

Viaduct priority area strategy comparison

Each of the strategies has been evaluated against the corridor needs and goals and objectives. Some of the assessments completed were highly quantitative, such as the geometric, bridge and traffic assessments and others were more qualitative assessments. Through this process strategies were compared to the no-build conditions and at times to each other. Using professional judgment each strategy was then rated at a macro scale view as poor, fair, good or very good in meeting the specific goals related to Transportation, Economic, Social and Environmental factors.

The following scorecard summarizes the rating results for each strategy:

Criteria/ Strategy:	Rehabilitation	Reconstruction	Boulevard	Tunnel	Depressed Highway
Transportation	Poor	Very Good	Very Good	Good to Fair	Fair
Economic	Poor	Good	Very Good to Good	Fair	Fair to Poor
Social	Poor	Good to Fair	Very Good to Good	Poor to Very Poor	Poor
Environmental	Fair	Good to Fair	Good	Poor to Very Poor	Poor
Feasibility:	Not Feasible	Feasible	Feasible	Not Feasible	Not Feasible
Cost Range:	\$480-600 million	\$800-900 million	\$650-800 million	\$1.6-1.8 billion	\$1.3-1.5 billion

Very Poor: significantly reduced operations and/or conditions.

Poor: reduced operations and/or conditions.

Fair: little to no change in operations and/or conditions.

Good: improved operations and/or conditions.

Very Good: significantly improved operations and/or conditions.