
From: Liisa Antilla [liisa_antilla@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, December 05, 2010 11:23 AM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: objection to bored tunnel

I-007-001 | I wish to record my objection to the bored tunnel/viduct project. My main objections relate to:

- I-007-002** | 1) increased greenhouse gas emissions and energy use
I-007-003 | 2) the expense
3) the lack of providing incentives for mass transit.

I-007-004 | I would prefer a surface street option that would be more affordable, would not threaten historic sites and buildings, and would encourage alternative modes of transport.

Thank you.

Liisa Antilla
2311 N 45th St, Ste 315
Seattle 98103

I-007-001

Regional greenhouse gas emissions from all of the build alternatives are predicted to be higher in 2030 than for the 2015 Existing Viaduct, but lower than for the Viaduct Closed (No Build Alternative). Projected increases in greenhouse gases would be due primarily to the increases in future vehicle traffic and fuel use in the region. The bulk of greenhouse gas emissions from the build alternatives would come from vehicle exhaust. Emissions from energy sources that would power SR 99 ventilation and lighting systems and provide maintenance would produce a tiny fraction of greenhouse gas emissions.

I-007-002

Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts. Cost estimates for mitigation are included in the overall project costs. These estimates, along with other cost estimates, are refined as the planning and design process proceeds and details are developed. All cost estimates allow for escalation and inflation and include contingencies for unforeseen events. The project is included in the financially-constrained long range plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (the area's Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO). Cost estimates for the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS are:

- Bored Tunnel – \$1.96 billion
- Cut-and-Cover Tunnel – \$3.0 to \$3.6 billion
- Elevated Structure – \$1.9 to \$2.4 billion

These cost estimates do include different elements. The Bored Tunnel Alternative cost does not include replacing the seawall, improving the Alaskan Way surface street, or building a streetcar. Costs for the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel and Elevated Structure Alternatives do not include replacing the seawall between Union and Broad Streets.

I-007-003

Downtown transit access to and from the south would likely be similar to existing conditions for the Elevated Structure Alternative, since the Columbia and Seneca ramps would be rebuilt and transit could continue to use these ramps as they do today to access downtown and SR 99 (although transit would have the option to use the ramps to Alaskan Way S. as well). For the tunnel alternatives, downtown transit access to and from the south would change, since the Columbia and Seneca ramps would be relocated and buses would likely access downtown via the new ramps on Alaskan Way S., and then use S. Main Street and/or S. Washington Street to access the north-south Third Avenue bus “spine.” The new ramps would extend transit service coverage to a larger portion of the downtown area, particularly the Pioneer Square area.

For transit vehicles serving downtown Seattle from the north, transit access is expected to be comparable for the build alternatives.

I-007-004

Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, of the Final EIS describes the project's history and alternatives evaluated prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The 2004 Draft EIS included evaluation of the Surface Alternative. This alternative was eliminated because it reduced roadway capacity and didn't meet the project's purpose as identified in the 2004 Draft EIS.