

Vince Panesko

Page S-7 of the draft EIS summary states the following:

"What Other Alternatives are Evaluated in the EIS?

In addition to the Proposed Action, a Local Actions Alternative and a No Action Alternative were evaluated in the EIS. SEPA regulations require that an EIS analyze reasonable alternatives. In general, this means alternatives that could achieve the project objectives and have lower environmental costs. Over the past decades, many flood hazard projects and concepts have been studied. Ideas such as re-routing or raising I-5, constructed side channels or channel diversions, other levees, floodwalls, flood retention facilities, and restoration actions have all been assessed for effectiveness in controlling floods. These alternatives were considered but not further analyzed in this EIS because they had higher environmental costs, were not economically feasible, or did not meet the proposed project objectives."

The problem with this statement is that it was written when the cost of alternatives were compared with a \$400 million FRE.

Now that the FRE costs have ballooned from around \$400 million up to a range of \$1.3 to \$2.3 billion, those alternatives (such as levees) which were previously dismissed may now be economically feasible.

The draft EIS cannot arbitrarily make a statement that previous alternatives are still not economically feasible without showing the comparison of costs with the new \$2.3 billion dollar FRE.

This draft EIS, Appendix 1, Alternatives needs to reveal the costs of alternatives and show how they compare with the NEW cost of the FRE.

While on one hand, Ecology claims this draft EIS is supposed to provide transparency, this draft fails to provide transparency with regards to the comparison of costs between the new FRE design and dismissed alternatives.