

---

**From:** Barak Gaster [seattlebarak@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2010 2:17 PM  
**To:** AWW SDEIS Comments  
**Subject:** NO - to Deep Bore Tunnel

Dear WSDOT,

I-050-001

I am a physician who works at the University of Washington and lives on Capitol Hill. I have lived in Seattle for 23 years. Over the past 23 years there is no other local political issue that I feel more strongly, more passionately, AGAINST than the proposal to dig a deep bore tunnel to replace the Alaska Way Viaduct.

Given the current state of the economy and the potential for cost overruns which could bankrupt our city, I feel very strongly that this project is a monumental mistake that has the potential to do great damage to the well-being of our city.

PLEASE PLEASE stop this project and proceed instead with either a surface option or a rebuild of the viaduct. Either option would be safer, more fiscally reasonable, and overall far better for our city.

Sincerely yours,

Barak Gaster, MD  
1223 18th Ave E  
Seattle WA 98112

### I-050-001

FHWA, WSDOT, and the City of Seattle appreciate receiving your comments on the Bored Tunnel Alternative. The Final EIS Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, describes the environmental documentation and alternatives analysis that occurred prior to the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS.

After studying several retrofitting concepts, the lead agencies' found that rebuilding the viaduct would not be a cost-effective, long-term solution that adequately addresses the risks to public safety and the weakened state of the viaduct. Elements of the Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives were incorporated into the Elevated Structure Alternative, which was analyzed in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

As explained in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS, the Surface Alternative does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. Because the project has evolved since comments were submitted in 2004 and 2006, please refer to the Final EIS for current information.

Although costs are an important part of project planning and decision-making, they are purposely not a major part of the environmental review process. As provided in CFR 1502.23 "For purposes of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of the various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations." Overall project costs are included with the project description and are used for the analysis of economic impacts.