

---

## CHAPTER 7: EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

---

### Evaluation Criteria and Rating System

As was discussed in Chapter 2 (Methodology) the SLU study team developed objectives that corresponded to the overall study goals and applied these as criteria to evaluate the alternative packages. The study goals and corresponding objectives are shown in Table 7.1 on the following page.

Each of the three alternative scenarios were then assessed for general performance and were given a high, medium or low rating for each criteria listed under a specific study goal. The high, medium and low ratings were then “rolled up” to a single overall “consumer report” type rating for each study goal. The SLU study team used a five-scale system to rate each scenario’s success in supporting the SLU study goals. A full dot means that the given alternative was highly effective in meeting the stated goal (i.e., the evaluation criteria were generally given a high rating for a majority of the evaluation criteria). A three-quarter circle means the alternative is considered generally effective at supporting the stated goal (i.e., a mix of high and medium ratings for the individual evaluation criteria). A half-dot indicates an average rating (attained by a mix of ratings). A quarter dot means the alternative, with respect to the stated goal, generally scored low. And an empty dot means that the scenario may actually hinder achievement of the stated SLU Transportation Study goal.

**Table 7.1: SLU Study Goals and Corresponding Objectives**

Goal	Objectives
<b>Improve Mobility and Access for All Modes within and between SLU, Surrounding Neighborhoods, and Downtown Seattle</b>	Provide improved connections across SR 99/Aurora Avenue
	Improve transit service possibilities within SLU, surrounding neighborhoods, and downtown Seattle
	Improve pedestrian and bicycle connection throughout SLU, across SR 99/Aurora and to Eastlake and Capitol Hill
	Improve non-motorized connections across Mercer & Valley Streets to SLU Park
	Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit use as a way to accommodate travel demand
	Improve transit speed and/or reliability through and within SLU
	Improve arterial connections between SLU and surrounding neighborhoods and downtown Seattle
	Improve or maintain vehicle travel times on key routes through SLU Improve or maintain average vehicle system delay throughout SLU
<b>Improve Safety for All Transportation Modes</b>	Improve roadway and intersection geometry (e.g., to reduce weaving movements, improve way finding, etc.)
	Provide appropriate separation between pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles
	Provide safe pedestrian crossings
	Provide safe pedestrian access to transit
<b>Improve Regional Access To and Through South Lake Union</b>	Improve arterial street connections to and from I-5 and SR 99
	Improve connections between I-5 and SR 99
	Improve regional transit service to SLU
	Improve local transit connections to regional transit service/lines
	Improve bicycle connections to regional bicycle facilities and routes Improve or maintain regional freight routes
<b>Promote Economic Vitality, Neighborhood Livability, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life</b>	Improve streetscape design
	Accommodate local business access and circulation needs
	Encourage transit and/or pedestrian oriented development.
	Provide for a safe and active pedestrian environment within SLU
	Improve non-motorized access to SLU park
	Manage parking appropriately to reflect a sustainable balance between parking demand and supply, and study area mode split goals
	Minimize adverse environmental impacts Minimize residential and business displacements
<b>Work Toward Implementing Comprehensive Plan Goals and Other City Policies and Plans</b>	Support projected growth and planned land-use patterns
	Support SLU Neighborhood Plan Goals and Policies
	Support City Plans and Policies
	Support other infrastructure and development plans
	Support the Mercer Corridor Project recommendations
	Reflect feedback from SLU Stakeholders
<b>Implementation Feasibility (not a formal goal)</b>	Constructability (relative ease or difficulty in constructing the improvements)
	Financial limitations
	Public/Political Acceptability
	Cost effectiveness (qualitative)

Table 7.2 shows the five-scale rating system and the corresponding qualitative evaluation text developed and used by the study team.

**Table 7.2: Evaluation Rating System**

<b>Dot Rating</b>	<b>Descriptive Evaluation Text</b>
●	Highly effective in supporting goal
◐	Effective in supporting goal
◑	Some effectiveness in supporting goal
◒	No effectiveness in supporting goal
○	Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

---

### **Results of the Rating of Alternatives**

The three alternative improvement scenarios were evaluated qualitatively against the above noted criteria. The following summarizes the results of the evaluation.

#### **Area Improvement Scenario**

Results of the evaluation process for the Area Improvements Scenario are shown in Table 7.3. The Area Improvements Scenario was found to be somewhat effective in supporting the “improve mobility and access” goal. However, this scenario was rated not effective for all other SLU Transportation Study goals: improving safety, improving regional access, promoting economic vitality and working towards implementing comprehensive and City plans or policies. While the Area Improvements is not very effective at supporting the SLU Transportation Study goals, it requires the least amount of construction and is the least expensive of the three scenarios. For this reason it was rated as somewhat effective with regards to implementation feasibility. On the whole, however, the Area Improvements Scenario is generally considered to be not effective in supporting the SLU Transportation Study goals.

**Table 7.3: Area Improvements Scenario**

Overall Goal Rating	Goal	Criteria	Level of Improvement
	<b>Improve Mobility and Access for All Modes within and between SLU, Surrounding Neighborhoods, and Downtown Seattle</b>	Provide improved connections across SR 99/Aurora Avenue	Medium - adds Thomas crossing, Broad St retained
		Improve transit service possibilities within SLU, surrounding neighborhoods, and downtown Seattle	Medium - adds Thomas crossing
		Improve pedestrian and bicycle connection throughout SLU, across SR 99/Aurora and to Eastlake and Capitol Hill	Medium - adds Thomas crossing, Terry Ave, and connections to Capital Hill
		Improve non-motorized connections across Mercer & Valley Streets to SLU Park	Low - adds Terry Ave signals
		Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit use as a way to accommodate travel demand	Low to medium - adds Thomas St crossing, Terry Ave, and potential future connections to Capital Hill
		Improve transit speed and/or reliability through and within SLU	Medium - Fairview Improvements & SLU streetcar. Also, Thomas crossing provides additional routing opportunities
		Improve arterial connections between SLU and surrounding neighborhoods and downtown Seattle	Low to Medium - Thomas crossing of Aurora adds connectivity
		Improve or maintain vehicle travel times on key routes through SLU	Medium
		Improve or maintain average vehicle system delay throughout SLU	Medium
	<b>Improve Safety for All Transportation Modes</b>	Improve roadway and intersection geometry (e.g., to reduce weaving movements, Improve way-finding, etc..)	Low - minimal improvements
		Provide appropriate separation between pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles	Low - limited locations
		Provide safe pedestrian crossings	Low - minimal improvements over existing. Thomas provides a safe crossing of Aurora. Signals on Terry at Mercer and Valley
		Provide safe pedestrian access to transit	Medium - some improvement over existing
	<b>Improve Regional Access To and Through South Lake Union</b>	Improve arterial street connections to and from I-5 and SR 99	No improvement
		Improve connections between I-5 and SR 99	No improvement
		Improve regional transit service to SLU	Low (direct service from regional P&R lots would increase this rating, though current street configuration is not conducive to this service)
		Improve local transit connections to regional transit service/lines	Medium to high - via Fairview transit improvements, SLU streetcar, and improved connections to the Monorail station with Thomas St overcrossing
		Improve bicycle connections to regional bicycle facilities and routes	Low
	<b>Promote Economic Vitality, Neighborhood Livability, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life.</b>	Improve streetscape design	Low to medium - Terry Ave, Westlake Ave, Harrison St and other limited locations
		Accommodate local business access and circulation needs	Low - some improvement with Thomas crossing of SR 99
		Encourage transit and/or pedestrian oriented development.	Low - Terry and Westlake Ave conducive
		Provide for a safe and active pedestrian environment within SLU	Low - Terry Ave and other limited locations
		Improve non-motorized access to SLU park	Low - Terry Ave an improvement, but Mercer/Valley Street still barriers
		Manage parking appropriately to reflect a sustainable balance between parking demand and supply, and study area mode split goals	TBD
		Minimize adverse environmental impacts	Medium - does not rate high for aesthetics, multi-modal support, and traffic congestion
		Minimize residential and business displacements	High - Few residential or business displacements
	<b>Work Toward Implementing Comprehensive Plan Goals and Other City Policies and Plans</b>	Support projected growth and planned land-use patterns	Low - Does not support the expected growth nor integrate with expected or desired land-use patterns
		Support SLU Neighborhood Plan Goals and Policies	Low - Does not provide a systemwide improvement plan for the Mercer/Valley corridor that supports the SLU Park Master Plan
		Support City Plans and Policies	Low - Does not support the HUB Urban Village concepts, the SLU Park Master Plan or the overall vision for an improved SLU neighborhood.
		Support other infrastructure and development plans	Low - Does not integrate well with the AWW Project plans or the SLU Park plan, could be adapted to integrate with the Westlake/SLU Streetcar and Terry Avenue plans
		Support the Mercer Corridor Project recommendations	TBD
		Reflect feedback from SLU Stakeholders	Low to Medium - Addresses few of the Stakeholder concerns
	<b>Implementation Feasibility (not a formal goal)</b>	Constructability (relative ease or difficulty in constructing the improvements)	High - Minimal construction is required and proposed Thomas Street crossing of SR 99/Aurora is relatively straight forward
		Financial feasibility	Medium - Relatively low cost items, but no dedicated funding source
		Public/Political Acceptability	Low - Does not reflect the public desire to improve the SLU neighborhood for current and future uses or re-connect the SLU neighborhood with the SLU Park and waterfront area
		Cost effectiveness (qualitative)	Low to Medium - Low cost but low effectiveness in meeting study goals

### **Roy Street Undercrossing and Realignment of Fairview/Valley Intersection Scenario**

Evaluation results of the Roy Street Undercrossing and Realignment of Fairview/Valley Intersection scenario were somewhat better than for the Area Improvements with Existing Mercer/Valley scenario.

The Roy Street Underpass scenario was found to be supportive of the improve mobility and access goal by providing another westbound crossing of Aurora Avenue for all modes. With regard to improving safety and regional access to and through SLU, the Roy Street Undercrossing scenario was found to be somewhat effective at supporting these goals because it improves some intersection geometry for auto and truck traffic and provides a better regional connection westbound to the Seattle Center from I-5.

It was also found moderately effective in terms of supporting City plans and policies, in that it implements some improvements contained in the SLU Neighborhood Plan. However, the Roy Street Undercrossing alternative was found to have low effectiveness in relation to promoting economic vitality, livability, and sustainability. This is primarily because it provides only a moderate improvement to non-motorized facilities; does not significantly enhance the pedestrian environment, including pedestrian access to transit; and maintains a wide high-volume Valley Street which is considered incompatible with, and an access barrier to the planned SLU Regional Park.

The Roy Undercrossing alternative is also expected to have low effectiveness towards supporting the informal, implementation feasibility goal, as it requires considerable construction work and funds to complete the project. On the whole, the Roy Street Undercrossing and Realigned Fairview/Valley Intersection scenario has some effectiveness in supporting some of the SLU Transportation Study goals, and limited effectiveness in others. Table 7.4 details the results of the qualitative evaluation.

**Table 7.4: Roy Street Undercrossing and Realignment of Fairview/Valley Intersection**

Overall Goal Rating	Goal	Criteria	Level of Improvement
●	Improve Mobility and Access for All Modes within and between SLU, Surrounding Neighborhoods, and Downtown Seattle	Provide improved connections across SR 99/Aurora Avenue	Medium to High - adds Thomas and Roy St crossings, retains Broad St
		Improve transit service possibilities within SLU, surrounding neighborhoods, and downtown Seattle	Medium - Thomas and Roy St crossings provide additional opportunity for transit routing
		Improve pedestrian and bicycle connections throughout SLU, across SR 99/Aurora and to Eastlake and Capitol Hill	Medium - adds Thomas and Roy St crossings, Terry Ave, and potential future connections to Capital Hill
		Improve non-motorized connections across Mercer & Valley Streets to SLU Park	Low - adds Terry Ave signals
		Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit use as a way to accommodate travel demand	Medium - Lake-to-Bay trail included as part of the undercrossing and curb-bulbs throughout area.
		Improve transit speed and/or reliability through and within SLU	Medium - Fairview Improvements & SLU streetcar. Also, Thomas and Roy St crossings provide additional routing opportunities
		Improve arterial connections between SLU and surrounding neighborhoods and downtown Seattle	Medium - Thomas and Roy crossings of Aurora adds connectivity
		Improve or maintain vehicle travel times on key routes through SLU	Medium - some key routes are improved while others degrade slightly.
		Improve or maintain average vehicle system delay throughout SLU	Medium - average vehicle delay through the system is similar to Area Improvements
●	Improve Safety for All Transportation Modes	Improve roadway and intersection geometry (e.g., to reduce weaving movements, improve way finding, etc.)	Low to Medium- some signage improvements. Roy underpass provides more direct connection across SR 99. Weaving on Fairview and Valley still occurs, though realignment of Fairview/Valley intersection should improve this slightly.
		Provide appropriate separation between pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles	Low to medium - limited locations with improvements. Roy undercrossing will include a multi-use non-motorized trail.
		Provide safe pedestrian crossings	Low to Medium - minimal improvements over existing in most areas. Thomas and Roy provide safe crossings of Aurora
		Provide safe pedestrian access to transit	Medium -- some improvements over existing (curb-bulbs, etc.)
●	Improve Regional Access To and Through South Lake Union	Improve arterial street connections to and from I-5 and SR 99	Low to medium - Roy St provides more direct route to SR 99 from I-5
		Improve connections between I-5 and SR 99	Medium - Roy St provides a relatively direct WB route between I-5 and SR 99
		Improve regional transit service to SLU	Low (direct service from regional P&R lots would increase this rating, though proposed street configuration may pose some limitations to this type of service)
		Improve local transit connections to regional transit service/lines	Medium to high - via Fairview transit improvements, SLU streetcar, and improved connections to Monorail station with Thomas St overcrossing
		Improve bicycle connections to regional bicycle facilities and routes	Medium - Roy undercrossing provides bicycle link across Aurora (Lake-to-Bay Trail)
		Improve or maintain regional freight routes	Medium - Roy connection provides more direct WB freight route as compared to existing

- Highly effective in supporting goal
- Effective in supporting goal
- Some effectiveness in supporting goal
- No effectiveness in supporting goal
- Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

**Table 7.4: (continued):  
Roy Street Undercrossing and Realignment of Fairview/Valley Intersection**

	<b>Promote Economic Vitality, Neighborhood Livability, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life</b>	Improve streetscape design	Low to medium - Terry Ave, Westlake Ave, Harrison St and other limited locations
		Accommodate local business access and circulation needs	Low - some improvement with Thomas crossing of Aurora
		Encourage transit and/or pedestrian oriented development.	Low - Terry and Westlake Ave conducive
		Provide for a safe and active pedestrian environment within SLU	Low - Terry Ave, Harrison St, and other limited locations
		Improve non-motorized access to SLU park	Low - Terry Ave an improvement, but Mercer/Valley Street still barriers
		Manage parking appropriately to reflect a sustainable balance between parking demand and supply, and study area mode split goals	TBD
		Minimize adverse environmental impacts	Medium - does not rate high for aesthetics, multi-modal support, and traffic congestion
		Minimize residential and business displacements	Medium - properties west of Aurora along Roy, and adjacent to the realigned Fairview/Valley intersection impacted
	<b>Work Toward Implementing Comprehensive Plan Goals and Other City Policies and Plans</b>	Support projected growth and planned land-use patterns	Low - Does not integrate with expected or desired land-use patterns or planned growth
		Support SLU Neighborhood Plan Goals and Policies	Medium - Provides a systemwide improvement plan for the Mercer/Valley corridor, but does not support the SLU Park Master Plan
		Support City Plans and Policies	Low to Medium - Does not adequately support the HUB Urban Village concepts, the SLU Park Master Plan or the overall vision for an improved SLU neighborhood.
		Support other infrastructure and development plans	Low to Medium - Does not integrate well with the AWW Project plans or the SLU Park plan, could be adapted to integrate with the Westlake/SLU Streetcar and Terry Avenue plans
		Support the Mercer Corridor Project recommendations	TBD
		Reflect feedback from SLU Stakeholders	Medium -- Addresses some of the Stakeholder concerns
	<b>Implementation Feasibility (not a formal goal)</b>	Constructability (relative ease or difficulty in constructing the improvements)	Low to Medium -- Project would require an additional below-grade crossing of Aurora Avenue at a difficult location, but would not require complicated construction techniques or staging
		Financial limitations	Low to Medium - project is relatively expensive and does not have a dedicated funding mechanism
		Public/Political Acceptability	Low to Medium - Does not reflect the public desire to improve the SLU neighborhood for current and future uses or re-connect the SLU neighborhood with the SLU Park and waterfront area
		Cost effectiveness (qualitative)	Low to Medium - Relatively high cost for rather limited effectiveness in supporting study goals (doesn't open waterfront to neighborhood, maintains high volume couplet system).

- Highly effective in supporting goal
- ◐ Effective in supporting goal
- ◑ Some effectiveness in supporting goal
- No effectiveness in supporting goal
- Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

### **Two-Way Mercer and Narrow Valley Street Scenario**

The Two-Way Mercer scenario was found to be highly effective in supporting goals related to mobility and access, safety for all modes, and implementation of the comprehensive and City plans and policies. The two-way Mercer Street allows for considerably improved arterial connections and intersection geometry as well as improved way-finding for both familiar and unfamiliar drivers arriving from the I-5 freeway ramps. The two-way Mercer and narrow Valley concept not only allows for significant improvements to pedestrian amenities near and around the waterfront and South Lake Union park areas, but also considerably improves safety and mobility of bicycle and pedestrian travel in this area. This scenario was found to be

effective in improving regional access to and through SLU as well as promoting the economic vitality and livability of the SLU neighborhood. As would be expected with any major construction undertaking, implementation can be complex and costly. However, one benefit of this scenario is the proposed Mercer Street underpass of Aurora Avenue, as it would be a widening of an existing structure, rather than the construction of a new underpass, which would occur at Roy Street under the Roy Street scenario. However, the Two-Way Mercer scenario will still require considerable funding and was therefore rated as having low effectiveness in supporting the implementation feasibility goal.

In total, the Two-Way Mercer and Narrow Valley Street scenario was found to be effective to highly effective in supporting the SLU Transportation Study goals. Table 7.5 details the results of the qualitative evaluation.

**Table 7.5: Two-Way Mercer and Narrow Valley Street Scenario**

Overall Goal Rating	Goal	Criteria	Level of Improvement
●	Improve Mobility and Access for All Modes within and between SLU, Surrounding Neighborhoods, and Downtown Seattle	Provide improved connections across SR 99/Aurora Avenue	Medium to High - Adds Thomas, removes Broad, widened 2-way provides more direct WB connection across Mercer
		Improve transit service possibilities within SLU, surrounding neighborhoods, and downtown Seattle	Medium to High - Adds Thomas and 2-way Mercer improves function for transit
		Improve pedestrian and bicycle connections throughout SLU, across SR 99/Aurora and to Eastlake and Capitol Hill	Medium to High - Adds Thomas and improves Mercer for non-motorized crossings of SR 99, potential future connection to Capitol Hill
		Improve non-motorized connections across Mercer & Valley Streets to SLU Park	High - Narrow Valley St; traffic signals, curb bulbs and Median on Mercer at ped crossings; and widened sidewalks w/ped buffers all significantly improve non-motorized access
		Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit use as a way to accommodate travel demand	Medium to High - Valley St & Fairview Ave N bike lanes will better tie to regional system. Improved pedestrian environment facilitates access to transit
		Improve transit speed and/or reliability through and within SLU	Medium to High - Fairview Improvements & SLU streetcar. Also, Thomas and two-way Mercer crossings provide additional routing opportunities
		Improve arterial connections between SLU and surrounding neighborhoods and downtown Seattle	Medium to High - Thomas crossing of Aurora; two-way Mercer and two-way Westlake/9th adds connectivity
		Improve or maintain vehicle travel times on key routes through SLU	Medium - some key routes are improved while others degrade slightly
		Improve or maintain average vehicle system delay throughout SLU	Medium - average vehicle delay through the system is similar to Area Improvements
●	Improve Safety for All Transportation Modes	Improve roadway and intersection geometry (e.g., to reduce weaving movements, improve way-finding, etc...)	High - Major weaving movements on Fairview and Valley St are eliminated. Direct WB route from I-5 to SR 99 and Seattle Center/Queen Anne established
		Provide appropriate separation between pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles	Medium to High - Mercer and Valley Streets greatly improved, Lake-to-Bay Trail, Fairview & Valley Bike lanes
		Provide safe pedestrian crossings	High - Crossings of Mercer and Valley Streets greatly improved. Thomas and 2-way Mercer provide safer crossings of Aurora
		Provide safe pedestrian access to transit	High - widened sidewalks, enhanced buffers between peds and travel lanes, and improved ped crossings in the area.

- Highly effective in supporting goal
- Effective in supporting goal
- Some effectiveness in supporting goal
- No effectiveness in supporting goal
- Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

**Table 7.5: (continued):  
Two-Way Mercer and Narrow Valley Street Scenario**

	<b>Improve Regional Access To and Through South Lake Union</b>	Improve arterial street connections to and from I-5 and SR 99	Medium to High - 2-way Mercer provides more direct route to/from SR 99 and I-5; Fairview/Mercer intersection improved to allow new access from SB Fairview to the I-5 ramps and better accommodate existing turn movements to I-5
		Improve connections between I-5 and SR 99	Medium to High - 2-way Mercer provides more direct route between I-5 and SR 99
		Improve regional transit service to SLU	Medium (street system may better accommodate direct service from regional P&R lots)
		Improve local transit connections to regional transit service/lines.	Medium to High - via Fairview transit improvements, SLU streetcar, and improved connections to Monorail station with Thomas St overcrossing. Two-way Mercer provides additional opportunities for transit connections
		Improve bicycle connections to regional bicycle facilities and routes	High - Bicycle lanes along Valley St and Fairview Ave N provide a better connection to Dexter bike lanes and the future Lake-to-Bay trail; Also to the Burke Gilman trail via East Lake Union route.
		Improve or maintain regional freight routes	High - Two-way Mercer provides more direct/improved regional freight route
	<b>Promote Economic Vitality, Neighborhood Livability, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life</b>	Improve streetscape design	Medium to High - Terry Ave, Westlake Ave, Mercer and Valley Streets greatly improved
		Accommodate local business access and circulation needs	Medium to High - 2-way Mercer, Westlake and 9th provide improved local access and circulation. 2-way Mercer and Thomas crossings of Aurora provide better connections
		Encourage transit and/or pedestrian oriented development.	Medium to High - Terry Ave, Westlake Ave, Valley Street and to a lesser degree, Mercer St - will be more conducive to transit and/or pedestrian oriented development
		Provide for a safe and active pedestrian environment within SLU	High - Terry Ave, Mercer and Valley Streets provide greatly improved pedestrian environment
		Improve non-motorized access to SLU park	High - Terry Ave, Mercer and Valley Streets provide greatly improved pedestrian environment
		Manage parking appropriately to reflect a sustainable balance between parking demand and supply, and study area mode split goals	TBD
		Minimize adverse environmental impacts	Medium to High - No significant impacts anticipated, though traffic congestion still exists, provides better opportunities for alternate modes of travel
		Minimize residential and business displacements	Low to Medium - widened Mercer will require ROW takes and may displace of businesses
	<b>Work Towards Implementing Comprehensive Plan Goals and Other City Policies and Plans</b>	Support projected growth and planned land-use patterns	High - Very supportive of projected growth and integrates well with expected or desired land-use patterns
		Support SLU Neighborhood Plan Goals and Policies	High - Provides a systemwide improvement plan for the Mercer/Valley corridor that includes support of the SLU Park Master Plan
		Support City Plans and Policies	High - Supports the current City plans for creation of a SLU HUB Urban Village
		Support other infrastructure and development plans	High - integrates well with AVV Project Plans, Terry Avenue, Streetcar, and SLU Park
		Support the Mercer Corridor Project recommendations	TBD
		Reflect feedback from SLU Stakeholders	Medium to High - Addresses a high percentage of Stakeholder concerns
	<b>Implementation Feasibility (not a formal goal)</b>	Constructability (relative ease or difficulty in constructing the improvement)	Medium to High - Project does not require extensive structures or complicated construction techniques or staging
		Financial limitations	Low to Medium - Project is relatively expensive and does not have a dedicated funding mechanism
		Public/Political Acceptability	Medium to High - Reflects the public desire to improve the SLU neighborhood for existing and future users and re-connect the SLU neighborhood with the SLU Park and waterfront area
		Cost effectiveness (qualitative)	Medium to High - High cost improvements, but proposed improvements strongly support overall study goals.

- Highly effective in supporting goal
- ◐ Effective in supporting goal
- ◑ Some effectiveness in supporting goal
- ◒ No effectiveness in supporting goal
- Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

Table 7.6 shows the overall ratings of the three scenarios for comparative purposes. As was discussed previously, the general rating for the Area Improvements Scenario is typically

“little to no effectiveness” in supporting the goals (four of the six goals were rated as “not effective” and two were rated as somewhat effective.). The Roy Street Undercrossing scenario results are quite mixed with one “effective” rating, three “some effectiveness” ratings, and two no effectiveness ratings in supporting the specific goals. Lastly, the Two-Way Mercer and Narrow Valley Street alternative is generally rated as effective to highly effective, with three “highly effective” ratings, two “effective” ratings and one “no effectiveness” rating.

**Table 7.6: Alternative Scenarios Ratings Comparison**

Goal	Area Improvements with Existing Mercer/Valley	Roy Undercrossing	Two-Way Mercer
Improve Mobility and Access for All Modes within and between SLU, Surrounding Neighborhoods, and Downtown Seattle			
Improve Safety for All Transportation Modes			
Improve Regional Access To and Through South Lake Union			
Promote Economic Vitality, Neighborhood Livability, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life			
Work Towards Implementing Comprehensive Plan Goals and Other City Policies and Plans			
Implementation Feasibility (not a formal goal)			

- Highly effective in supporting goal
- Effective in supporting goal
- Some effectiveness in supporting goal
- No effectiveness in supporting goal
- Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

### Draft Recommendation

Based on the above noted ratings results, the SLU Transportation Study team determined that the Two-Way Mercer and Narrow Valley Street improvement scenario clearly did the most to support or meet the goals set forth at the beginning of the study. The SLU study team designated the Two-Way Mercer and Narrow Valley Street scenario as the draft recommended improvement scenario. The draft recommendation then was presented to both the SLU Stakeholders Group and a team of agency representatives for their feedback.

### **SLU Stakeholders Group**

The study team asked the stakeholders group, formed at the beginning of the study, to reconvene to evaluate the three improvement scenarios from their perspective (neighborhood, employer, employee, resident, and developer). The study team presented the improvement scenarios to the stakeholders as a group, discussing the various elements of each scenario, and then asked the stakeholders to form two groups. Three members of the study team were assigned to each of the two groups to answer questions and provide more detailed information. The stakeholder groups then developed their own study goal ratings of each scenario. The results of these stakeholder group ratings are presented in Tables 7.7 and 7.8.

As can be seen in Table 7.7, the first stakeholder group rated the Area Improvements Scenario very similarly to the SLU study team, with the only difference being the implementation feasibility rating, which was rated at “no effectiveness” compared to “some effectiveness” by the SLU study team.

Stakeholder Group 1 also rated the Roy Street Undercrossing scenario similarly to the SLU study team, with some minor changes that included changing their “improve mobility and access” rating to “some effectiveness” as opposed to “effective”; promoting “economic activity” to “some effectiveness” rating, up from “no effectiveness” rating; and reducing “implementation feasibility” to “does not support goal” down from “no effectiveness” as rated by the study team.

Finally, regarding the Two Way Mercer Scenario, Stakeholder Group 1 reduced the ratings for the first, second and fifth goal to “effective” down from “highly effective” as noted by the study team, and reduced implementation feasibility from “no effectiveness” to “does not support.” Generally speaking, while specific ratings of goals varied somewhat, Stakeholder Group 1 agreed that the Two-Way Mercer Scenario was the most effective of the three and that the Area Improvements Scenario was least effective in meeting study area goals.

**Table 7.7: Stakeholder Group 1 Scenario Ratings**

Goal	Area Improvements with Existing Mercer/Valley	Roy Undercrossing	Two-Way Mercer
Improve Mobility and Access for All Modes within and between SLU, Surrounding Neighborhoods, and Downtown Seattle			
Improve Safety for All Transportation Modes*			
Improve Regional Access To and Through South Lake Union			
Promote Economic Vitality, Neighborhood Livability, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life			
Work Towards Implementing Comprehensive Plan Goals and Other City Policies and Plans			
Implementation Feasibility (not a formal goal)			

\* One group member assigned a full circle to the Area Improvements with Existing Mercer/Valley Scenario for this goal, with the rationale that no change was safer.

- Highly effective in supporting goal
- Effective in supporting goal
- Some effectiveness in supporting goal
- No effectiveness in supporting goal
- Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

Stakeholder Group 2 rated the Area Improvements Scenario exactly the same as the SLU study team, with four of the six ratings being “no effectiveness” and two rated as “some effectiveness.” One rating for the Roy Street Undercrossing scenario was reduced by Stakeholder Group 2; the “improving mobility and access” rating was reduced from “effective” to “some effectiveness” by the second stakeholder group. Lastly, Stakeholder Group 2 rated the Two-Way Mercer scenario exactly the same as the SLU study team with nearly all “highly effective” or “effective” ratings.

**Table 7.8: Stakeholder Group 2 Scenario Ratings**

Goal	Area Improvements with Existing Mercer/Valley	Roy Undercrossing	Two-Way Mercer
Improve Mobility and Access for All Modes within and between SLU, Surrounding Neighborhoods, and Downtown Seattle			
Improve Safety for All Transportation Modes			
Improve Regional Access To and Through South Lake Union			
Promote Economic Vitality, Neighborhood Livability, Sustainable Development and Quality of Life			
Work Towards Implementing Comprehensive Plan Goals and Other City Policies and Plans			
Implementation Feasibility (not a formal goal)			

- Highly effective in supporting goal
- Effective in supporting goal
- Some effectiveness in supporting goal
- No effectiveness in supporting goal
- Does not support goal, may have negative impacts

### Agency Representatives

The SLU study team next met with local agency representatives to discuss the draft recommended improvement scenario as well as feedback obtained from the SLU Stakeholders Group. The SLU study team presented the improvement scenarios to the agency representatives (King County Metro, SDOT, Seattle City Light, Seattle Popular Monorail, Seattle Public Utilities, Department of Planning and Development, and others) and asked them for their thoughts and feedback on the draft recommendation. In general the agency representatives felt comfortable with the overall evaluation process and ratings of the three scenarios and concurred that the Two-Way Mercer scenario best addressed the goals of the SLU Transportation Study.

The agency representatives also offered feedback on the two-way Mercer scenario noting that they would like to see more analysis of continuation of the two-way configuration to First Avenue North versus ending at Fifth Avenue North. It was determined that this analysis would be best conducted in conjunction with the Mercer Corridor EIS effort in coordination with Seattle Center and surrounding communities. Access to Seattle Center parking lots

south of Mercer Street, between Fifth Avenue N. and Aurora Avenue, should also be further evaluated under this scenario.

A considerable amount of the discussion focused on the need to implement transportation demand management (TDM) strategies and the most appropriate implementation strategies. All participants agreed that TDM is a very important component of the overall transportation infrastructure and any improvement scenario that is selected. However, most all participants noted that the Two-Way Mercer scenario provided transportation infrastructure that was most conducive to TDM strategies. It was agreed that the SLU study team would continue working with King County Metro staff and other County staff, from various divisions/departments, to develop an encompassing TDM strategy.

### **Summary**

Based on the ratings of the SLU study team, the stakeholder groups, and the Agency representatives, the Two-Way Mercer scenario was carried forward as the draft recommended improvement scenario for the South Lake Union Transportation Study. The study team presented the recommendations to the public at an open house on March 18, 2004. Feedback from participants at the open house supported the study recommendations.