
From: Morgan Keuler [mkeuler@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 3:50 PM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: No Tunnel

I-089-001

Based on your own estimates the deep bore tunnel would not be effective and has the potential to be disastrously expensive. Please don't repeat the Big Dig at our end of I-90. I strongly support a surface transit option.

Freeways can be torn down for the better:
<http://www.infrastructurist.com/2009/07/06/huh-4-cases-of-how-tearing-down-a-highway-can-relieve-traffic-jams-and-help-save-a-city/>

I-089-001

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. The Surface and Transit scenario developed in 2008 was rejected for similar reasons.

Some people and groups feel the viaduct could be replaced by a combination of improvements to surface streets, I-5, and additional transit service. After the purpose and need statement was updated in 2009, design concepts were reevaluated and screened to determine the alternatives to be evaluated in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS. The Surface and Transit Hybrid concept was screened out because the lead agencies determined it lacked the capacity to serve the long-term needs of the region and it does not meet the project's purpose and need to provide capacity to and through downtown Seattle. The Surface and Transit Scenario Year 2030 Analysis Results is included in Appendix W, Screening Reports, of the Final EIS.