

**From:** [Ellen Gaynor](#)  
**To:** [AWV SDEIS Comments](#);  
**CC:** [Ellen Gaynor](#);  
**Subject:** Viaduct Essential ~e  
**Date:** Saturday, September 16, 2006 11:00:05 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

To Whom it WILL concern:

I-591-001

The Alaska Way Viaduct has been a major artery of transport through my lifetime, from West Seattle to Queen Anne Hill, from Ballard to Beacon Hill, from Downtown to points SW, NW, N, NE, and so on.

All and every person traveling on the Alaska Way Viaduct enjoys the inspiration of the climate and view of the day.. there for anyone with a vehicle who simultaneously depends on that route for alleviating the toil of the bottle-neck of I-5 in downtown, or the endless navigation of foot traffic and lights of downtown Seattle.

Introduction of the I-90 approach from 1st avenue has presented an alternative that utilizes the on ramp at Columbia to avoid the long stop lights on 2nd avenue/4th avenue and stopped traffic due to trains crossing near the stadiums.

The Alaska Way Viaduct has stood STRONGLY through time and stress, it's fallibility due to NEGLECT and the LACK OF SMOOTH SURFACE which in turn makes vehicles, large and small, rock and bounce their way along that FINE STRUCTURE.

My vote is to rehabilitate that structure. Those who use it are comfortable with it's size and

### I-591-001

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.

I-591-001

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

~~~~~