

COMPARISON OF SR 520 WESTSIDE OPTIONS: Considerations

**USED FOR DISCUSSION AT 11/10 WESTSIDE SUBGROUP MEETING**

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

<b>West Approach Profile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow.</li> <li>Consider visual impacts.</li> <li>Consider impacts to fish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow.</li> <li>Consider visual impacts.</li> <li>Consider impacts to fish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow.</li> <li>Consider visual impacts.</li> <li>Consider impacts to fish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow.</li> <li>Consider visual impacts.</li> <li>Consider impacts to fish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider removing the west navigation passages and work with Seattle Fire Department to understand the costs to of locating a facility on the south side of SR 520.</li> <li>Consider differences between stormwater treatment methods – pump versus gravity flow.</li> <li>Consider visual impacts.</li> <li>Consider impacts to fish.</li> </ul>
<b>Portage Bay Bridge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider legislation.</li> <li>Consider community issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider community issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider community issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider legislation</li> <li>Consider community issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider community issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Documentation and Permitting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider differences in environmental impacts.</li> <li>Request to rank in order of impact for 11/17 Workgroup meeting.</li> <li>Consider permitting feasibility differences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider differences in environmental impacts.</li> <li>Consider permitting feasibility differences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider feedback from all parties involved.</li> <li>Consider differences in environmental impacts.</li> <li>Consider permitting feasibility differences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider differences in environmental impacts.</li> <li>Consider permitting feasibility differences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boat section has been addressed.</li> <li>Continue conversation with communities to address design and environmental issues.</li> <li>Consider feedback from all parties involved.</li> <li>Consider differences in environmental impacts.</li> <li>Consider permitting feasibility differences.</li> </ul>
<b>Cost</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider financing availability.</li> <li>Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge.</li> <li>Consider different approaches to retrofitting.</li> <li>Cost = 2.022B - 2.298B</li> <li>Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider financing availability.</li> <li>Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge.</li> <li>Consider different approaches to retrofitting</li> <li>Cost = 4.070B – 4.168B</li> <li>Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider financing availability.</li> <li>Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge.</li> <li>Consider different approaches to retrofitting</li> <li>Cost = 2.562B - 2.642B</li> <li>Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider financing availability.</li> <li>Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge.</li> <li>Consider different approaches to retrofitting</li> <li>Cost = 2.195B</li> <li>Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider financing availability.</li> <li>Assess retrofitting of Portage Bay Bridge.</li> <li>Consider different approaches to retrofitting</li> <li>Cost = 3.358B</li> <li>Look at pieces to remove to lower costs to 4.65B or below.</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider litigation.</li> <li>Continued options development with community groups.</li> <li>Address requirements of legislation.</li> <li>Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider litigation.</li> <li>Continued options development with community groups.</li> <li>Address requirements of legislation.</li> <li>Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider litigation.</li> <li>Continued options development with community groups.</li> <li>Address requirements of legislation.</li> <li>Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider litigation.</li> <li>Continued options development with community groups.</li> <li>Address requirements of legislation.</li> <li>Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider litigation.</li> <li>Continued options development with community groups.</li> <li>Address requirements of legislation.</li> <li>Consider fatal flaws: permitting, funding, litigation.</li> </ul>