
From: Jenny Hayes [pajamas70@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 3:22 PM
To: AWV SDEIS Comments
Subject: comments on 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS

I-065-001

I'm writing to urge you to consider non-deep-bore-tunnel alternatives. As Cary Moon's letter states:

"A version of I-5/ Surface/Transit alternative that includes an urban, four-lane waterfront street should be included in this EIS so that decision makers who care about mobility for people and freight AND Seattle's new waterfront have lower cost, lower risk alternative to consider."

I am sure you have many comments so I will keep this brief, but I do hope you will strongly consider such an alternative. I and many others are in favor of something like this, especially considering the HUGE costs and risks associated with the tunnel option -- something which just doesn't seem to make sense.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jenny Hayes
Seattle (Ballard)

I-065-001

The Final EIS Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, describes the environmental documentation and alternatives analysis that occurred prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, which included the consideration of the I-5, Surface, and Transit Hybrid. This approach was rejected because the lead agencies determined it lacked the capacity to serve the long-term needs of the region and, therefore, did not meet the project's purpose and need. The Surface and Transit Scenario Year 2030 Analysis Results is included in Appendix W, Screening Reports, of the Final EIS.