

Boulevard interchange would be removed for expansion of the off-ramps and 24th Avenue East onto that property.

As with the 4-Lane Alternative, the south retaining wall between SR 520 and Lake Washington Boulevard East, east of Montlake Boulevard, would be replaced by a higher retaining wall to accommodate the deeper SR 520 roadbed and the new Montlake lid structure (see Exhibit 10). Construction of these walls could stress or damage the street trees in the strip planter. The addition of 8-foot-high sound walls east of the lid could require trimming the trees. The changed vegetation and the new sound walls would cause a high level change to views from houses along Lake Washington Boulevard East, which could be perceived as a positive change.

In the east Shelby-Hamlin area, the bicycle/pedestrian path, new off-ramps to Montlake Boulevard, and 10- to 18-foot-high sound walls would remove the existing tree screen and a wide strip of grass and shrubs in the open space south of the Shelby Drive alley. The sound wall would screen views of the highway for residents adjacent to SR 520, and a barrier or screen would be placed between the path and the remaining open space.

The MOHAI building, McCurdy Park, and portions of East Montlake Park would be removed to accommodate the roadway and a stormwater treatment wetland (the same as for the 4-Lane Alternative). This could be a positive change because the wetland would be more consistent with the shoreline and wetlands of Union Bay and the Arboretum.

As with the 4-Lane Alternative, the new roadway structures over the Arboretum wetlands and waterways would be more visible than the existing SR 520 due to the increased height, greater depth of the roadway, and 8-foot-high sound walls on both sides of the roadway (see Exhibits 11 and 12). The 6-Lane Alternative heights, profiles, and column spacing (proposed 250 feet apart versus existing 100 feet apart) would be similar to the 4-Lane Alternative. The removal of the unused R.H. Thompson Expressway Ramps and the wider column spacing would open up views at water and ground level (see Exhibit 13). The west-to-south ramp to the Arboretum would pass under the highway at about 15 feet above the water.

An important difference between the 4-Lane and 6-Lane Alternatives east of Montlake would be the addition of two HOV flyover ramps (one



lane eastbound and one lane westbound) that would cross over the main highway about 60 to 65 feet above Arboretum waterways. This ramp would probably be visible from most viewpoints.

Views from shoreline neighborhoods along Lake Washington in Seattle would be noticeably different because of the wider and higher roadway, the straighter alignment, taller girders, and 8-foot-high sound walls. The roadway would likely be visible above the tree canopy in the Arboretum (Exhibit 12). The Evergreen Point Bridge alignment would be about 70 feet further north than the existing bridge, which would result in greater separation between North Madison Park and the bridge. This is expected to improve views north across Union Bay. The new structures would not change views from the Graham Visitors Center or the interior of the Arboretum near the Center.

Construction activities and the new alignment would cause the temporary loss of vegetation in the Arboretum. Vegetation would be replanted wherever possible.

The Aurora Borealis sculptures standing at the entrance to Union Bay would be removed to accommodate the bridge alignment. The sculptures would not be reinstalled because they would not be visible from the highway.

## **Lake Washington**

### **No Build Alternative**

Under the No Build Alternative's Continued Operations Scenario, no structures or vegetation would be replaced or noticeably modified. This assumes that the existing bridges and roadways would be maintained in their current shape. There would be no changes to views to and from the Seattle project area.

Under the Catastrophic Failure Scenario, the Portage Bay Bridge and the fixed approach structures could fail in an earthquake. The floating portion of the Evergreen Point Bridge could sink in a catastrophic failure, which would leave unobstructed views of Lake Washington. This scenario could also require the removal of damaged or failed portions of the Evergreen Point Bridge, which would change the appearance of the surroundings. For the Catastrophic Failure Scenario, the visual effects would be high until the failed portions of the bridges were removed.



#### 4-Lane Alternative

The new Evergreen Point Bridge would look similar to the existing bridge, but the roadway would sit on a column-pontoon structure, not directly on pontoons as the existing bridge does. As a result, the roadway would be about 25 feet above the water, or 14 feet higher than the existing roadway. The west approach to the Evergreen Point Bridge would be wider than the existing bridge, about 70 feet farther north, and straight so as to remove the S-curve at the existing west highrise. The existing truss structures atop the west and east highrises would not be replaced on the new bridge.

These changes in scale and appearance are expected to be noticeable when seen from distant shoreline neighborhoods (Exhibits 12 and 14), but would not change the quality or character of those views because the bridge is an existing, small element in the distance. For houses near the bridge in Medina, the northward shift would move the columns and roadway closer to houses on the north side and farther from houses on the south side of the east highrise (Exhibit 15). The overall character or quality of those views would not change because the bridge is already a large part of those views, depending on the viewpoint's proximity to the bridge. The column spacing would increase from 30 feet apart to 75 feet apart, which would open up views from the lake.

Sweeping views of the Cascade and Olympic Mountains and Mount Rainier that currently exist from the Evergreen Point Bridge would be very noticeably changed and constricted because the roadway would have a 10-foot-high sound wall on the south side of the bridge near Madison Park. On the north side of the bridge, the barrier between the new bicycle/pedestrian path and the roadway could partially block views to the north for motorists for the full length of the bridge. The path would make these panoramic views to the north available to bicyclists and pedestrians, and the four scenic vantage points on the bridge would allow users the opportunity to stop and enjoy the view from the lake.

Views for boaters and others on the lake would change moderately because the column-pontoon structure would raise the roadway, making the structure more noticeable from viewpoints close to the bridge. However, the increased column spacing would open up views from the lake level.



---

## Existing View

- Main roadway about 10 feet above water
- S-curve at west approach
- Floating bridge deck rests directly on pontoons



---

## 4-Lane Alternative

- Main roadway about 25 feet above water
- S-curve removed and alignment straightened
- Floating bridge alignment shifted to north
- Floating bridge deck rests on column-pontoon combination



---

## 6-Lane Alternative

- Same as 4-Lane Alternative, but wider



---

Looking northeast across Lake Washington toward Evergreen Point Bridge and Kirkland from Lynn Street Park in Madison Park



**Exhibit 14. View from Madison Park—Viewpoint 6**

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

---

## Existing View

- Columns 30 feet apart between floating bridge and navigation channel
- Floating bridge deck about 10 feet above water
- Navigation channel 207 feet wide and 57 feet high



---

## 4-Lane Alternative

- Columns 75 feet apart from east highrise across lake
- Floating bridge deck about 25 feet above water on columns
- Floating bridge alignment is shifted about 130 feet north (measured at east highrise)
- Bicycle/pedestrian path passes under bridge just west of landfall
- Operations building set into hillside under bridge, screened by vegetation
- Navigation channel is 200 feet wide and 70 feet high



---

## 6-Lane Alternative

- Same as 4-Lane Alternative



---

Looking northeast from Lake Washington toward Evergreen Point Bridge, east highrise, and Medina



Exhibit 15. **View from Lake Washington—Viewpoint 12**

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

## 6-Lane Alternative

The 6-Lane Alternative would be noticeably wider than the 4-Lane Alternative; otherwise this alternative would have the same visual effects as the 4-Lane Alternative along Lake Washington. The bicycle/pedestrian path and vantage points on the north side of the bridge would be a new element, similar to the 4-Lane Alternative, but small relative to the scale of the bridge (Exhibits 12 and 14).

## Eastside

### No Build Alternative

No buildings or vegetation would be removed as part of either of the Continued Operation or Catastrophic Failure scenarios. The existing bridges at Evergreen Point Road, 84th Avenue Northeast, and 92nd Avenue Northeast would not change under either the Continued Operation or Catastrophic Failure scenarios for the Eastside project area. This assumes that the structures, roadway, and vegetation at the road edge are maintained in their current condition.

### 4-Lane Alternative

The greatest visual changes in the Eastside project area would result from:

- The northward shift in alignment at Evergreen Point and widening the roadway, resulting in noticeable loss of vegetation and affecting a few homes near the new landfall
- Continuous sound walls of varying heights (8 to 20 feet high) on both sides of the roadway from Evergreen Point Road to Bellevue Way, appreciably changing the character of the roadway

In general, the northward shift in alignment at Evergreen Point and lowering of the roadway in places would require new retaining walls to support steep slopes or access ramps and the bicycle/pedestrian path. The retaining and sound walls, combined with the greater width of the roadway, would change the character of the SR 520 corridor from a tree-lined roadway to a walled roadway.

Bridges over SR 520 at Evergreen Point Road, 84th Avenue Northeast, 92nd Avenue Northeast, and the pedestrian bridge near the Bellevue Christian School would be rebuilt. The new bridges would be similar in scale and materials to the existing structures, so there would be no or low visual quality change. The Evergreen Point Road bridge is a viewpoint of local interest for its view westward over Lake Washington



of Husky Stadium, the Seattle hills and shoreline, and the Olympic Mountains. The 4-Lane Alternative would likely have a positive effect on the view from this bridge because the removal of vegetation for the new alignment would open the view (Exhibit 16).

The new bridge operations facility and dock located under the east highrise adjacent to the Lake Washington shoreline would be noticeable to boaters on the lake. However, the facility would not be visible from most locations because it would be in the abutment partially buried in the hillside, and screened with vegetation. The road to the facility, dock, and bicycle/pedestrian path passing under the east highrise would be visible from the lake.

Throughout the Eastside project area, swaths of vegetation would be removed or affected by widening of the roadway and the addition of sound walls (Exhibit 16). For the majority of houses along the SR 520 corridor, the changes to views would be low under the 4-Lane Alternative; however, views would be very noticeably affected for houses adjacent to the roadway where the tree screen would be replaced by sound walls.

The largest vegetation removal would occur just west of Evergreen Point Road, where a swath of trees and shrubs would be permanently removed to accommodate the northward shift of the alignment (Exhibit 16). Fairweather Park and the adjacent playfields and tennis courts would not be affected; however, the tree screen between these areas and SR 520 may be affected during construction. Wetherill Park and Hunts Point Park would also not be affected, but the tree screen along the south edge of both parks would probably be permanently lost because of the wider roadway near 84th Avenue Northeast. Between 92nd Avenue Northeast and the Yarrow Bay wetland, a 100-foot-wide swath of tree and shrub screen would be removed to accommodate the wider roadway and the addition of a sound wall. The new bicycle/pedestrian path parallel to the roadway between 92nd Avenue Northeast and the Lake Washington shoreline would be separated from the road by sound walls and/or retaining walls. Bicyclists on the proposed path or on the existing Points Loop Trail would likely have a comfortable, pleasant experience (Exhibit 17).

Most houses are far enough from the right-of-way that tree buffers and other vegetation would remain in place to screen views of the roadway; however, a few houses that are very close to the right-of-way would lose the trees that now obscure views of the roadway. Motorists would



### Existing View

- Steel frame superstructure on east highrise over navigation channel
- Roadway width about 60 feet wide



### 4-Lane Alternative

- No superstructure over navigation channel
- Floating bridge alignment is shifted about 130 feet north (measured at east highrise)
- Roadway width about 180 feet tapering to 110 feet (including bicycle/pedestrian path) at east highrise
- 20-foot-high sound walls at Evergreen Point Road bridge stepping down to 8 feet



### 6-Lane Alternative

- Same as 4-Lane Alternative except roadway width about 150 feet (including bicycle/pedestrian path) at east highrise
- Landscape on lid is only to indicate scale; lid design would be coordinated with Medina



Looking west along SR 520 toward Lake Washington and Evergreen Point Bridge



Exhibit 16. View from Evergreen Point Road Bridge—Viewpoint 10

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

---

### Existing View

- Points Loop Trail separated from westbound lanes by landscaped open space
- Existing trail 9 feet wide



---

### 4-Lane Alternative

- Trail shifted about 2 feet north
- 12-foot-high sound wall



---

### 6-Lane Alternative

- Edge of new roadway about 5 feet from trail edge
- 12-foot-high sound wall



---

Looking east along Points Loop Trail toward SR 520 where trail descends from Hunts Point City Hall and curves east along SR 520



**Exhibit 17. View toward SR 520 from Points Loop Trail—Viewpoint 7**  
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

experience a wide, walled roadway corridor because of the loss of vegetation and the presence of high sound walls.

At Bellevue Way, two small buildings would be removed to accommodate the stormwater treatment facility. The buildings in their current condition contrast noticeably with the new, landscaped office building in the vicinity. The visual changes caused by the stormwater treatment facility would be noticeable, but the new facility would resemble the existing stormwater detention pond at the southeast corner of the cloverleaf. This could be a positive change if the landscaping were either natural-appearing or complemented the existing landscapes across the street.

View quality for motorists in the Eastside project area would decrease because the experience would be of a walled corridor, not a tree-lined roadway (Exhibit 18). The northward shift, increased height, and greater width at the bridge's landfall in Medina would change views from a few homes north of the bridge. The portion of the view that includes the existing bridge may be affected by the greater height of the approach and roadway; however, the bridge is already a major part of views here, and the overall level of change is expected to be low.

## 6-Lane Alternative

Changes to visual quality and character would be similar in kind but generally greater than those of the 4-Lane Alternative:

- Sound wall locations would be the same as for the 4-Lane Alternative, but the heights would differ slightly.
- The 6-Lane Alternative would be wider than the 4-Lane Alternative, most notably at Evergreen Point, resulting in noticeable loss of roadside tree and shrub screens.
- The bridges at Evergreen Point Road, 84th Avenue Northeast, and 92nd Avenue Northeast would be replaced with 500-foot-wide lids. The lids are expected to have positive effects on visual quality because the lids would be landscaped, replacing existing human-built elements with open space and vegetation.

In general, the northward shift in alignment at Evergreen Point and lowering of the roadway in places would require new retaining walls to support steep slopes or access ramps and the bicycle/pedestrian path. The retaining and sound walls, combined with the greater width of the



## Existing View

- Slightly recessed roadway with tree screen



## 4-Lane Alternative

- 10-foot-high sound walls on north side (right side of image)
- 18-foot-high sound walls on south side (left side of image)
- 92nd Avenue Northeast bridge over SR 520 in the distance



## 6-Lane Alternative

- East edge of landscaped lid about 200 feet closer to viewpoint than 92nd Avenue Northeast bridge in 4-Lane
- 18-foot-high sound walls on both sides



Looking west along SR 520 toward  
92nd Avenue Northeast bridge over SR 520



**Exhibit 18. View of 92nd Avenue  
Northeast Bridge over SR 520—  
Viewpoint 9**

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

roadway, would change the character of the SR 520 corridor from a tree-lined roadway to a wide, walled roadway. Because of its greater width, the 6-Lane Alternative may not appear as confined as the 4-Lane Alternative.

Visual changes resulting from the new bridge operations facility located under the bridge at the Evergreen Point landfall would be similar to that described for the 4-Lane Alternative.

The lids at Evergreen Point Road, 84th Avenue Northeast, and 92nd Avenue Northeast would create a dramatically different visual quality and character; however, the change could be a very positive contribution to open space and community interconnections. In particular, the Evergreen Point Road lid would connect directly to Fairweather Park and could serve as an extension of that open space (Exhibits 16 and 19).

The new bicycle/pedestrian path parallel to the roadway between 92nd Avenue Northeast and the Lake Washington shoreline would be separated from the road by sound walls and/or retaining walls. Bicyclists on the proposed path or on the existing Points Loop Trail would likely have a comfortable, pleasant experience (Exhibit 17).

The 6-Lane Alternative would remove more vegetation along the roadway than the 4-Lane Alternative to accommodate the wider highway footprint. A swath of mature trees and understory, nearly 150 feet wide on the north side of the new east end of the bridge at Evergreen Point, would be removed (Exhibit 16). The grassy slope between Fairweather Park and the transit stop would be replaced by roadway. A footpath along the edge of the park would be built to maintain the connection between the pedestrian overpass at Bellevue Christian School and Evergreen Point Road. The tree screen just south of Fairweather Bay would be affected by construction, and up to 50 feet of the tree screen would be lost permanently for the new alignment.

Throughout the Eastside project area, bands of vegetation north and south of SR 520 would be removed or affected by expansion of the roadway. The bands would vary from a few feet up to 100 feet wide. Between 84th Avenue Northeast and 92nd Avenue Northeast, both sides of the roadway would be equally affected (Exhibit 19). Just east of 92nd Avenue Northeast, the highway footprint would widen for the longer on- and off-ramps, and the alignment expansion would change



## Existing View

- Bus stop and Points Loop Trail
- Existing asphalt path 4-1/2 feet wide



## 4-Lane Alternative

- Footprint slightly wider than existing footprint
- 20-foot-wide decreasing to 14-foot-high sound walls on north side (foreground)
- 16-foot-high sound walls on south side (background)
- New pedestrian bridge



## 6-Lane Alternative

- Lid with earthen berm and landscaping on north side
- New pedestrian bridge
- New 8-foot-wide trail



Looking east along SR 520 from Points Loop Trail just east of Evergreen Point Road



**Exhibit 19. View of Medina and Clyde Hill—Viewpoint 8**

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

entirely south of the roadway. This would remove a wide swath of the tree buffer and grassy area to the south of SR 520.

Most houses are far enough from the right-of-way that tree buffers and other vegetation would remain in place to screen views of the roadway; however, a few houses that are very close to the right-of-way would lose the trees that now obscure views of the roadway. Motorists would experience a wide, walled roadway corridor because of the loss of vegetation and the presence of high sound walls (Exhibit 18). Visual effects due to the northward shift, increased height, and greater width of the bridge at landfall in Medina would be the same as those under the 4-Lane Alternative.

At Bellevue Way, a few small buildings would be removed to accommodate the stormwater storage facility. The buildings in their current condition contrast noticeably with the new, landscaped office building across the street. The visual changes from the stormwater treatment facility would be noticeable, but could be a positive change if the landscaping were either natural-appearing or complemented the existing landscaping across the street.

Between Bellevue Way and 124th Avenue Northeast area, effects on viewers' experiences would be minimal because most of the improvements would be confined to the existing roadway footprint.

## **Would the project create new sources of shadow, glare, or light?**

### **Seattle**

#### **No Build Alternative**

The SR 520 roadway and bridges have lighting now, and no new sources of light or glare are planned under the Continued Operation Scenario. Under the Catastrophic Failure Scenario, there could be fewer lights if some or all of the roadway were closed. Changes in vegetation bordering the roadway could change existing shadow and shading patterns, but since the vegetation is subject to maintenance, this is not expected to produce a noticeable change.

#### **4-Lane Alternative**

Under the 4-Lane Alternative, continuous illumination would be installed on all freeways and ramps throughout the project area, but the levels would likely be similar to existing levels. There would be no high-mast illumination on the Portage Bay Bridge. New lighting would



be similar to existing lighting and would use fixtures that shield sideways glare. The bicycle/pedestrian path would not be lit.

Over Portage Bay, the increased height, high sound walls, and northward displacement of the roadway would create new shadow and shade effects for a few residents immediately north of the Portage Bay Bridge in the Roanoke Park area. Through the Arboretum on the west approach to the Evergreen Point Bridge, shadows and shading would be reduced under this alternative because of the height of the roadway.

### **6-Lane Alternative**

Shadow, glare, and light effects or changes would be similar to the 4-Lane Alternative. The extra width of the 6-Lane Alternative would create wider shadow bands, but the height of the roadway would allow light under the roadbed and reduce the intensity of the shade. The roadway and pedestrian areas under the lids would be illuminated, but since transition illumination would not be required, the overall light level would not noticeably increase.

## **Lake Washington**

### **No Build Alternative**

No new sources of light, glare, or shadow would be introduced under the Continued Operation or Catastrophic Failure scenarios.

### **4-Lane Alternative**

Lighting effects on the Evergreen Point Bridge would slightly decrease because there would be no nighttime lighting on the bridge or drawspan other than navigation lights. Bicycle/pedestrian path lighting would be limited to recessed fixtures in the bridge barrier and probably of low wattage.

Shading on Lake Washington would increase relative to that from the existing bridge due to the wider and higher roadway.

### **6-Lane Alternative**

Overhead lighting on the Evergreen Point Bridge would be similar to that of the 4-Lane Alternative. Bicycle/pedestrian path lighting would be limited to recessed fixtures in the bridge barrier. Shading would increase due to the wider and higher roadway.



## **Eastside**

### **No Build Alternative**

No new sources of light, glare, or shadow would be introduced in the Eastside project area under either of the No Build Alternative scenarios.

### **4-Lane Alternative**

Overhead lighting, shade, and shadowing in the Eastside project area would be similar to existing conditions; therefore, no new effects are expected. Surrounding communities may require that pole heights of streetlights be limited to 30 feet. Illumination would be provided on affected city streets to city standards.

At the bridge landfall in Medina, the increased height and northward displacement of the roadway would change and/or increase shadow and shade effects for residents immediately north of the bridge.

No new sources of glare are anticipated because the new structures would be similar to existing ones.

### **6-Lane Alternative**

The 6-Lane Alternative is similar to the 4-Lane Alternative in that overhead lighting, shade, and shadowing would be similar to existing conditions. The only new lighting sources would be in roadway and pedestrian areas under the lid, but since transition illumination would not be required, the overall light level would not noticeably increase. No new sources of glare are expected, and the sound walls would block light from the roadway. Outside of the roadway, shade and shadowing could change due to the loss of vegetation in some locations.

## **How would project construction temporarily affect visual quality and aesthetics?**

The most noticeable temporary changes to the visual character and quality of the SR 520 corridor would result primarily from:

- Construction of temporary work and detour bridges
- Construction of the new roadway and bridges
- Demolition of the old roadway and bridges
- Excavation outside of the existing roadway
- Removal of vegetation outside of the existing roadway
- Temporary erosion control measures



- Stockpiling and staging areas for materials and equipment
- Presence of construction equipment of all sizes, including haul trucks, cranes, and barges
- Temporary traffic or construction signage
- Temporary retaining or screening walls

Changes to the quality of the landscape could result from possible increased traffic congestion during construction. Traffic slowdowns with cars moving slowly through the project area are not unusual, but the duration and frequency of such occurrences could noticeably increase. These effects could result from changed or reduced access, detours through neighborhoods, and the addition of construction traffic, parking and heavy equipment. The presence of medium- and heavy-duty construction and demolition equipment would be out of character with this area and would greatly detract from visual quality. In addition, light and glare could be increased by construction equipment, especially if work were performed at night. These effects would be temporary because they would only be associated with construction.

Other less obvious visual effects could result from dust and airborne debris from grading and construction. Specific effects for each project area are discussed below.

## Seattle

### 4-Lane Alternative

Viewers looking from and toward the project would experience the visual effects listed above throughout the Seattle project area. The Roanoke Park area would undergo the replacement of the 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive bridges over SR 520, the construction of the new Portage Bay Bridge, and construction of new interchange ramps at I-5. The Montlake area would undergo the reconstruction of the Montlake Boulevard, 24th Avenue East, bridges over SR 520, and the Evergreen Point Bridge west approach and ramps through the Arboretum.

Reconfiguring the on- and off-ramps at Montlake Boulevard and the addition of the bicycle/pedestrian path would require excavation and construction activities well outside of the roadway as it exists now. Businesses and residences nearby would likely experience high change in visual character due to the removal of screening vegetation and/or structures and to the proximity of large equipment. Most of these



changes are temporary, and some revegetation may ameliorate the permanent changes. Construction effects would be particularly noticeable at Queen City Yacht Club, NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center, and McCurdy and East Montlake parks, where buildings, parking and landscaped areas, and drives would be removed.

The addition of the work bridge on both sides of the Portage Bay Bridge would be highly visible because of the width that the work bridge would add to the overall bridge deck and because of the appearance of the structure itself. The work bridge would contrast highly with the more simple horizontal and vertical lines of the existing bridge, and with the wooded hillsides of residential dwellings. The work bridge is a temporary visual effect, however, that would be dismantled when the new Portage Bay Bridge is finished.

Construction effects in the Arboretum will be discussed in the following section so that the Evergreen Point Bridge and its approaches (through the Arboretum and from Evergreen Point) can be discussed as a unit in this report.

### **6-Lane Alternative**

All of the changes to the visual character and quality described for the 4-Lane Alternative apply to the 6-Lane Alternative as well. This alternative would also entail construction of two lids (in Roanoke Park and Montlake), which would require the use of heavy, large equipment.

## **Lake Washington**

### **4-Lane and 6-Lane Alternative**

Construction of the west approach through the Arboretum would require a temporary detour bridge and demolition of the old structures. Visual changes to quality and character due to these structures would be temporary, but they would be very high and have negative effects. The presence of the detour bridge means that there would be two bridges through the Arboretum. The detour bridge's trestle structure would contrast markedly with the natural-appearing landscape and the simple horizontal and vertical lines of the existing bridge and ramps. Equipment would include barges and cranes, which would stand out due to their size or height.

Vegetation in the Arboretum would be removed in 30- to 60-foot-wide swaths in the areas where the temporary detour bridge would be built. This also would result in high visual quality changes; however, the



effects would be temporary and all areas would be replanted with native vegetation species.

Similar visual effects would result for the new floating bridge because it would be constructed parallel to the existing bridge. This double bridge would not be as significant a change as bridges through the Arboretum, and because most views are from a distance, the overall visual change would be moderate. For boaters, motorists on the Evergreen Point Bridge, and residents of North Madison Park, the visual effects would be moderately high.

Construction of the bridge operations facilities under the east highrise would not generally be noticeable except to the residences immediately to the south.

## **Eastside**

### **4-Lane Alternative**

The visual effects listed in the introductory section *How would project construction temporarily affect visual quality and aesthetics?* would be experienced throughout the Eastside area by viewers looking from and toward the project. The Evergreen Point Road, 84th Avenue Northeast, 92nd Avenue Northeast, and Bellevue Way bridges over SR 520 would be demolished and reconstructed, with temporary detour bridges built next to the old bridges for the duration of the construction work. Some areas on the north side of the roadway would experience vegetation loss and excavation outside the roadway to accommodate the new bicycle/pedestrian path and stormwater management facilities.

Reconfiguring the on- and off-ramps at 92nd Avenue Northeast and the addition of the bicycle/pedestrian path would require excavation and construction activities well outside of the roadway as it exists now. Residences near the north edge of SR 520 would likely experience high change in visual character due to the removal of screening vegetation and/or structures and due to the proximity of large equipment. Most of these changes would be temporary and revegetation, where possible, may ameliorate the permanent changes.

Increased traffic congestion during construction could temporarily reduce the visual quality of the surrounding landscape. Traffic congestion would not be unusual in the Eastside project area, but the duration of such occurrences could noticeably increase. The presence of medium- and heavy-duty construction and demolition equipment would be out of character with the area and would greatly detract from



visual quality. These effects would be temporary because they would only be associated with construction.

### **6-Lane Alternative**

All of the changes to the visual character and quality described for the 4-Lane Alternative would apply to the 6-Lane Alternative as well. This alternative would also entail construction of three lids (Evergreen Point Road, 84th Avenue Northeast, and 92nd Avenue Northeast), which would require the use of heavy, large equipment.

### **How do the alternatives differ in their effects on visual quality and aesthetics?**

The 6-Lane Alternative would have uniformly greater visual quality and aesthetic consequences than the 4-Lane Alternative because of its greater width and the addition of five lidded structures. This difference would be particularly noticeable to viewers close to the structure in Portage Bay, Montlake, the Arboretum, and the Eastside. The lids would be a positive change, however, because they offer the possibility of landscaping and reconnecting neighborhoods on both sides of SR 520.

## **Mitigation**

### **What has been done to avoid or minimize negative effects?**

Mitigation options cannot be fully determined until engineering details are more defined, but preliminary mitigation includes reducing the number of columns in waterways by increasing the spacing between columns from 100 to 250 feet. This would substantially reduce the visual clutter when looking from outside the roadway.

In some cases sound walls would also serve as visual screens. This must be balanced against situations where the sound walls simply act as barriers and create a confined, or hard-edged, visual character or reduce visual quality by cutting off views of visual resources.

Many of the stormwater facilities would be placed underground, out of sight, or would have natural-appearing landscaping, which would be consistent with the parks and open space where they are located. In the Shelby-Hamlin neighborhood, the addition of the stormwater treatment wetland could be a positive visual change for the neighborhood



because the large asphalt parking lot would be replaced by a natural-appearing wetland landscape that is in harmony with the adjacent shoreline and bay.

The new bridge operations facility located under the east highrise at Evergreen Point would be inside the hillside abutment and screened with vegetation. In addition, the design of the structure could make the building look appropriate to the surroundings.

## How could the project compensate for unavoidable negative effects?

Mitigation that would be performed by WSDOT for all build alternatives includes the following:

1. Establish design guidelines that include visual standards for the corridor. The guidelines and standards would present ways to ensure visual unity and consistency throughout the SR 520 corridor. These could include defining the appearance and style of built elements, such as lighting, railings, sign bridges, structures, and walls. The guidelines should also discuss the use of art in the corridor, including the process for selection and location of any art.
2. Revegetate in areas where natural habitat, vegetation, or neighborhood tree screens are removed. These places are under Portage Bay Bridge in Roanoke Park; through Montlake, in particular at the NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center and East Montlake Park and the Arboretum; and along the highway in the Eastside project area. The policies of WSDOT's *Roadside Classification Plan* require that areas within the right-of-way and construction easements be revegetated to align with the goals for the designated roadside classification.
3. Establish landscaping that is compatible with the character of the existing vegetation, especially along Lake Washington Boulevard, Montlake Boulevard, and through the Washington Park Arboretum.
4. Follow the guidelines of the *Roadside Classification Plan* to blend the project into the adjacent land uses, while creating a unified experience for the highway user.
5. Construct walls that would visually screen the roadway from sensitive viewers, particularly in residential areas. The walls should be designed to ensure a unified visual appearance as viewed from within the highway corridor. Sound walls that face communities



should include a detailed texture to align with a slower viewing speed and ability to observe more detail.

6. Landscape the lids for the 6-Lane Alternative to ensure a unified visual appearance appropriate to the surrounding landscape. For example, the Evergreen Point Road lid could include a sloped surface on the north side that would carry the characteristics of Fairweather Park to the lid.
7. Replace the Bagley Viewpoint either on the new lid for the 6-Lane Alternative or elsewhere for the 4-Lane Alternative. WSDOT would work with the Seattle Parks Department to identify an appropriate site.

Particular mitigation actions are presented below. However, it will not be possible to delineate all mitigation options until engineering design is further advanced.

## Seattle

The MOHAI site and the remaining portions of McCurdy and East Montlake Parks would be redesigned in cooperation with the Seattle Parks Department. Grass and trees in the south Shelby-Hamlin area could be replaced with trees and screening vegetation to soften the appearance of the new sound wall.

Treatment of the area between the new bicycle/pedestrian path and adjacent residences in the Shelby-Hamlin neighborhood would be appropriate to the location and consistent with corridor visual standards for unity. The treatment would likely be a fence or vegetation or a combination of both, depending on available space.

## Lake Washington

Design guidelines should be established to ensure that the architectural style of the new structures presents a unified visual appearance.

## Eastside

Where possible throughout the Eastside project area, screening vegetation would be replaced to soften distant views of SR 520 and to screen sound walls near homes or businesses. Treatment of the area between the bicycle/pedestrian path and adjacent residences would be appropriate to the location and consistent with corridor visual standards for unity. The treatment would likely be a fence or vegetation or a combination of both, depending on available space.



## References

- City of Bellevue. 1993. *City of Bellevue Comprehensive Plan*. [http://www.ci.bellevue.wa.us/departments/Development/pdf/cp\\_parks\\_hi.pdf](http://www.ci.bellevue.wa.us/departments/Development/pdf/cp_parks_hi.pdf), last updated December 6, 1993, accessed on July 20, 2004.
- City of Clyde Hill. 2002. *City of Clyde Hill Comprehensive Plan*. [http://www.clydehill.org/main/doc\\_library/CompPlan10-28-02.pdf](http://www.clydehill.org/main/doc_library/CompPlan10-28-02.pdf), last updated October 28, 2002, accessed on July 20, 2004.
- City of Kirkland. 2004. *Draft Comprehensive Plan 10 Year Update*. [http://www.ci.kirkland.wa.us/depart/planning/comp\\_plan.htm](http://www.ci.kirkland.wa.us/depart/planning/comp_plan.htm), last updated July 1, 2004, accessed on July 20, 2004.
- City of Medina. 1999. *Draft Comprehensive Plan*. <http://www.medina-wa.gov>, last updated July 12, 1999, accessed on July 20, 2004.
- City of Seattle. 2002. *Inventory of Seattle's Public View Sites*. <http://www.cityofseattle.net/dclu/viewprotection/inventory.asp#reports>, updated May 2002, accessed on July 20, 2004. Department of Planning and Development.
- FHWA. 1989. *Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects*. FHWA-HI-88-054. 1981, reprinted 1989. Federal Highway Administration.
- Town of Hunts Point. 2002. *Town of Hunts Point Vision 2005 Strategic Plan*. <http://www.hunts-point.wa.us/Old/FiveYearPlan.htm>, updated October 18, 2002, accessed on July 20, 2004.
- Town of Yarrow Point. 2004. *Title 18 Planning (Comprehensive Plan)*. <http://www.ci.yarrow-point.wa.us>, updated June 1, 2004, accessed on July 20, 2004.
- WSDOT. 2004a. *Environmental Procedures Manual, Section 459: Visual Impacts, Light and Glare*. <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/fasc/EngineeringPublications/Manuals/EPM/459.pdf>, updated March 2004a, accessed on July 20, 2004. Washington State Department of Transportation.
- WSDOT. 2004b. *Roadside Classification Plan*. Washington State Department of Transportation.





# **Attachment 1**

## **Visual Quality Assessment Matrix**



# SR520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

## VIEWS TOWARD THE ROAD

09/09/2004	Prepared by: Susan Wessman	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane	4-Lane	6-Lane					
		Seattle												Seattle												Eastside						
VIEW UNIT NUMBER ( E=existing, P=proposed )		1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6	6	7	7	7						14	14	14		
		E	P	P	E	P	P	E	P	P	E	P	P	E	P	P	E	P	P	E	P	P						E	P	P		
	Foreground	LAND	4	4	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2									
		WATER	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1									
		VEGETATION	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4									
		MAN-MADE	5	5	5	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	5	4	4	1	1	1									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	4.50	4.50	4.50	2.25	2.25	2.25	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.75	2.50	2.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.75	1.00	1.75	0.00
	Middle ground	LAND	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1									
		WATER	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1									
		VEGETATION	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	4	4	4	2	2	2									
		MAN-MADE	5	5	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	2	5	5	5	2	2	2									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	3.75	3.75	3.75	2.25	2.25	2.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.25	2.25	2.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	0.00
	Background	LAND	2	2	2	7	7	7	3	3	3	4	4	4	6	6	6	1	1	1	1	1	1									
		WATER	1	1	1	6	6	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	2	4	4	4	4	4									
		VEGETATION	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	4	4									
		MAN-MADE	4	4	4	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	6	6	6	2	4	4	4	4	4									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	2.50	2.50	2.50	4.75	5.25	5.25	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.75	3.25	3.25	2.00	1.75	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	1.25	1.25	0.00
	Foreground	MAN MADE	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	5	5	5	6	6	6	3	4	4	6	6	6									
		NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	5	5	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	6	6	3	3	3									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
	Middle ground	MAN MADE	6	6	6	7	7	7	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	3	3	5	5	5									
		NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	6	5	5	7	7	7	2	2	2	3	2	2	6	6	6	3	4	4	3	3	3									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	6.00	5.50	5.50	7.00	7.00	7.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
	Background	MAN MADE	3	3	3	4	5	5	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	7	6	6									
		NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	6	6	6	2	3	3	5	5	5									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	2.00	2.50	2.50	6.00	5.50	5.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	0.00
	Foreground	MAN-MADE	5	5	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	4									
		OVERALL	5	5	5	4	4	4	1	1	1	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	4									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
	Middle ground	MAN-MADE	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	2	2	6	6	6	2	3	3	4	4	4									
		OVERALL	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	2	2	6	6	6	2	4	4	4	4	4									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	2.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
	Background	MAN-MADE	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	6	6	6									
		OVERALL	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	5	4	4	2	3	2	5	5	5									
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	1.50	3.00	2.00	5.50	5.50	5.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	0.00
	<b>AVERAGES</b>	Foreground	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.08	3.08	3.08	1.50	1.50	1.50	3.08	3.08	3.08	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.08	3.67	3.67	3.50	3.50	3.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.25	2.00	2.25	0.00
		Middleground	5.25	5.08	5.08	5.08	5.08	5.08	3.92	3.92	3.92	2.92	2.42	2.42	4.33	4.33	4.58	3.00	3.67	3.67	3.17	3.17	3.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.17	2.17	2.17	0.00
		Background	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.58	4.92	4.92	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.33	2.83	2.83	4.50	4.33	4.33	1.75	2.92	2.58	4.50	4.25	4.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.50	4.42	4.42	0.00
	<b>TOTAL VISUAL QUALITY</b>		4.58	4.53	4.53	4.25	4.36	4.36	2.97	2.81	2.81	3.11	2.78	2.78	4.17	4.11	4.19	2.61	3.42	3.31	3.72	3.64	3.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.97	2.86	2.94	0.00
	<b>VIEWPOINT</b>		Laurelhurst to Arboretum			Laurelhurst to Medina			UW to Portage Bay			NOAA to Portage Bay			Madison Park to L WA			Arboretum shoreline			Montlake Park (south entry)								Bridle Trails			
	<b>Evaluation Scale</b>		Seattle												Seattle												Eastside					
			<b>VIVIDNESS</b>												<b>INTACTNESS</b>												<b>UNITY</b>					
			(MAN-MADE)												(NATURAL ENVIRONMENT)																	
			7 = VERY HIGH												7 = NO DEVELOPMENT TO NON-EXISTENT												7 VERY HIGH					
			6 = HIGH												6= LITTLE DEVELOPMENT												6 HIGH					
			5 = MODERATELY HIGH												5 = SOME DEVELOPMENT												5 MODERATELY HIGH					
			4 = AVERAGE												4 = AVERAGE LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT												4 AVERAGE					
			3 = MODERATELY LOW												3 = MODERATELY HIGH DEVELOPMENT												3 MODERATELY LOW					
			2 = LOW												2 = HIGH LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT												2 LOW					
			1 = VERY LOW TO NON-EXISTENT												1 = VERY HIGH LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT												1 VERY LOW					



# SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

## VIEWS FROM THE ROAD

09/09/2004		Prepared by: Susan Wessman		4-Lane	6-Lane											4-Lane	6-Lane											4-Lane	6-Lane													
		Lake Washington										Eastside										Seattle																				
VIEW UNIT NUMBER ( E=existing, P=proposed )		1	1	1											2	2	2											3	3	3												
		E	P	P											E	P	P											E	P	P												
VIVIDNESS	Foreground	LAND	1	1	1											2	2	2											2	2	2											
		WATER	1	1	1											1	1	1											1	1	1											
		VEGETATION	1	1	1											2	2	3											2	2	2											
		MAN-MADE	2	1	4											2	2	3											2	2	2											
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	1.25	1.00	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.75	1.75	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
	Middle ground	LAND	1	1	1											1	1	1											4	2	2											
		WATER	4	4	4											1	1	1											5	2	2											
		VEGETATION	1	1	1											2	2	2											4	2	2											
		MAN-MADE	1	1	1											2	2	2											4	2	2											
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	1.75	1.75	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
L	Background	LAND	6	6	6											2	2	2											6	3	3											
		WATER	4	4	4											1	1	1											1	1	1											
		VEGETATION	4	4	4											2	2	2											2	2	2											
		MAN-MADE	6	6	6											2	2	2											2	2	2											
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.75	1.75	1.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
E	Foreground	MAN MADE	2	2	1											5	4	4											2	2	2											
		NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	2	2	1											3	2	2											2	1	1											
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	2.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
		MAN MADE	3	3	2											5	4	4											2	2	2											
		NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	2	2	2											3	2	2											4	1	1											
L	INTACTNESS	Middle ground	<b>AVERAGE</b>	2.50	2.50	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
			MAN MADE	3	3	3											5	4	4											2	2	2										
			NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	4	4	4											4	3	3											6	3	3										
			<b>AVERAGE</b>	2.00	3.50	3.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.50	3.50	3.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
			MAN-MADE	2	2	2											3	2	1											2	2	2										
2	Foreground	OVERALL	4	4	4											4	3	2											2	2	2											
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	2.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
		MAN-MADE	5	5	5											3	2	1											5	2	2											
		OVERALL	6	5	5											4	3	2											6	2	2											
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	5.50	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	2.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
UNITY	Middle ground	MAN-MADE	5	5	5											3	2	1											6	2	2											
		OVERALL	6	5	5											4	3	2											6	2	2											
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	5.50	5.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	2.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
		MAN-MADE	5	5	5											3	2	1											6	2	2											
		OVERALL	6	6	6											4	3	2											6	2	2											
AVERAGES	Background	<b>AVERAGE</b>	5.50	5.50	5.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.50	2.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00							
		Foreground	2.08	2.00	1.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.08	2.42	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00							
		Middleground	3.25	3.08	2.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00							
		Background	4.17	4.67	4.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.25	2.58	2.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00							
		<b>TOTAL VISUAL QUALITY</b>	3.17	3.25	3.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.11	2.44	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00							
VIEWPOINT		Midspan Floating Bridge										Typical corridor view										Roanoke Park																				
Evaluation Scale		Lake Washington										Eastside										Seattle																				
		VIVIDNESS										INTACTNESS										UNITY																				
												(MAN-MADE)										(NATURAL ENVIRONMENT)																				
		7 = VERY HIGH										7 = NO DEVELOPMENT TO NON-EXISTENT										7 VERY HIGH																				
		6 = HIGH										6= LITTLE DEVELOPMENT										6 HIGH																				
		5 = MODERATELY HIGH										5 = SOME DEVELOPMENT										5 MODERATELY HIGH																				
		4 = AVERAGE										4 = AVERAGE LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT										4 AVERAGE																				
		3 = MODERATELY LOW										3 = MODERATELY HIGH DEVELOPMENT										3 MODERATELY LOW																				
		2 = LOW										2 = HIGH LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT										2 LOW																				
		1 = VERY LOW TO NON-EXISTENT										1 = VERY HIGH LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT										1 VERY LOW																				