
From: Joshua Newman [joshua@oreza.org]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 10:38 PM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: 2010 SDEIS Comment

Dear Angela Freudenstein,

I-116-001

Thank you for proving that the tunnel is an expensive, inappropriate, and poor solution to the problem of the Alaska Way Viaduct. Your analysis shows that dollars to people moved, Washington State would be hard pressed to find a more expensive solution, or one that forces roughly 50,000 cars a day onto the surface streets of downtown, without providing any mitigation for those cars.

Stop advancing the Deep Bore Tunnel now, the state nor the city can afford it. Look to the Surface/I-5/Transit solution WSDOT and SDOT have already created.

Thank you,
Joshua Newman
Seattle, WA
206-963-2397

--
Never laugh at live dragons.
-- B. Baggins

I-116-001

The state legislature authorized funding to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct in RCW 47.01.402. According to this law; "The legislature finds that the replacement of the vulnerable state route number 99 Alaskan Way viaduct is a matter of urgency for the safety of Washington's traveling public and the needs of the transportation system in central Puget Sound." This legislation also authorizes WSDOT to obligate two billion eight hundred million dollars. In order to fund this obligation the legislation further identifies sources of funding: \$2,400,000,000 of state funding; \$400,000,000 of toll funding.

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 it has received from diverse interests. Specifically, compared to the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives, it avoids substantial closure of SR 99 during construction and it can be built in a shorter period of time than the other two alternatives. Extended closure of SR 99 would have severe adverse effects on Seattle and the Puget Sound region. Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) in the Final EIS provides a more in-depth comparison of tradeoffs for the three alternatives. Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report, addresses traffic impacts including congestion on surface streets downtown. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, of the Final EIS describes the environmental documentation and alternatives analysis that occurred prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, which included the I-5, Surface, and Transit Hybrid. This approach was seriously considered, but was rejected because the lead agencies determined it lacked the capacity to serve the long-term needs of the region. WSDOT conducted further analysis as documented in the Surface and Transit Scenario Year 2030 Analysis Results, which is included in Appendix W, Screening

Reports, of the Final EIS.

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.