

From: [Sharon Royal](#)
To: [AWV SDEIS Comments](#);
CC:
Subject: Choices??
Date: Friday, September 01, 2006 9:24:18 PM
Attachments:

Hello,

I-644-001

Although intuitively I am against replacing the viaduct in any way, I have yet to be presented with enough facts, side-by-side, to make a sound comparison of the choices at hand. I wonder how we, the citizens, can make an educated assessment of any of the options when we don't know the facts? I wonder why a presentation has not been made in the papers and many other very public places stating, *side-by-side*: 1) The real **design and scope** of each project, 2) the estimated **cost** of each project (with real figures), 3) a real estimated **time-table** of construction, start to finish, for each project and, importantly, 4) *Actual specific plans* for routing the **traffic** that now uses the viaduct each day and discussion about how it will impact life in the affected areas. I can't imagine how the mayor, the town council or anyone else can responsibly take a stand one way or another without these 4 pieces of information. Can someone please tell me either, where I can find such information all together, or why this information is not being pushed, visibly, into the public arena?

I-644-002

Opinion-wise, I think the tunnel option is grossly irresponsible for so many reasons including actual costs, costs to the businesses that will be affected, cost in quality of life to those people who use the viaduct daily, cost to all of us who will suffer as a result of the tear-down and construction. Let's take a real hard look at who this expensive beautification project will benefit and wonder together if it is the way we want to spend our money. What *are* the other options? How do they stack up in the ways mentioned above?

Thanks for your reply.
Sharon Royal

I-644-001

The "side-by-side" comparative information you've requested for the alternatives under consideration was included in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS. The information presented in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS is updated in the Final EIS. Specifically, please refer to the following chapters:

Summary and Chapter 3 - Alternatives Description. These chapters provide a clear and thorough "side-by-side" comparison of the alternatives currently being considered, including cost of each alternative.

Chapter 6 - Construction Effects. Provides a detailed description of the construction effects for each alternative.

I-644-002

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 be more disruptive to Seattle and the Puget Sound region. Chapters 5 (Permanent Effects) and 6 (Construction Effects) in the Final EIS provide a more in-depth comparison of trade-offs for the three alternatives.