

Attachment 1: Comparison of Proposed Alternatives

CONCEPT DESIGN FOR PIER BRIDGE PROJECT

Alternative No.	Concept Image	Description	Comment	Pros	Cons
1		<p><u>Replace in Kind</u> Replace Pier Bridge with a wider bridge (Approximately 58 ft wide – standard vehicular lanes, shoulders, bike lanes, wider sidewalks) in the same location (optional elevator).</p>	<p>This alternative is considered to provide baseline functionality of the bridge while addressing the current bridge structural and functional deficiencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains direct route for Pier access Maintains direct route for Pier parking access No traffic impacts at Moss Ave One bridge Does not impact Pier Sign No significant change in viewshed for historic elements Supported by the public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New bridge is 70% wider, doesn't match pier and doesn't provide vertical clearance at 1550 parking lot entrance (pier deck 10' high) Safety – Maintains many conflict points between vehicles and ped/bikes New bridge width doesn't provide required vertical clearance at Moomat Ahiko Way, on-ramp to PCH (Highway 1) No ADA access (w/o elevator) Does not improve traffic flow at Ocean/Colorado intersection Requires temporary Pier access for vehicles, peds, & bikes during construction
2		<p><u>Replace in Kind + ADA/Bicycle</u> Replace Pier Bridge with the same current width and construct a separate ADA/pedestrian/bike path north of the Pier.</p>	<p>Due to the long length required to meet ADA compliance, this alternative had potentially significant ROW impacts to the 1550 Lot as well as impacts to parking spaces and creates adverse visual impacts to the Landmarked Hippodrome Building. This alternative was not preferred by the public and was eliminated from further study.</p>	<p>This alternative was not preferred by the public and was omitted from future studies.</p>	
3		<p><u>New Bridge + ADA/Bicycle</u> Replace Pier Bridge with a pedestrian/bicycle bridge only and provide a vehicular access bridge at Moss Avenue.</p>	<p>As in Alternative 2, this alternative had potentially significant ROW impacts to the 1550 Lot as well as impacts to parking spaces and creates adverse visual impacts to the Landmarked Hippodrome Building. Additionally, due to the need to maintain delivery and emergency vehicle access from Ocean Avenue and lack of public support, this alternative was also eliminated from further study.</p>	<p>This alternative was not preferred by the public and was omitted from future studies.</p>	
4		<p><u>New Bridge + Emergency/ADA/Bike</u> Replace Pier Bridge with the same width designed primarily for pedestrian and bicycle use, but also accommodate limited (controlled) use, delivery, and emergency vehicles. ADA access would be provided by an adjacent ADA pathway or an elevator. Provide a separate vehicular access bridge at Moss Avenue.</p>	<p>This alternative received wide support in public and community meetings and is recommended to be further studied in the environmental document phase.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety – eliminate vehicle ped/bike conflicts at many locations, providing public safety Allows limited (controlled) use and emergency vehicle access Maintains direct route for Pier access for pedestrians Provides ADA access without an elevator Allows permanent vehicular access during construction Does not impact Pier Sign New bridge width matches pier Does not impact 1550 lot Less vehicular circulation at Colorado/Ocean Ave intersection by eliminating one signal phase for exiting No significant change in viewshed for historic elements Supported by the public Moss Avenue bridge is shorter span and cost effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires temporary Pier access for peds/bikes from Ocean Ave. during construction Traffic impacts at Moss Ave