

Other Public Concepts May 7, 2007

| Description | Consistency with Purpose and Need | Traffic Operations | Safety | Eastside Impacts | Cost | Access to Transit | Aesthetics / Bridge Type Restrictions | Staff Recommendation | Reasons to Eliminate |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Reversible lanes (3-lane section) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily used under retrofit conditions (modifying existing roadways). Considered when traffic volumes are split at least 70/30. The existing and forecast traffic split for Sellwood Bridge is only 60/40. | Potential for driver confusion | Footprint wider than 3-lane section to allow safe transition area, traffic control, and signalization at reversible lane termini. | | Would not accommodate streetcar | | Eliminate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peak-hour traffic split not large enough to realize the benefits of a reversible lane. Width at east end needs to be larger than 3 lanes for transitions. Driver confusion/accident potential. |
| 1 dedicated transit lane (3-lane section) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complications at ends of bridge as buses reenter traffic. More applicable to a retrofit condition. Because the traffic split is closer to 60/40 during peak hours, transit delay in opposite direction not reduced. | Would be unique to the Trimet system leading to potential driver confusion | Footprint wider than 3-lane section to allow safe transition area, traffic control, and signalization at reversible lane termini. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would not accommodate streetcar May preclude access to some bus stop locations | | Eliminate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing just 1 dedicated transit lane only partially serves the transit needs across the bridge. Driver confusion/accident potential. |
| Existing bridge for bicycle/pedestrian combined with a replacement vehicle bridge on separate alignment | Yes | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical separation between bikes/peds and vehicles Decreased security due to lack of visibility from vehicles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footprint narrowed by placing bike lanes and multi-use paths on separate bridge Minimum sidewalk widths still required on new bridge for emergency use | Rehabilitation for bicycle/pedestrian use only is cheaper (15%-25%) than rehabilitation for vehicle traffic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced seismic retrofit costs Reduced truss strengthening costs | More difficult to make connections to bus stops located on separate bridge | Saves existing bridge | Advance | |
| Couplet (Spokane/Tacoma or Tacoma/Tenino) | No | | | Requires change of street designation of Spokane or Tenino with impacts to residential land uses. | Cost increased to construct one bridge and rehab the other. | More difficult to make connections to bus stops located on separate bridge | | Eliminate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to residential land use on Spokane/Tenino. Cost |
| Rehabilitation with Phase 2 seismic upgrade | Yes | | Ensures quick repairs/reopening after small earthquakes and prevention of collapse in larger earthquakes. | | Additional \$32 million | | | Advance | |
| Rehabilitation with temporary detour bridge | Yes | Minimizes impacts to traffic during construction. | | | Additional \$12-\$23 million | | | Advance | |