

AWV Draft EIS Comment Form Results:

Name: Karen Millward  
Address: 7041 -- 16th Ave NW  
City: Seattle  
State: WA  
Zip Code: 98117  
Email: Writekm@aol.com  
Affiliation (optional):

Would like to be added to the project mailing list?

Yes

Project Comments:

I-361-001

I live in Ballard and commute to Boeing-Kent, so I use the Viaduct every workday. I think the view from the Viaduct is one of the best in Seattle, and when I have visitors I always include the Viaduct in "tours." When I travel downtown, I do so by bus whenever possible. My criteria for a preferred alternative is that it (1) has the least impact on existing "footprint" (e.g. parking, views, destruction of existing buildings and streets, construction time); (2) has least cost; (3) does not depend on other projects to achieve its objectives. My first preference would be to strengthen and refurbish the existing structure, not rebuild it, along with making imperative improvements to the existing seawall. This was not an alternative you presented, but it is what I think is possible, considering likely funding. Of the alternatives presented, I prefer Rebuild. The aerial alternative does not provide sufficient benefits to offset increasing the footprint. The ! tunnels destroy the views. The surface alternative is totally unacceptable because it impacts both pedestrian and vehicle traffic. The much-propagandized "connection between the waterfront and downtown" will not occur under any alternatives. Already, the condos/office buildings marching down the east side of the waterfront like Sherman into Georgia have cut off views of the waterfront from downtown more than the Viaduct has; I proved this to myself in August 2002 by photographing the views along First Avenue from about Lenora to south of Pike Street. These buildings, when seen from the waterfront, cut off downtown, and by the time construction begins on any alternatives, will have made moot any attempt to provide green space on the east side of Alaskan Way. The only views left from the tunnel and surface street alternatives will be exclusively for the very rich who live in the penthouses of these buildings. Even walking along the waterfront, views of the Sound ! are cut off by structures today except in a few open spaces. There are too many options and assumptions about other transportation projects in all alternatives except Rebuild and No Build. If options are not exercised, Ballard and Interbay residents will be far worse off, transportation-wise, than before with these other alternatives.

I-361-002

I-361-003

I-361-004

Comments apply to:  
Overall Project

**I-361-001**

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. 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.

**I-361-002**

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.

**I-361-003**

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.