ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT REPLACEMENT PROJECT  
2010 Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation

Submitted pursuant to:  
The National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.)  
and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (Ch. 43.21 C.R.W.)  
and Section 6(f) of the Department of Transportation Act;  
(49 U.S.C. 303(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 (State Route [SR] 99) was damaged in the 2001 Nisqually earthquake, is at the end of its useful life, and must be replaced. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), 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 SR 99 corridor provides vital transportation connections in to 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 March 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. The five alternatives evaluated were called the Rebuild, Aerial, Tunnel, Bypass Tunnel, and Surface Alternatives. Based on information presented in the Draft EIS, public comments, and further study and design, the project partners reduced the number of alternatives from five to two in late 2004. The two alternatives, the Tunnel and Elevated Structure, were then evaluated in the 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS document.

This Supplemental Draft EIS provides additional information available since the 2004 Draft EIS and 2006 Supplemental Draft EIS were published and new information analyzing the Bored Tunnel Alternative.
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The SR 99 Alaskan Way Viaduct and Interstate 5 are the primary north-south limited 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.
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IN MEMORIAM…
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