ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT REPLACEMENT PROJECT
Final Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation

City of Seattle
ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Final Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation

Submitted pursuant to:
The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321(2)(C)) and
the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (Ch. 43.21 C. RCW) and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, (49 U.S.C. 301(c)) by
the
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
and
WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
and
CITY OF SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Abstract
The existing Alaskan Way Viaduct (SR 99) was built in the 1950s and was damaged in the 2001 Nisqually earthquake. It is seismically vulnerable and at the end of its useful life—it must be replaced. The Federal Highway Administration, Washington State Department of Transportation, and City of Seattle plan to replace the existing facility to provide a structure capable of withstanding earthquakes and to ensure that people and goods can safely and efficiently travel within and through the project corridor. The Alaskan Way Viaduct provides vital transportation connections into and through downtown Seattle, as well as between various other regional destinations. Failure of the viaduct would create severe hardships for the city and region and could possibly cause injury or death.

The 2004 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzed five Build Alternatives and a No Build Alternative for their potential effects on the human and natural environment. Based on information presented in the Draft EIS, public comments, and further study and design, the lead agencies reduced the number of alternatives from five to two. The two alternatives, the Tunnel (now the Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative) and Elevated Structure, were then evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS document. In 2009, the Governor, former King County Executive, and former Seattle Mayor recommended replacing the central waterfront portion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a single bored tunnel. The 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS analyzed the new Bored Tunnel Alternative, provided information about design changes to the 2006 build alternatives still under consideration, and compared 2006 build alternatives to the Bored Tunnel Alternative.

This Final EIS evaluates the No Build Alternative in addition to the Bored Tunnel Alternative, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, and Elevated Structure Alternative, each with and without tolls, for their potential effects to the natural and built environments. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative with tolls as the preferred alternative. No decision will be made on the proposed action until the Record of Decision is published, which is expected in August 2011. If tolling is not authorized by the Washington State Legislature, it could direct WSDOT to request a revised Record of Decision from Federal Highway Administration to authorize the construction of the Bored Tunnel Alternative as a non-tolled facility.
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The SR 99: Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project proposes to replace SR 99 between S. Royal Brougham Way and Roy Street in Seattle, Washington with a facility that has improved earthquake resistance. Damage sustained by the viaduct during the February 2001 Nisqually earthquake compromised its structural integrity. This past damage, along with the age, design, and location of the existing viaduct, makes this facility vulnerable to sudden and catastrophic failure in an earthquake.

SR 99 and Interstate 5 are the primary north-south access routes through downtown Seattle, making the Alaskan Way Viaduct a vital link in the region’s highway and freight mobility system, and thus critical to the region’s economy. Together with the transit system, light rail and local streets, SR 99 serves regional and local needs.

This Final EIS analyzes and compares the effects of the No Build Alternative, and the Bored Tunnel Alternative, Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Alternative, and Elevated Structure Alternative, each with and without tolls. The No Build Alternative is evaluated to provide baseline information. The lead agencies have identified the Bored Tunnel Alternative with tolls as the preferred alternative. If tolling is not authorized by the Washington State Legislature, it could direct WSDOT to request a revised Record of Decision from the Federal Highway Administration to authorize the construction of the Bored Tunnel Alternative as a non-tolled facility.
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IN MEMORIAM…

This document is dedicated to the memories of Maureen Sullivan (WSDOT), Roland Benito (WSDOT), and James Leonard (FHWA). Their legacy of dedication and contributions to the delivery of the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program is immeasurable. We will carry forward their spirit and commitment towards delivery of this public safety project in their memories.