through traffic, that few of the vehicles are trucks, and that most of the trucks are also accessing downtown. WSDOT has not bothered to seriously analyze downtown street capacity."

Marshall and Gibson take special exception to the traffic projections in WSDOT's environmental impact statement for the no-replacement alternative. Although the Puget Sound Regional Council transportation model shows "little or no growth" in traffic on SR 99 ramps and local streets in 2030 because of growth in transit use, WSDOT chose to adjust the traffic estimates in these models upwards by 5 to 30 percent when considering the AWV options. The authors say WSDOT holds up its computer models like "the Wizard of Oz, saying the model says this, and we must accept it." But in truth, WSDOT has adjusted the models with inflated traffic to fit their "mental models."

WSDOT calls this practice "conservative," but the authors note "this suggests that only the risk of building too little capacity is considered, and not the risk of purchasing too much capacity at an extravagant cost."

CNU President JohnNorquist said the phenomenal cost of both rebuilding the elevated freeway and replacing it with a tunnel means the people of Seattle deserve to have the best information possible on a surface-streets-and-transit option that may prove very beneficial. "This transportation review shows that the experience of San Francisco, Portland, and Milwaukee deserves serious consideration in Seattle. Given how traffic has redistributed and how neighborhoods have come back to life, it's hard to find anyone in these cities who would consider rebuilding the elevated freeway or digging a big tunnel."

In order for Seattle to make an informed choice, WSDOT needs to correct a number of
flaws in its no-replacement proposal, says the report. The revised model should:

- Use accurate downtown traffic volume projections instead of inflated volumes,
- Provide a detailed surface Alaskan Way with desirable urban speed (30 m.p.h.) and design features,
- Include an improved distribution system to the north and south so that SR-99 traffic can smoothly reach parallel streets,
- Include the increases in transit service that Seattle will soon be experiencing, and
- Run the full model including the mode choice model to get proper transit forecasts.

Marshall and Gibson were hired by two national public-interest groups, the Congress for the New Urbanism and the Center for Neighborhood Technology, both based in Chicago, which have a grant from the SURDNA foundation to help evaluate the results in cities that have replaced elevated freeways with boulevards and other street improvements and to apply those lessons to cities that are considering what to do with elevated freeways in their downtowns. Smart Mobility's experience includes transportation and planning analysis for the state departments of transportation in New York, Minnesota, Georgia, and New Hampshire among other clients.

The Congress for the New Urbanism is the leading organization applying the principles of city and town design to today's development challenges. Working with architects, planners, transportation engineers, CNU advances walkable, compact neighborhood development as an alternative to sprawl.

For more information, contact Stephen Filmanowicz, CNU, 312-551-7300

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ciara Stewart

---

**Ciara Stewart**, Client Services, Sustainability Specialist
Fusionpartners, LLC
3131 Western Suite 423
Seattle, WA 98121
Office: 206.254.7707 Ext. 7#
www.fusionhappens.com
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-663-001
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. It meets project goals better than other alternatives and with fewer impacts. This is not to say other alternatives do not meet the goals, just that the Bored Tunnel Alternative meets them better.

I-663-002
FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. As a result of the comments received on the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, additional planning and analysis was conducted and presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS.

After the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS was published, there was not a consensus on how to replace the viaduct along the central waterfront. In March 2007, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former City of Seattle Mayor Nickels initiated a public process called the Partnership Process to develop a solution for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront. Details about the project history are described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2006, please refer to this Final EIS for the current information.

In January 2009, Governor Gregoire, former King County Executive Sims, and former Seattle Mayor Nickels recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single, large-diameter bored tunnel. After the recommendation was made, the Bored Tunnel Alternative was analyzed and compared to the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative), Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure Alternatives in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The comments received on the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS, subsequent Partnership Process, and the analysis presented in the 2010
Supplemental Draft EIS led to the lead agencies' decision to identify the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for replacing the viaduct along the central waterfront.

developing convention center facilities in lower cost areas, the viability of major increases in future tourist visits is in question.

The media has also found that cruise ship tourist primarily make only short stops, if any, in Seattle to support connection with ships and exiting transportation.

It is difficult to fathom any type of new economic development with a tunnel that doesn't vastly enrich only a few property owners, developers and businesses. It is not hard to imagine the rush to build 70 story, luxury offices/condos West of First Avenue. A WINDFALL !!! AND FUNDED BY THE PUBLIC FOR THE FEW !!!

The need for park facilities for the expanding number of high-price downtown condos should have been considered by the City long ago before adopting an ultra high density planning view of downtown !!! The waterfront will never be a Central Park. And the existence of Myrtle Edwards Park has not entered City evaluations!!! These residents bought into limited or no park conditions with their desire to be Downtown. No Tears Please !!!

This is one of a number of AWV comment and EIS input messages that I will be sending.

Sincerely
John Starz
206-244-1941
E-Mail: jstarz@verizon

PS: I believe that I am already on mailing lists of all addressees.
I-663-003

Please see the Final EIS for current information about the emergency systems proposed for the tunnel alternatives. Specific emergency rescue plans to be used by emergency service providers during tunnel operation will be developed once the final design of the project is complete. The lead agencies have coordinated with emergency service providers throughout preliminary design of the project and will continue to coordinate with emergency providers as the project heads toward construction and operation. The emergency evacuation system for the tunnel will be approved by the Seattle Fire Department and will be based on local and national standards for public safety.

I-663-004

The design criteria calls for the tunnel to resist forces similar or greater than those experienced in the Nisqually Earthquake (February 2001) without cracking or rupturing of reinforcement. The tunnel will be designed to withstand the extreme forces of an earthquake with an expected recurrence of 2,500 years (termed a Rare Earthquake). This is based on sophisticated design analysis and 3D earth-structure interaction analysis using specialized software.

See the Final EIS for current information about the design of the preferred Bored Tunnel Alternative.
Comment noted. The design of the tunnel has been guided by a Fire and Life Safety committee comprised of tunnel ventilation, security, and structural experts that have taken into consideration the latest safety codes and national and international design experience. The tunnel will be designed to withstand the extreme forces of a "Rare Earthquake," that is, one with an expected probability of recurrence only once every 2,500 years. The tunnel will provide emergency egress and will be monitored with state-of-the-art surveillance systems. Please note that the preferred alternative for this project is the Bored Tunnel Alternative. Current project information can be found in the Final EIS.

Sincerely,
John Storz
206-244-1941
E-Mail: jstorz@verizon.net
Thank you for your comments. The project study area is bordered by I-5 to the east, Puget Sound to the west, Aloha Street in the north, and S. Spokane Street in the south. The study area establishes the area for which the transportation performance and effects of the project alternatives are assessed. The most intensive evaluation of transportation performance and impacts was performed on SR 99 itself. Elsewhere in the study area, assessment focuses on capturing the important effects and primary operational differences associated with alternatives.

Transportation analysis takes into account population and employment trends and transportation patterns for the region in addition to those within the study area. Additional detail regarding traffic forecasting methodology is provided in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.
I-663-007
No changes are proposed along the S. Spokane Street Viaduct as part of the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project. However, the City of Seattle has several changes proposed along this roadway. Details concerning this project can be found on the City of Seattle’s website.

The proposed interchange in the south end would improve access in the south end by adding ramps that provide connections to the stadiums and SR 519, which connects to I-90. Providing additional connections to SR 99 in this location will be helpful in improving the congested traffic conditions that occur along surface streets when events take place in the stadiums. Additionally, the Stadium area interchange will separate vehicle from rail operations. Currently, these operations are not separated and there are times when trains block roadway connections at S. Atlantic Street. The proposed interchange would also improve freight connections between the Duwamish industrial area, Harbor Island, and SR 519 and I-90. Under the Bored Tunnel and Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives, the Columbia Street and Seneca Street ramps would no longer exist. Access to downtown would be provided with the Stadium area ramps. The Bored Tunnel and Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternatives are anticipated to offer some improvement overall to traffic operations in the downtown area due to the redistribution of traffic accessing SR 99 to several east–west streets, rather than to a single street (Columbia Street).

Analysis of intersections near the reconfigured Mercer Street and the Stadium area, including Atlantic Street, is included in the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS.
unsolvable traffic jam will occur during events in the two stadiums. I presume that buildings on the historical register in Pioneer Square would be immune from destruction to provide wider streets needed for major traffic flows dictated by this concept. Of course ALL street parking would have to be eliminated in Pioneer Square 24/7.

MERCEER STREET MESS
The current EIS plan to make Mercer a two-way street (three lanes each way) from I-5 to 5th Avenue defies logic from a traffic flow view. The elimination of the Broad Street underpass would force all traffic bound to (1) the waterfront, (2) streets to downtown from 5th Avenue West to Elliott Bay, (3) and those from I-5/SR-520 to Northbound Elliott Ave North to make a left turn across East bound Mercer at 5th. A real traffic jam in the making!!! Although only of value of Lake Union waterfront property and the Paul Allen’s streetcar line, the current Valley Street/Broad St route permitted multiple access to downtown Seattle. Having left turns from Mercer towards downtown East of SR-99 will cause a huge mess with cars backing up to make left turns due to concurrent heavy East bound traffic squeezed down to three lanes!!!

Sincerely
John Storz
206-244-1941
E Mail: jfstorz@verizon.net
I-663-008
It is normal and appropriate for lead agencies to identify a preferred alternative. Identification of a preferred alternative is required by regulation for the Final EIS. All those involved made their decision after careful review of extensive information and considering the opinions of the general public and wide range of organizations.

I-663-009
City and State officials and the Expert Review Panel received sufficient information for their purposes.
In March 2007, the City of Seattle held an advisory vote. The ballot included an Elevated Structure Alternative and a Surface-Tunnel Hybrid Alternative.

It is normal during the course of environmental review for the funding picture to be uncertain or incomplete. This does not preclude agencies and decision-making officials from making informed decisions on a preferred alternative or similar matters.
I spoke with you at the end of the WSDot session at Plymouth Church last Thursday evening. I appreciate the fact that you seem interested in public opinion on the SR99 problem/project.

I feel that a tunnel is far too extravagant and impractical. I would favor IMMEDIATE repair efforts on the viaduct, as it is being heavily used at this moment. I would also favor more extensive research regarding potential retrofit, as I feel that Seattle will suffer greatly, on many levels and for many years (at least 42 months!), if the traffic flow through the city is slowed down more than it presently is. We need a major highway in addition to I-5. If improvements to I-5 need to be made, or if there is a major incident which blocks I-5, and there is a construction project which limits the SR99 use, how will we move people from the North end of the city to the South end...via 405?

I really don't understand how a tunnel project could seem the logical choice.

I also have a difficult time understanding how the state could stand by and watch the devastation of Seattle's maritime industry, as the city's face is altered from that of a functioning port with its integral beauty to one of a soul-less tenant-style hotel/cruise ship 'port'.

Thank you,

Linda Strandberg
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

Formal adoption of project mitigation measures, including transportation mitigation, will be through the Final EIS and the project Record of Decision. The intent is to have as many measures as possible in place before construction begins.

Thank you for sharing this article. The project team has conducted a thorough analysis of alternatives as described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Please refer to Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, in the
Final EIS for updated information regarding traffic analysis in the corridor.
I-666-001
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

I-666-002
Traffic demand management is part of the construction mitigation strategy. Regionally, there are also many programs in place to help reduce the growth in traffic demand.
I-667-001
Three different construction plans were developed (a shorter construction plan, an intermediate construction plan, and a longer construction plan) and evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. Since 2006, the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives and the construction approach for each of the alternatives have been refined. One construction plan is analyzed for each of the alternatives (Bored Tunnel, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel, and Elevated Structure) in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 describes each alternative and its construction plan, and Chapter 6 describes construction effects.

Of the build alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS, the Bored Tunnel Alternative would have the shortest construction duration at about 5.4 years. The Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative would have a construction duration of about 8.75 years, and the Elevated Structure Alternative would have the longest construction duration at about 10 years.
I-668-001
The lead agencies, which include the City of Seattle, recognize the value of connecting the waterfront to downtown Seattle. The final configuration of Alaskan Way will be determined by the Central Waterfront Project being led by the City of Seattle.

The build alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would improve pedestrian connections and provide improved public space along the waterfront to allow people to walk, bicycle, play, view Elliott Bay and the mountains.
I-669-001

Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

---

From: Peter Vanyoagi
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
CC: 
Subject: Viaduct
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2006 5:24:40 PM
Attachments:

I'm a member of Feet First and add my voice to the Transit + streets approach of Viaduct replacement. I don't think you can reduce traffic by building a very expensive tunnel. Optimize the existing streets and continue to improve mass transit.

Sincerely, Ruth Van Voast

How low will we go? Check out Yahoo! Messenger's low PC-to-Phone call rates.
I-670-001
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.

I-670-002
Formal adoption of project mitigation measures, including transportation mitigation, will be through the Final EIS and the project Record of Decision. The intent is to have as many measures as possible in place before construction begins.

I-670-003
Thank you for sharing this article. The project team has conducted a thorough analysis of alternatives as described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. Please refer to Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, in the
Final EIS for updated information regarding traffic analysis in the corridor.
Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- **Bored Tunnel** – $1.96 billion
- **Cut-and-Cover Tunnel** – $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- **Elevated Structure** – $1.9 to $2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

**I-671-002**

Improvements north of Battery Street Tunnel do improve safety and the transportation functions in the area by improving access to and from SR 99. Safety, mobility, and access are some of the basic needs the project is meant to address.

**I-671-003**

Improvements north of Battery Street Tunnel are part of the overall project, as described in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS.
The potential air quality impacts from the proposed alternatives are fully disclosed in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs, and these analyses have been revised, as applicable, for the Final EIS.

Traffic disruptions during the construction phases will be minimized according to the mitigation measures described in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS, and an analysis has been included in the Final EIS to estimate the potential air quality impacts of these disruptions. Also, see Final EIS Appendix M, Air Discipline Report, for all the detail on the air quality analysis performed for the project.

The ventilation fans would be designed not to exceed either 60 dBA at the nearest commercial uses or 57 dBA at the property line of the nearest residential use during normal operations. Please see Chapter 5 of the Final EIS for more information about potential project noise during operation of the facility.

The cost of congestion has as one of its components the increased expenditure on fuel due to prolonged idling, as well as spending more time in your car. The cost of congestion is discussed in the Economics Discipline Report, Appendix L, of the Final EIS.

Potential changes in the number of fatalities related to operation of proposed facilities will not be studied as part of the project. However, the Transportation Discipline Report, Appendix C of the Final EIS, does discuss traffic safety for each build alternative.
A detailed discussion of the construction effects on transportation facilities and services is provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Also included in Chapter 6 is a listing of the planned construction mitigation activities. Within the planned mitigation strategies are variable message signs that can be adjusted to warn travelers in advance of road closures and construction activities.

It is outside of the scope of the project to restructure any of the region’s transit service systems. However, some additional transit improvements have been included as part of the potential mitigation measures for the construction period. A listing of the planned construction mitigation activities are in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.
Many people asked the lead agencies to consider an alternative that would remove the viaduct and replace it with a four-lane surface roadway along Alaskan Way and include transit improvements. Without a host of improvements and modifications, a four-lane Alaskan Way would create even more congestion on I-5 and downtown streets than the alternatives evaluated in the Draft and Supplemental Draft EISs. Transportation studies performed for this project indicate that replacing the viaduct with a four-lane surface street would substantially increase congestion for most of the day and part of the evening on I-5 through downtown Seattle, downtown streets, and Alaskan Way. On downtown streets, traffic would increase by 30 percent; though traffic increases to specific areas like Pioneer Square and the waterfront could exceed 30 percent. With a four-lane roadway, traffic on Alaskan Way would quadruple to 35,000 to 56,000 vehicles per day compared to about 10,000 vehicles today. This traffic increase would make Alaskan Way the busiest street downtown, carrying more traffic than Mercer Street does today. The increased traffic congestion would also make travel times worse for buses, making transit improvements along these streets largely ineffective. Finally, neighborhoods west of I-5 (Ballard, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle) would be less accessible and would face longer commute times.
I-674-001
WSDOT coordinated its major corridor projects with the regional planning efforts for the 2010 Winter Olympics.

From: KZwar@NCMachinery.com
To: AWV SDEIS Comments:
CC:
Subject: comment
Date: Tuesday, August 22, 2006 12:43:41 PM
Attachments:

Has anyone taken into account that the 2010 Olympics is coming up in Canada. What is the schedule for the project if it goes through.

KEITH ZWAR
USED EQUIPMENT SALES
E-MAIL: KZWAR@NCMACHINERY.COM
BUS: 425-251-6800
CELL: 425-766-1067
OFF: 800-562-4735

We hope that you are finding the e-mail interesting and informative, but if you would rather not receive this, simply reply to this e-mail with "Remove" in the subject line.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, even if you have opted out, we reserve the right to send you information about your account, but we will not send you any unsolicited communications regarding any commercial offers or advertisements.
Traffic analysis provided data for the development of mitigation strategies designed to reduce overall travel demand during construction and to reduce overall traffic congestion while providing access to and through downtown Seattle. A number of the proposed strategies would likely remain in place after construction is complete. Information on traffic impacts and mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report. Chapter 8 of the Final EIS also summarizes the traffic mitigation measures.

The Spokane Street Viaduct Widening Project is a separate project being undertaken by the City of Seattle. Construction of the widening project started in 2008 and is anticipated to be completed in 2012. The widening phase of the project includes additional lanes as well as a new eastbound, two-lane loop off-ramp at 4th Ave South, making it possible to extend West Seattle Bridge transit lane from SR 99 to 4th Avenue.
I-675-003
SDOT has no plans to reopen the Fourth Avenue S. on-ramp to westbound Spokane Street Viaduct as the ramp no longer meets federal standards. The West Seattle bridge transit lane will be extended to the newly constructed Fourth Avenue Loop Ramp as part of the S. Spokane Street Viaduct Project.

I-675-004
The design and construction of the south end has become a separate project referred to as the S. Holgate Street to S. King Street Viaduct Replacement Project. The project began construction in 2010 and is scheduled for completion by 2013. Details of the project’s design can be found on the WSDOT website.

I-675-005
The Washington Department of Transportation, the City of Seattle, and King County Metro have developed a mitigation program to address construction impacts. This program includes expanded public transit service along the affected corridor. Refer to Chapter 8 of the Final EIS for details.

I-675-006
Changes to the Water Taxi service are not included in the project scope or construction mitigation program.

I-675-007
Several strategies are proposed to help mitigate traffic effects during stadium events while construction is ongoing. More information about event traffic and related construction mitigation strategies can be found in the Event Traffic sections of Chapter 6 in the Final EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report.
The study area for the project does not extend as far east as 23rd Avenue S. The study area included streets that were expected to be the most affected by project construction. While a small amount additional traffic may travel along 23rd Avenue S., providing additional capacity as part of construction mitigation would not be expected to substantially improve operations along this roadway and was therefore not included in the planned mitigation strategies.

---

From: Mark Jacobs [mailto:jaktraffic@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 03, 2006 7:15 PM
To: WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct
Subject: improving traffic flow east of SR - 5

I have not thoroughly reviewed the legions of environmental documents prepared. However I have looked over some of the documents pertaining to dealing with traffic during construction. Reference is made to improving traffic operations on City streets. I know that the capacity of the 23rd Ave. S. corridor could be enhanced greatly. See my comment below:

Traffic capacity of the 23rd Ave. S. from Rainier Ave. S. to SR - 520 could be substantially enhanced via peak hour left turn restrictions and the elimination of the associated split phased signals. The left turn traffic could simply use the street and right turns to get to their destination. This is a cost effective improvement that could add capacity during the peak hours.

Thinking bigger acquiring ROW to install left turn pockets?

Please let me know if this is already identified; if not it should be.

Mark

Mark J. Jacobs, PE, PTOE
JAKE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING, INC
7731 8th Avenue SW
Seattle, WA 98106-2007
Tel: 206.762.1978
Cell: 206.799.5692
From: Rich Baldwin [mailto:rich.baldwin@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 3:01 PM
To: MacDonald, Doug
Subject: Opposed to SR 99 tunnel in Seattle

Dear Secretary MacDonald:

I oppose Mayor Nickels' proposed tunnel project on SR 99 in Seattle.

As your department found the maximum cost of a tunnel exceeds the cost of a viaduct replacement by $2.2 billion, and given the uncertainty of schedules and budgets associated with a large waterfront tunnel, I believe the state should proceed with the viaduct replacement instead.

Regards,
Rich Baldwin
Bothell

I-677-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative as the preferred alternative for this project. Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel - $1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover - $3.0 to $3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure - $1.9 to $2.4 billion