
From: Tom Griga [tom.griga@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2010 11:46 AM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: minimal environmental benefits from the tunnel

Hello,

I-056-001

I would like to add my opposition to the proposed deep bore tunnel. As a Seattle resident I am embarrassed that this supposedly progressive city has a 2 billion dollar plan to simply move some cars underground. Here are some of my problems with the tunnel:

- money invested in fossil fuel based automobile transport instead of public transit
- adds no benefit to reducing carbon emissions
- removes existing downtown exit, an expensive bypass of the city
- the waterfront park area will be blocked for pedestrians by a boulevard with more traffic than there is currently
- since the tunnel is tolled more traffic will be diverted to downtown with no real plan to deal with that additional traffic
- the proposed tunnel is planned to move much traffic and is very expensive.

I favor options that included improved existing surface roads, improved public transit and improvement to the existing I-5

Thank You,

Tom Griga
505 14th Ave E Apt 202
Seattle WA 98112

I-056-001

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 I-5, Surface, and Transit Hybrid. This approach was considered, but was rejected because the lead agencies determined it lacked the capacity to serve the long-term needs of the region. The Final EIS Appendix W, Screening Reports, includes the Surface and Transit Scenario Year 2030 Analysis Results.

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.