

Alternative	COMMENTS		EVALUATIONS				RESULTS
	Advantages	Disadvantages	Environmental	Transportation	Urban Design	Cost	Recommended Alternatives for Further Development
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No business or residential displacements identified. Good access to Magnolia. Retains dramatic views and entry into Magnolia. Lowest right-of-way costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires construction adjacent to or over shoreline. Existing bridge shut down for extended periods. Interbay property separated from water. High construction costs. 	**	*		*	
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No business displacements identified. Improved access to waterfront and Magnolia center. Could create a beautiful route into Magnolia. Medium construction, right-of-way & relocation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential direct impacts to aquatic shoreline and relatively high geological hazard impacts. Less direct route to Galer and Thorndyke areas. Much more compatible with a second access route. Highest mitigation costs. 		**	**	**	
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No residential displacements identified. Improved access to waterfront from Magnolia. Low relocation and right-of-way costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires construction adjacent to or over shoreline. Less direct and slower route to Magnolia. All Magnolia traffic comes through center of Port property. High construction and mitigation costs. 	*	*		*	
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No residential displacements identified. Improved access to waterfront, Magnolia, and Port property. Allows land to be connected to water. Low mitigation and right-of-way costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential displacement of businesses on Port properties. Some bridge closures during construction. Some view blockage of water from Port uplands. Highest construction costs. 	**	**	**		
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No shoreline impacts. Possible traffic benefits along 15th Avenue. Include Thorndyke improvement per Olmsted plan. Medium construction costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business and residential displacements. No direct access from Magnolia to waterfront. Ramps impact land use along 15th Avenue corridor. Highest relocation and right-of-way costs. 					
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No shoreline impacts. Possible traffic benefits along 15th Avenue. Original Olmsted route: include Thorndyke improvement per Olmsted plan. Highest relocation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business and residential displacements. No direct access from Magnolia to waterfront. Does not adequately support development on Port property. Highest relocation costs. 				**	
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No shoreline impacts. Improved access to waterfront and Port property. Central access for Port property. Medium construction costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires significant construction in steep slope areas. Less direct route to Magnolia. Ramps impact land use along 15th Avenue corridor. High mitigation and right-of-way costs. 	*			**	
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No shoreline impacts. Two access points to Magnolia. Choices will reduce unnecessary traffic on bluff and Thorndyke. Lowest mitigation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business displacements on Port properties. Worse access to waterfront and Port property from 15th Avenue. Ramps impact land use along 15th Avenue corridor. High construction costs. 	**	**	**		
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No shoreline impacts. Good access to Magnolia. Parcelization of Port property is workable. Medium construction costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business and residential displacements. No direct access from Magnolia to waterfront. Heavy localized neighborhood impacts along Boston. High relocation costs. 					

(E - I If traffic improves in the 15th Avenue corridor, freight mobility will also improve)79

Key

- ** = Best alternatives
- * = Good alternatives
- blank = Alternative did not score as well

