

Online Comment by User: Jay

Submitted on: 11/1/2006 12:25:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

I am disappointed underground options were dismissed out of hand as too expensive. I don't dispute they maybe expensive, just that they were dismissed before any general public comment could be made. I think these current proposals are simple alternatives of the same old let's do it cheap options and are penny wise and pound foolish. From all the reading I can gather it appears a total of \$150,000 was spent studying only one such alternative to traditional pave and pile, a tunnel proposal. At first that sounds like a lot but that is about one person for 6 months. I strikes me that no one really wanted to look at creative alternatives. The only thing being considered is the absolute cheapest way to do this.

Comparisons are made to Boston's "Big Dig". Forty years from now no one will be complaining about the cost overruns of the big dig. People will marvel at how beautiful the Boston water front is by not being marred by freeways. They will remember the brilliant foresight by bold city leaders who fought for the best.

If we proceed with any of the official proposed options Seattle will look back at the lost opportunity of preserving and expanding what is possibly the 2nd most beautiful urban landscape in the world, the first being Ravenna Park. Even if the options were \$5B to \$10B I think they should be made available for full public comment and worthy of real consideration by the public. Looking back thirty to forty years even those costs will look like a bargain when Seattle is recognized through the world for it's enlighten view of protecting it's natural assets.

Let's look at a specific current example of what was considered the biggest cost overrun in history; The England-France "Chunnel" completed 13 years ago. People bickered over the cost of that project from the first proposal by Napoleon's engineers in 1802. At various stages the project was on and off with 2000 meters even dug in 1880. The final horrendous cost of that project, after nearly 200 years of bickering was... \$13 billion dollars!! People aren't complaining too much about it now. I can't help but think that that does not strike me as terribly expensive to link two independent countries by a 36km long tunnel buried UNDER THE OCEAN carrying both cars and 300km/h modified French TGVs. The modifications were to accommodate the ability for the trains to switch to different voltages used in different places in route. I bet there was a lot of finger pointing when that unexpected extra \$10 million for that cost came up!

Hmmm, they did that for just 2 or three times the cost of our little less than 1 mile of pavement and high rise spans that will blot out foster island?. Either our estimates of the cost of tunneling are way off or our values are so tightly focused on penny pinching NOW that we can't even think 10 years into the future.

Whatever alternative is chosen I support funding #1 by tools and #2 by gas tax.

I-0559-001

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0559-002

Comment Summary:

Funding

Response:

See Section 3.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0559-001

I-0559-002