
From: jordan west monez [jordanwestmonez@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 11:35 PM
To: AWW SDEIS Comments
Subject: Do not build a bored tunnel

I-111-001

To whom it may concern,
The replacement of the failing Viaduct with a tunnel is too shortsighted and too expensive for Seattle to invest in. This ridiculous idea of yet again drastically changing the city waterfront, while putting in a high-cost, high-risk system that will not have the capacity that the Viaduct currently does, that does not invest in future technologies like rail, is a mistake and should be seen as one by those in charge of our city funds. Even if Washington did get behind this project, which it looks like won't happen, it should still be looked at as an overpriced and unnecessary investment in our infrastructure. If "most of the trips" on 99 will go to other routes, why do we need the bored tunnel in the first place?

As a citizen of Seattle, I do not want to allow the tunnel option to go through, and think that more forward-thinking solutions should be found for the transportation problem on the waterfront. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jordan Monez
Seattle, WA
December 2010

I-111-001

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 alternatives.