

COMPARISON OF SR 520 WESTSIDE OPTIONS: Considerations – **IN DEVELOPMENT**

	OPTION A	OPTION K	OPTION L	A+ Hybrid	OPTION M
Bascule Bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be travel time savings. Concerns over bridge openings. Consider impacts of circulation of local traffic affecting property values. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community concerns of visual impacts. Concerns over bridge openings Higher cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider impacts of circulation of local traffic affecting property values. Concerns over bridge openings. 	
Immersed Tube Tunnel/Sequential Excavation Method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider challenges with permitting. Mitigation (To be determined). Consider construction viability. Consider benefit to immediate neighborhoods. Consider litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider challenges with permitting. Not analyzed in the supplemental draft environmental impact statement. Mitigation (To be determined). Consider construction viability. Consider benefit to immediate neighborhoods. Consider litigation.
Arboretum vicinity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider Lake Washington Boulevard ramps in or out. Consider impacts of increased versus decreased traffic through the Arboretum (compared to No Build). Consider Arboretum Foundation goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most increase in trips through the Arboretum. Most fill and wetland effects. Consider Arboretum Foundation goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider Arboretum Foundation goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider Lake Washington Boulevard ramps in or out. Consider impacts of increased versus decreased traffic through the Arboretum (compared to No Build). Consider Arboretum Foundation goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar trips as Option K. Environmental analysis (To be determined) Consider impacts of increased versus decreased traffic through the Arboretum (compared to No Build). Consider Arboretum Foundation goals.
Capacity on Montlake Boulevard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider volume of throughput compared to today. Consider purpose and need of the SR 520 project. Consider differences between demand versus capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider efficiency of the Pacific Street/Montlake Boulevard intersection. Separates local circulation from freeway access. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider efficiency of the Pacific Street/Montlake Boulevard intersection. Separates local circulation from freeway access.
Transit Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences in transit connectivity. Look for other opportunities to replace the function of the Montlake Freeway Flyer Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences in transit connectivity. Look for other opportunities to replace the function of the Montlake Freeway Flyer Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences in transit connectivity. Look for other opportunities to replace the function of the Montlake Freeway Flyer Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider connection to University of Washington Sound Transit Station. Consider differences in transit connectivity. Look for other opportunities to replace the function of the Montlake Freeway Flyer Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider connection to University of Washington Sound Transit Station. Consider differences in transit connectivity. Look for other opportunities to replace the function of the Montlake Freeway Flyer Station.

<p>West Approach Profile</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow. Consider visual impacts. Consider impacts to fish. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow. Consider visual impacts. Consider impacts to fish. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow. Consider visual impacts. Consider impacts to fish. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow. Consider visual impacts. Consider impacts to fish. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider height of navigation channel to save cost Continue conversation with Seattle Fire Department. Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow. Consider visual impacts. Consider impacts to fish.
<p>Portage Bay Bridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider legislation. Consider community issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider legislation Consider community issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider legislation Consider community issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider legislation Consider community issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider legislation Consider community issues.
<p>Environmental Documentation and Permitting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences in environmental impacts. Request to rank in order of impact for 11/17 Workgroup meeting. Consider permitting feasibility differences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences in environmental impacts. Consider permitting feasibility differences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider feedback from all parties involved. Consider differences in environmental impacts. Consider permitting feasibility differences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider differences in environmental impacts. Consider permitting feasibility differences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boat section has been addressed. Continue conversation with communities to address design and environmental issues. Consider feedback from all parties involved. Consider differences in environmental impacts. Consider permitting feasibility differences.
<p>Cost</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider financing availability. Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge. Consider different approaches to retrofitting. Cost = 2.022B - 2.298B Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider financing availability. Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge. Consider different approaches to retrofitting. Cost = 4.070B – 4.168B Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider financing availability. Retrofit of PBB Consider different approaches to retrofitting. Cost = 2.562B - 2.642B Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider financing availability. Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge. Consider different approaches to retrofitting. Cost = 2.195B Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider financing availability. Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge. Consider different approaches to retrofitting. Cost = 3.358B Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below.
<p>Other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. Continued options development with community groups. Address requirements of legislation. Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. Continued options development with community groups. Address requirements of legislation. Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. Continued options development with community groups. Address requirements of legislation. Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. Continued options development with community groups. Address requirements of legislation. Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider litigation. Continued options development with community groups. Address requirements of legislation. Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation.