

---

**From:** michael archambault [michael.arch@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2010 6:55 PM  
**To:** AWW SDEIS Comments; peter.hahn@seattle.gov;  
mike.mcgin@seattle.gov; richard.conlin@seattle.gov;  
sally.bagshaw@seattle.gov; tim.burgess@seattle.gov;  
sally.clark@seattle.gov; jean.godden@seattle.gov;  
nick.licata@seattle.gov; bruce.harrell@seattle.gov  
**Subject:** Comments on the Alaskan Way Viaduct 2010 SDEIS

**I-009-001**

Thank you for your work on the Viaduct Replacement Supplemental Draft EIS. After reviewing the SDEIS, I am left with serious questions and concerns about the current plans to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct.

My biggest issue with the SDEIS is that it is not at all clear that the bored tunnel has any significant benefits over the surface/transit/I-5 option, not to mention that the bored tunnel is a more costly and inherently riskier project.

**I-009-002**

The environmental impacts of the tolled bored tunnel option (primarily the impact to the surface-level traffic) seem to have relatively similar consequences to surface traffic as the Surface/Transit/I-5 improvements option has suggested, except that the bored tunnel alternative comes with an addition \$1 billion+ price tag and does little to rethink the long term vision of our transportation infrastructure. If that weren't enough, the risk of building the world's largest bored tunnel undoubtedly results in a world of potentially unaffordable risks that do not get enough attention in this SDEIS.

**I-009-003**

The surface/transit/I-5 option gets barely a passing mention throughout this entire report.

Since it has no downtown exits, the number of cars that will use this bored tunnel (less than many of Seattle's 4-lane roads, including most prominently, the Ballard Bridge!) is incredibly insignificant when considering the significant costs and risks associated with boring such a large tunnel under downtown. For example, the fact that the presence of the south portal will significantly increase car traffic through historic and treasured Pioneer Square area while threatening its historical buildings is especially disconcerting.

Especially during times of forced fiscal restraint, this SDEIS does very little to justify its expensive price tag and risks, especially since it only compares it to other nearly-as-expensive alternatives (cut and cover, rebuilt viaduct). I am seeing negative impact after negative impact in this report, yet no serious positive that justifies its enormous price tag.

I strongly demand that WSDOT provide information comparing the bored tunnel option (with tolls) to Surface/Transit/I-5 option, which is cheaper and uses more proven and predictable construction methods. WSDOT's own studies were beginning to show serious promise for the Surface/Transit/I-5 improvements option, and until the bored tunnel is fairly compared against the Surface/Transit/I-5 option, I consider this SDIES significantly lacking and desperately incomplete.

Thanks for your concern and attention,  
Michael Archambault  
Seattle resident  
206-529-7558

### **I-009-001**

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 consideration of the I-5, Surface, and Transit Hybrid. This approach was rejected because the lead agencies determined it lacked the capacity to serve the long-term needs of the region.

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 that it has received from diverse interests.

### **I-009-002**

In the Surface and Transit Alternative, substantial delays would be expected in the stadium area for northbound SR 99 traffic near S. Atlantic Street where vehicles would transition from a limited-access facility to an urban arterial with signalized intersections. Substantial delays also would be expected in the area north of Denny Way for southbound traffic at intersections along Aurora Avenue at Valley and Roy Streets. More reasonable operations are predicted for many intersections beyond these bottleneck intersections. The 2030 transportation analysis presented in the 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix C, Transportation Discipline Report's Attachment A shows operational benefits for the Bored Tunnel over the Surface and Transit Alternative and compares the two alternatives. Updated analysis for the Surface and Transit Scenario Year 2030 Analysis Results has been included in Appendix W, Screening Reports, of the Final EIS.

### **I-009-003**

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 seriously considered during the Partnership Process, but was rejected because the lead agencies determined it lacked the capacity to serve the long-term needs of the region. 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 that it has received from diverse interests.

Because the I-5, Surface, and Transit Hybrid did not meet the purpose and need for the project, detailed cost estimates were not prepared. 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. Please refer to the Final EIS for current information.