

---

**From:** Sydney Hammerquist [shammerquist@me.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2010 11:09 PM  
**To:** AWW SDEIS Comments  
**Subject:** Response to DEIS

Dear Ms. Freudenstein, Mr. Paananen, & Mr. Hahn,

I-059-001

I am a King County resident and Washington state taxpayer concerned with the preferred alternative's ability to meet the fundamental project goals.

There is one point which is reason enough to reconsider another viaduct replacement plan in place of the current preferred plan.

The fact that the tunnel will be the largest of its type ever attempted is a RED flag. Add to that the fact that the cost overrun budget was GIVEN AWAY, and we have a financial disaster waiting to happen.

Please consider these concerns when reviewing the DEIS and all other decisions on this subject.

Respectfully,

Sydney Hammerquist  
Sammamish, WA 98074  
Sent from my iPhone

### I-059-001

The purpose and need statement is included in Question 5 of Chapter 1, Introduction, in the Final EIS. Chapter 2, Alternatives Development, of the Final EIS describes the history of the project, including how the purpose and need statement was updated and alternatives development. 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.