

DATE: January 7, 2009

TO: Dave Dye  
Ron Paananen  
Jennifer Ziegler

FROM: John White

CC: Craig Stone Matt Preedy Theresa Greco  
Mike Rigsby Amy Grotefendt Mark Bandy

SUBJECT: SR 99 Deep Bored Tunnel Transportation Performance

Deleted: December 29

Deleted: 8

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Based on the preliminary analysis to date, the team believes that a single bored tunnel is likely the more effective tunnel option from both a cost and schedule perspective (as compared to a twin bored tunnel), and thus was the main focus of this review. More investigation of the cost and constructability trade-offs of both the single and twin bore options is required to confirm this preliminary finding. The briefing paper covers the following topics:¶

## BACKGROUND

In response to your request for additional information on a deep bored tunnel under downtown Seattle as a replacement for the Alaskan Way Viaduct, the program team has prepared this briefing paper related to transportation performance.

Deleted: <#>Transportation function provided by a four-lane deep bored tunnel¶  
<#>Cost estimate for a deep single-bored tunnel ¶  
<#>Schedule for opening a deep bored tunnel to traffic¶  
<#>Potential options for funding a deep bored tunnel¶

## CONCLUSIONS

- Public safety would be improved compared to the existing viaduct.
- Constructing a deep bored tunnel creates the opportunity to maintain SR 99's capacity for trips through downtown Seattle.
- This capacity provides the travel time and reliability for freight and other longer distance trips, accommodating growth in the port, manufacturing/industrial, and commerce functions that rely on the corridor.
- The Elliott-Western and mid-town ramps would not exist with the bored tunnel, so some in-city trips would have longer trip times to get onto SR 99 or through downtown on other routes.
- A deep bored tunnel could be open to traffic in 2015 if a decision is made to proceed in early 2009. The existing viaduct can begin to be taken down by 2012 as currently planned or remain in place to maintain capacity during construction.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: will

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: existing

Deleted: Provides

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: most

Comment [JP1]: None of the work the IPM did provides a basis for this conclusion.

Comment [A2]: The capacity would be generally the same for trips on { ... [1]

Deleted: and provide room for g { ... [2]

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: in-city trips

Deleted: by early 201

Deleted: 7

Deleted: January

Deleted: .

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: provide

Deleted: Preliminary cost estimat { ... [3]

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold

## DISCUSSION

**Proposed deep bored tunnel.** A deep single bore tunnel would connect to the new south mile of SR 99 (from Holgate Street to King Street). It would connect to Aurora Avenue north of the Battery Street Tunnel, in the vicinity of Harrison Street. The alignment of the tunnel would be primarily under First Avenue at a depth necessary to avoid other existing tunnels (bus, rail, sewer, water) under downtown Seattle.

The tunnel would be approximately 9,000 feet in length and would be a single bore that is currently approximately 54 feet in diameter. The tunnel would accommodate four lanes of

Deleted: December 29

Deleted: 8

traffic (two lanes in each direction) plus shoulders and tunnel systems (ventilation, emergency access).

A four-lane street would be constructed along the waterfront and up the hill to Elliott and Western avenues, preserving a grade-separated link to the Ballard, Interbay and Magnolia areas of northwest Seattle.

Deleted: In the current location of the viaduct, a

Deleted: surface

Deleted: with a surface street connection to

Deleted: A

Deleted: replacing an essential link

Comment [A3]: Scenario F, bored tunnel, had the couplet but was low on TDM, transit, and I-5. Probably worth mentioning.

Deleted:

Deleted: This summary assumes that the seawall replacement, utilities relocation, and investments in I-5, transit, city streets, and demand management strategies will be implemented independently by other programs or agencies. Previously these other improvements have been specifically included as part of the project planning, and their removal will need to be explained through the continued planning process.

Deleted: way

Deleted: (removal of the mid-town ramps at Columbia and Seneca have been assumed in all scenarios evaluated)

Formatted: Font: Bold

Comment [A4]: Whether BST

Comment [JP5]: So is the turn

Deleted: likely not be required

Deleted: as it's sole function w

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: being

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Comment [A6]: I think the

Comment [JP7]: Note that the

Comment [A8]: Travel time

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: -

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Comment [JP9]: Again: No

Comment [JP10]: Note that

Comment [A11]: Travel time

Through traffic on SR 99 would be on a limited access road from Denny Way to Spokane Street. Traffic from Ballard, Interbay, and Magnolia that use the existing viaduct via the Elliott/Western ramps would no longer have that option. Those drivers would either take Alaskan Way to travel through downtown, access the deep bored tunnel via Mercer Street (east to southbound direction only), or use I-5. Access from the south into downtown Seattle would be served by the new King Street ramps in the vicinity of the sports stadiums.

Transportation performance of a bored tunnel. Public safety would be improved compared to the existing viaduct.

- The Battery Street Tunnel, which has limited sight distance, short ramps, narrow lanes, and no shoulders, would no longer serve high volumes of traffic and could be closed.
- The existing viaduct also has narrow lanes and shoulders and substandard ramp connections. The deep bored tunnel would have lane and shoulder widths that meet today's safety standards.
- Generally grades in and out of the tunnel would be six percent or less, which would meet state and federal design guidelines while remaining conducive to freight movement.
- The tunnel would be designed with modern safety features that comply with national fire protection safety standards.
- Limited access roads, such as a bored tunnel, typically have a lower crash rate than arterial roads.

Capacity for trips through downtown Seattle would be maintained and their travel times would potentially increase by up to two minutes due to population growth expected by 2030.

- Approximately 65 percent of traffic using the viaduct today is through trips (trips that do not begin or end inside the downtown area). The bored tunnel would carry a higher percentage of through trips (75 percent) when open to traffic. This is primarily due to the change in access for the trips to/from Ballard, Magnolia, and Interbay.
- Trips that use the viaduct today to travel through downtown Seattle take between five and a half and seven minutes between Aloha Street and Spokane Street during peak travel times. In a deep bored tunnel, these trips would take between five and six minutes at year of opening.
- Predicted population growth is expected to increase traffic by up to 11 percent between 2015 and 2030. This could add up to two minutes to travel times for through trips during the peak periods.

\* Please note that all current travel time analysis is based on 2015 projections, and that the 2030 travel times shown are extrapolated based on additional growth projected between 2015 and 2030. Additional analysis would be required to confirm 2030 travel times.

Deleted: December 29

Deleted: 8

- Today there are approximately 91,000 vehicles each day on the viaduct (measured north of Seneca Street); a deep bored tunnel will carry approximately 80,000 to 85,000 vehicles at the same location. The lower volumes are due to the removal of the Elliott/Western ramps.
- However, with a daily volume of 80,000 to 85,000, the new bored tunnel would carry more traffic than the existing Battery Street Tunnel, which currently serves about 63,000 vehicles per day.
- The bored tunnel would provide an important redundancy to I-5 for the north to south link through downtown Seattle, including the ability to absorb additional through trips diverted from I-5 due to blockages from incidents or during future re-construction of its pavement.

Deleted: due

Comment [A12]: I think more context is needed here – the difference I see is that a bored tunnel and elevated have more ability to absorb traffic that shifts due to an incident.

Deleted: to

Deleted: closures related to accidents

Deleted:

Comment [JP13]: No analysis has been done by the IPM to support this.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: assumed

Deleted: in

Comment [A14]: True for any future scenario so I'd re-state to say that the bored tunnel (and elevated) can keep demand on the West Seattle to CBD routes from growing further.

Deleted: slightly shorter

Comment [A15]: Previous work did not assume any level of tolling on a bored tunnel – should that be necessary to pay for it, there would likely be some shift to surface streets and I-5. And it could affect one's view of how much capacity and redundancy is provided – I think a paragraph about tolling may be in order.

Trips from Ballard, Magnolia, and Interbay would no longer have direct access to SR 99 with a deep bored tunnel; this would lengthen the time it takes to make trips from those neighborhoods through downtown Seattle.

- Trips from northwest Seattle neighborhoods (Ballard, Interbay, Magnolia) that would no longer have direct access to SR 99 would experience longer trip times.
- Those trips take between two and three minutes today; they would take between seven and eight minutes in 2015 if they took a four-lane surface street on the waterfront. Trip times could increase by up to another three minutes by 2030 due to population growth beyond 2015.
- Other options would exist for Ballard-Interbay connectivity assuming the advancement of the two-way Mercer improvements from Elliott to Dexter (travel times for these routes have not yet been modeled)

Trips from West Seattle would experience longer travel times to downtown Seattle, due to the combination of growth and the removal of the mid-town ramps at Columbia and Seneca (a result common to all scenarios evaluated). Travel times for West Seattle trips through downtown to the north would likely be faster than today.

Deleted: The

Deleted: travel demand modeling results

Deleted: modeling analysis for the deep bored tunnel assumed minimal investments in I-5 and city streets, and a moderate baseline level of demand management strategies and transit service enhancements. These investments have little effect on through trips that would choose to stay on SR 99 if it is maintained as a deep bored tunnel. Therefore if those investments are ... [15]

The configuration of SR 99 near its northern portal would allow for reconnecting some local cross streets (for example Thomas St.). This reconnection helps with traffic circulation and pedestrian and bike movement in and between the growing Uptown, Queen Anne, and South Lake Union neighborhoods.

The modeling analysis for the deep bored tunnel assumed basic investments in I-5 and city streets, and a minimum level of demand management strategies and transit service enhancements. These investments have little effect on the type of trips that would use the bored tunnel, and therefore if those investments are not made there is expected to be little difference in the transportation performance described above.

Deleted: ¶

Route to Ballard-Interbay – I dor ... [16]

Comment [JP16]: Need to be careful with this since it all depends on ... [17]

Comment [JP17]: I'd be careful with this.

Deleted: Building a deep bored tunnel. Completion of an enviro ... [18]

Deleted: ¶

Paying for a Deep Bored Tunn ... [19]

Deleted: ATTACHMENTS ¶ ... [20]

**Page 1: [1] Comment [A2]** Administrator 1/6/2009 11:30:00 AM

The capacity would be generally the same for trips on SR 99 through downtown, but that have a trip-end north of Denny. The subtle distinction is that the Elliott-Western capacity is not the same. If EW capacity is handled through couplet, then that needs to be part of definition. Also, configuration north of Denny is important.

**Page 1: [2] Deleted** WSDOT 1/7/2009 1:11:00 PM

and provide room for growth in those vehicle trips expected to occur by 2030.[JP1]

**Page 1: [3] Deleted** WSDOT 1/7/2009 9:58:00 AM

Preliminary cost estimates for a single bored tunnel shows the possibility of achieving cost savings compared to a twin bored tunnel. More work is needed in early 2009 to confirm this finding.

**Page 2: [4] Deleted** WSDOT 1/7/2009 9:42:00 AM

(removal of the mid-town ramps at Columbia and Seneca have been assumed in all scenarios evaluated to date).

**Page 2: [5] Comment [A4]** Administrator 1/6/2009 11:46:00 AM

Whether BST remains or not is a function of how long and what portion of SR 99 you keep open during bored tunnel construction. If the viaduct is torn down in 2012, prior to the new tunnel being open, I don't see a need to modify BST at all, just close it and fill it in.

**Page 2: [6] Comment [JP5]** James Parsons 1/6/2009 8:34:00 AM

So is the tunnel rehabilitated as a one lane facility in each direction. I thought it was going to be closed and abandoned/filled in???

**Page 2: [7] Deleted** WSDOT 1/7/2009 9:50:00 AM

as it's sole function would be to provide enhanced local grid connectivity[A2].[JP3]

**Page 2: [8] Comment [A6]** Administrator 1/6/2009 1:44:00 PM

I think the performance discussion should be split into today/opening year and 2030. For 2030, what I would make sure we state is that a BT provides the travel time and reliability for freight and other longer distance trips that keep the port, manufacturing/industrial and commerce functions near the 99 corridor growing.

**Page 2: [9] Comment [JP7]** James Parsons 1/6/2009 9:41:00 AM

Note that the IPM work did not do any type of 2030 analysis to come to this conclusion.

**Page 2: [10] Comment [A8]** Administrator 1/6/2009 1:40:00 PM

Travel time and reliability of that travel time are important features of a limited access facility such as a bored tunnel – that's what would distinguish it from surface streets.

**Page 2: [11] Deleted** WSDOT 1/7/2009 11:47:00 AM

[JP4][A5]

Approximately 65 percent of traffic using the viaduct today is through trips (trips that do not begin or end inside the downtown area). The bored tunnel would carry a higher percentage of through trips (75 percent) when open to traffic. This is primarily due to the change in access for the trips to/from Ballard-Interbay.

**Page 2: [12] Comment [JP9]** James Parsons 1/6/2009 8:37:00 AM

Again: No 2030 analysis has been done to support this conclusion.

**Page 2: [13] Comment [JP10]** James Parsons 1/7/2009 10:12:00 AM

Note that the IPM work did not do any type of 2030 analysis to come to this conclusion.

**Page 2: [14] Comment [A11]** Administrator 1/7/2009 10:12:00 AM

Travel time and reliability of that travel time are important features of a limited access facility such as a bored tunnel – that's what would distinguish it from surface streets.

Page 3: [15] Deleted	Administrator	1/7/2009 1:38:00 PM
<p>modeling analysis for the deep bored tunnel assumed minimal investments in I-5 and city streets, and a moderate baseline level of demand management strategies and transit service enhancements. These investments have little effect on through trips that would choose to stay on SR 99 if it is maintained as a deep bored tunnel. Therefore if those investments are not made there is expected to be little effect on the transportation performance of the bored tunnel.</p>		
Page 3: [16] Deleted	WSDOT	1/7/2009 12:53:00 PM

Route to Ballard-Interbay – I don't think the waterfront route is the only choice. We should describe how someone might use the bored tunnel and either Mercer or Dexter/Nickerson.

Page 3: [17] Comment [JP16]	James Parsons	1/6/2009 8:42:00 AM
<p>Need to be careful with this since it all depends on what you decide to model for 2030.</p>		

Page 3: [18] Deleted	WSDOT	1/7/2009 11:37:00 AM
<p><b>Building a deep bored tunnel.</b> Completion of an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required before construction of a deep bored tunnel can begin. Work on the environmental review process began in July 2008 with the issuance of a notice of intent and purpose and need statement. Scoping comments have already been solicited from the public and agencies</p>		

We believe this earlier work can be used as the initiation of the environmental review of a deep bored tunnel. Under this bored tunnel proposal, the next step would be to revise the purpose and need statement and issue a new notice of intent. This provides an opportunity to focus on SR 99 replacement and explain why seawall replacement, surface streets, and transit improvements have independent utility and will be implemented separately. With a narrowed focus the status of co-lead (Seattle and King County) and cooperating (Federal Transit Administration and Corps of Engineers) agencies can be revisited. As required by the National Environmental Policy Act, all reasonable alternatives must be evaluated in the EIS. Based on the outcomes of the last year of scoping-level analysis, it seems likely that a new independent elevated structure and a surface and transit option would be carried as additional alternatives. Other options evaluated, such as a cut and cover tunnel, could be dropped from further consideration based on future transportation performance and construction impacts. In addition, it is unclear whether the surface and transit option meets the 2030 transportation needs, which could potentially result in it being dropped upon further evaluation. [JP6]The integrated elevated scenario evaluated in 2008 carries significant concerns due to Section 4(f) impacts and public safety issues, and could also be dropped.

If work begins in early January on the environmental review of a bored tunnel, then the draft EIS could be published in December 2009 for public review; a final EIS released in September 2010; and a federal Record of Decision signed in December 2010. There is an opportunity to shorten this schedule if a decision is made to not apply current federal funding and not solicit new federal funding to the central waterfront replacement of the viaduct. This would create a situation where the State Environmental Policy Act would guide the environmental review process. [JP7]



A single bored tunnel could be open to traffic by early 2017 assuming an aggressive schedule and funds being available when needed. No assumption has been made about the existing viaduct. It could be removed by 2012 as currently planned, or remain standing until the bored tunnel is open, in order to maintain traffic in the SR 99 corridor. Maintaining traffic on SR 99 during construction would create higher construction risks at the portal locations and may cause slight increases to the cost estimates below.

The cost estimates provided below are preliminary and have not been through a Cost Estimate Validation Process (CEVP), which is a standard procedure for all large projects managed by WSDOT. The methodology for preparing these estimates has generally followed the methodology of CEVP by establishing a base estimate for construction costs and adding factors for risks, contingency, and inflation that are likely to occur. These numbers are also based on conceptual designs; additional preliminary design and a complete CEVP are needed to confirm these costs.

<b>Essential Elements – SR 99 Single Bored Tunnel</b>	<b>Planning Level Estimate</b>
Construction Costs	\$850 to \$961 million
Contract and Construction Management; Final Design	\$162 to \$300 million
Contingency and Risk	\$325 to \$547 million
Inflation	\$208 to \$281 million
Right-of-Way Costs	\$40 million
<b>Total Tunnel Costs</b>	<b>\$1,585 to 2,130 million</b>
Viaduct Demolition and	
Alaskan Way Restoration (Four-Lane Surface Street)	\$98 to \$125 million
<b>Total Program Costs</b>	<b>\$1,683 to \$2,255 million</b>

These costs *do not* include the costs of the following items:

<b>Other Elements</b>	<b>Planning Level Estimate</b>
Seawall Replacement	\$189 to \$256 million
Waterfront Utility Relocation	\$41 to \$56 million
Waterfront Streetcar	\$9 to \$12 million
City Street Work	\$49 to \$66 million
Other	\$83 to \$112 million
<b>Other Costs</b>	<b>\$503 to \$682 million</b>

**Paying for a Deep Bored Tunnel.** The state has committed \$2.8 billion to pay for a viaduct replacement. Currently \$1.1 billion has been committed or spent for the Moving

Forward Projects, which replace or repair over half of the viaduct. This leaves approximately \$1.7 billion in state investment. Given that some portions of the Moving Forward Program would either not be required or require less investment under a bored tunnel option, there is potential for savings that could be transferred to help pay for the bored tunnel. This would involve decisions regarding the latter phase of Battery Street Tunnel retrofit work, retrofitting the existing viaduct between Lenora Street and the Battery Street Tunnel, and the scope and cost of the northern transition section of the Holgate to King viaduct replacement project. Current estimates would indicate between \$100 million and \$150 million could be available, further work would be required to confirm a more specific estimate.

Charging tolls to drivers in a four-lane bored tunnel through downtown Seattle would support up to \$410 million in additional project funding between 2014 and 2018. Tolling the existing viaduct during construction could raise up to another \$140 million in pay-as-you go project funding, for a total SR 99 tolling contribution of approximately \$550 million.

Tolling SR 99 during and after construction would increase the total possible state funding available for a deep bored tunnel to \$2.25 billion. Tolling is expected to divert some trips to other routes such as the downtown street grid or I-5. Preliminary studies have indicated the diversion rate could be from 35 to 40 percent, which is assumed within the above tolling assessment.

At this point in time there are no proposals for additional federal funds within the program, though there are ongoing questions related to stimulus package opportunities. As previously mentioned, there is some schedule advantage to pursuing the central waterfront environmental planning work based solely on state funding.

Other potential funding sources have been discussed, including a local improvement district for property owners who would benefit from new open space on the central waterfront; local public utilities paying for utility relocation; open space funds; and Port of Seattle funding. The amount and likelihood of these funding sources have not been explored related to the current bored tunnel proposal, although the Port of Seattle has expressed interest in discussing the funding plan for a capacity replacement.

## **NEXT STEPS**

If a decision is made to pursue a deep bored tunnel as a replacement option for the Alaskan Way Viaduct, we recommend the following steps be taken by the program team:

Convene an early January work shop to further review the base estimates, findings of the recent independent estimate review, and the program mark-ups that have come into question. It is assumed we would engage a variety of independent tunnel experts in order to ensure findings that have broad industry support.

Complete a two to three month tunnel feasibility study to confirm preliminary findings about the cost, schedule and alignment of a single bored tunnel as compared to a dual bored tunnel.

Continue the environmental review process.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Single bored tunnel alignment and profile