

From: Matt Anderson [mailto:emattanderson@me.com]  
Sent: Thursday, November 04, 2010 11:35 PM  
To: AWW SDEIS Comments  
Subject: Comment on SR99 Tunnel environmental document

I-006-001

However you address the environmental impact of a bored tunnel in the terrain beneath Seattle, it seems to me that the environmental impact of a tunnel beneath the city of Seattle is inherently far greater than that for a "tunnel" consisting of a tube(s) on, or embedded in, the seabed of Puget Sound. Why has this option been ignored? I haven't heard any mention of a seabed option being considered, although I have sent in this suggestion previously.

Just a few "environmental concerns" that come to mind that favor a seabed tunnel under Puget Sound:

1. The seabed would be much more flexible and protective in the event of an earthquake.
2. Tidal forces could be utilized to generate power for lighting and signage. Possibly even recharging strips for electric cars.
3. Independent water available for fire suppression and any other water needs.
4. Much easier access for repairs and/or emergencies along the entire stretch of that section of SR99.
5. Zero impact on any building, property, or utilities in downtown Seattle, ever.
6. Easily expanded in the future to handle increases in traffic.
7. Easily provide any number of exits or entrances, either now or in the future.
8. Easily enable, or tie in to a cross sound underwater tunnel. I-90 too.
9. Cost way less. This may not be "environmental" in the strictest sense, but savings could be applied to other environmental issues.

## I-006-001

The Final EIS Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, describes the environmental documentation and alternatives analysis that occurred prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. This chapter discusses all of the alternatives that have previously been evaluated. 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 that it has received from diverse interests. Seabed or immersion tunnels are only used for crossing waterbodies. Since the existing viaduct does not cross any waterbodies, immersion tunnels were not considered as a viable alternative. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.