

Alternatives	Technical Analysis	Public Feedback	Stakeholder Group Feedback	Elected Leadership Group Recommendation
<b>Alternatives with more potential</b>		(station rank by public response)		
<b>SF 1</b> [2 alternative routes]		2	<b>Suggest continuing study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closer to activity center</li> <li>• Higher traffic congestion impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to existing businesses and newly redeveloped area</li> </ul>
<b>SF 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater opportunities for housing and business development near station</li> <li>• Offers greater station access for people walking, biking, taking transit, or driving</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closer to activity center</li> <li>• Higher traffic congestion impacts</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>SF 3</b>		3	<b>Suggest not continuing study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to develop in vacant lot</li> <li>• Higher traffic congestion impacts with new I-5 ramp</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider adjusting location given close proximity to WSDOT right-of-way</li> <li>• Current location results in impacts to existing businesses</li> </ul>
<b>SF 4</b> [4 alternative routes]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most opportunities for housing and business development near the station</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closer to residential area</li> <li>• Higher redevelopment opportunity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher potential for development</li> <li>• Consider impacts to existing businesses</li> <li>• Note: SR 99 alignment not preferred by City of Federal Way and results in greater impacts to tribal property</li> </ul>
<b>SF 8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least potential impacts to nearby properties and businesses</li> <li>• Least impact to retail sales tax-generating properties</li> <li>• Shortest alignment distance and fastest travel time</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher business impacts, during construction and when built</li> <li>• Difficult to access given current traffic congestion</li> <li>• Conflict with SR 18</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>SF 9</b>		6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher business impacts, during construction and when built</li> <li>• Difficult to access given current traffic congestion</li> <li>• Conflict with SR 18 ramps</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>Alternatives with greater challenges</b>				
<b>SF 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highest potential impacts to nearby properties, businesses and retail sales tax-generating properties</li> <li>• Longest alignment and longest travel time</li> <li>• Lower potential for housing and business development and higher environmental impacts than other station alternative on SR 99</li> </ul>	7	<b>Split opinion about whether to continue study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher construction impacts</li> <li>• Higher environmental impacts</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>SF 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher potential impacts to nearby properties and businesses</li> <li>• Fewer opportunities for housing and business development near the station</li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not close to residential or business areas</li> <li>• Easy to drive to, but lower multimodal connectivity</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>SF 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for impacts to nearby retail businesses</li> </ul>	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to access due to traffic congestion</li> <li>• Higher business impacts</li> <li>• Conflict with SR 18 ramps</li> <li>• Higher construction impacts</li> <li>• I-5 is a barrier to development on all sides</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>SF 10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fewer opportunities for housing and business development near the station</li> <li>• Limited station access for people walking, biking, taking transit, or driving</li> </ul>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like I-5 alignment</li> <li>• Challenging topography for access</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>SF 11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires additional structures to cross into station in the median, including a pedestrian bridge over I-5</li> <li>• Limited space in the median could require widening I-5</li> <li>• More highway congestion likely during construction</li> </ul>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenging station access</li> <li>• Higher construction impacts</li> <li>• Conflict with SR 18 plans</li> </ul>	No comment
<b>SF 12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires construction of additional structures to cross I-5</li> <li>• Fewer opportunities for housing and business development near the station</li> </ul>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less developed area is a benefit</li> <li>• Additional crossing of I-5 is a challenge</li> <li>• Higher traffic congestion at 356th/Meridian</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires two I-5 crossings</li> </ul>
<b>SF 13</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires construction of additional structures to cross I-5</li> <li>• Fewer opportunities for housing and business development near the station</li> </ul>	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far from residential and businesses</li> <li>• Limited existing access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires two I-5 crossings</li> </ul>

Alternatives	Technical Analysis	Public Feedback	Stakeholder Group Feedback	Elected Leadership Group Recommendation
<b>Alternatives with more potential</b>		(station rank by public response)		
<b>Fife 3</b> [2 alternative routes]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the City of Fife's planned City Center for a more livable, walkable, accessible, and business-friendly city center</li> <li>Greater opportunities for housing and business development near station</li> <li>More convenient station access for people walking, biking, taking transit, or driving</li> </ul>	1	 <b>Suggest continuing study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Best location for planned City Center vision</li> <li>Good potential for adjacency to parking</li> <li>Consider how the alignment moves west</li> <li>A pedestrian bridge would improve access to station</li> </ul>	 No comment
<b>Fife 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the City of Fife's planned City Center for a more livable, walkable, accessible, and business-friendly city center.</li> <li>Greater opportunities for housing and business development near station</li> <li>More convenient station access for people walking, biking, taking transit, or driving</li> </ul>	2	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher construction/traffic impacts along SR 99</li> <li>Good station location near planned City Center, Emerald Queen Casino, residential area</li> <li>A pedestrian bridge would improve access to station</li> </ul>	 No comment
<b>Alternatives with greater challenges</b>				
<b>Fife 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewer opportunities for housing and business development near the station</li> <li>Least convenient station access for people walking, biking, taking transit, or driving</li> </ul>	4	 <b>Split opinion about whether to continue study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At edge of planned City Center</li> <li>Higher impacts to industrial area</li> <li>Higher impacts to tribal residential areas</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impact to tribal properties on Alexander &amp; 12th Street, consider adjusting alignment to avoid this community</li> <li>Challenge to coordinate with SR 167 design</li> </ul>
<b>Fife 2</b> [2 alternative routes]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Located outside of City of Fife's planned City Center</li> </ul>	3	 <b>Suggest not continuing study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts more businesses</li> <li>Further from residential areas</li> <li>Costlier property acquisitions</li> </ul>	 No comment
<b>Fife 5</b> [3 alternative routes]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station located near to an already congested intersection: SR 99/54th</li> </ul>	5	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close to I-5 interchange and major exit/entrance to Fife</li> <li>Higher impacts to shopping center</li> </ul>	 No comment
<b>Fife 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential challenges to build elevated track around SR 167, I-5 and 54th Street ramps</li> <li>Fewer opportunities for housing and business development near station</li> <li>Potential for more highway congestion delay along SR 99 and 54th Street during construction</li> </ul>	7	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher impacts to businesses during construction</li> <li>Alignment blocks business visibility</li> <li>Conflict with SR 167 project</li> <li>Lower station access</li> <li>I-5 is a barrier to future development</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual impacts to existing businesses</li> </ul>
<b>Fife 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for more highway congestion delay along SR 99 and 54th Street during construction</li> </ul>	8	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher impacts to businesses during construction</li> <li>Alignment blocks business visibility</li> <li>Conflict with SR 167 project</li> <li>Lower station access</li> <li>I-5 is a barrier to future development</li> <li>At edge of planned City Center</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual impacts to existing businesses</li> </ul>
<b>Fife 8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires construction of additional structures to reach median, including a pedestrian bridge over I-5</li> <li>Limited space in the median would require widening I-5</li> <li>More highway congestion likely during construction</li> </ul>	9	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflict with SR 167 project</li> <li>Higher impacts to businesses from widening of I-5</li> <li>Possibility to have a lower impact on private property</li> <li>Lower multimodal connections</li> </ul>	 No comment
<b>Fife 9</b> [2 alternative routes]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Located outside of City of Fife's planned City Center</li> <li>Fewer opportunities for housing and business development near station</li> <li>Potential impacts to nearby wetlands</li> <li>Most construction coordination challenges with SR 167 extension project</li> </ul>	6	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about multiple I-5 crossings</li> <li>Conflicts with Puyallup Tribe of Indians and City of Fife development plans</li> <li>Closer to residential area, but preference for a station with more business access</li> <li>Impacts to 20th St and SR 167 projects</li> </ul>	 No comment

Alternatives	Technical Analysis	Public Feedback (station rank by public response)	Stakeholder Group Feedback	Elected Leadership Group Recommendation
<b>Alternatives with more potential</b>				
<b>ET 1</b> [south Puyallup River crossing]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most direct route along Puyallup Ave to connect with ET 1: I-5 to Puyallup station TD 1</li> <li>Route to station would have lower impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> </ul>	2	 <b>Suggest not continuing study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor connectivity for East Tacoma community</li> <li>Industrial location</li> <li>Not bikeable</li> <li>Concerns about need for environmental remediation prior to construction</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer ET 2 given proximity of ET 1 to ET 2</li> <li>Need to provide connectivity for Eastside residents given the barriers of I-5 and Sounder tracks</li> </ul>
<b>ET 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most direct route along 25th St to connect with stations TD 2 or TD 3</li> <li>Lower impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> </ul>	1	 <b>Suggest continuing study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor connectivity for East Tacoma Industrial location</li> <li>Not bikeable</li> <li>Concerns about need for environmental remediation prior to construction</li> <li>Slightly better than ET 1 because off congested Puyallup Ave</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer ET 2 given proximity of ET 1 to ET 2</li> <li>Need to provide connectivity for Eastside residents given the barriers of I-5 and Sounder tracks</li> </ul>
<b>ET 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> <li>Station located near activity center south of I-5</li> <li>Avoids property impacts to nearby businesses</li> </ul>	3	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity to change street grid as part of locating station; improving access</li> <li>Needs to provide transit connections to serve residents</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station is located very near to ET 4 and ET 5</li> <li>Need to provide connectivity for Eastside residents</li> </ul>
<b>ET 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> <li>Station located near activity center south of I-5</li> <li>Avoids property impacts to nearby businesses</li> </ul>	4	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to serves McKinley via L Street</li> <li>Potential to serves East Tacoma/lower Tacoma</li> <li>Also consider station that bridges Portland Ave</li> <li>Needs to provide transit connections to serve residents</li> <li>Opportunity to change street grid as part of locating station; improving access</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to provide connectivity for Eastside residents</li> </ul>
<b>ET 4</b> [2 alternative routes]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station located near activity center south of I-5</li> <li>Lower impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> </ul>	5	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to provide transit connections to serve residents</li> <li>Opportunity to change street grid as part of locating station; improving access</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station is located very near to ET 3 and ET 5</li> <li>Need to provide connectivity for Eastside residents</li> </ul>
<b>ET 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> <li>Station located near activity center south of I-5</li> <li>Higher potential to avoid property impacts to nearby businesses</li> </ul>	6	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to provide transit connections to serve residents</li> <li>Opportunity to change street grid as part of locating station; improving access</li> <li>Limited development opportunities</li> <li>Traffic congestion concerns due to proximity to I-5</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station is located very near to ET 3 and ET 4</li> <li>Need to provide connectivity for Eastside residents</li> </ul>
<b>Alternatives with greater challenges</b>				
<b>ET 1</b> [north Puyallup River crossing]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Route to station over Puyallup River crosses sensitive tribal cultural area</li> </ul>	2	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to tribal ceremonial grounds</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impacts to sacred Puyallup Tribal land</li> </ul>
<b>ET 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher impacts to nearby properties</li> <li>Most impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> <li>Requires building a complex structure over I-5</li> </ul>	7	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant change in elevation of track</li> <li>Impacts to neighborhood and existing business</li> <li>Cultural impacts</li> <li>Increased cost</li> <li>Additional crossing of Puyallup River in less favorable location</li> <li>Difficult I-5 crossing</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impacts to Emerald Queen Casino</li> </ul>
<b>ET 8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher impacts to nearby properties</li> <li>Most impacts for building a new bridge over Puyallup River</li> <li>Requires building a complex structure over I-5</li> </ul>	8	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant change in elevation of track</li> <li>Impacts to neighborhood and existing business</li> <li>Cultural impacts</li> <li>Increased cost</li> <li>Reasonable access for Eastside residents</li> </ul>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impacts to Puyallup Tribal property and wetlands</li> </ul>

**Station Area Comments from the Stakeholder Group:**

- Regardless of station site, ensure equitable access into the East Tacoma neighborhood.
- Please address the ability for the extension of the existing Tacoma Link to be alternatively extended to the East Tacoma neighborhood.

Alternatives	Technical Analysis	Public Feedback	Stakeholder Group Feedback	Elected Leadership Group Recommendation
<b>Alternatives with more potential</b>		(station rank by public response)		
<b>TD 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most opportunities for housing and business development near station</li> <li>• More convenient access for people walking, biking, taking transit, or driving</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<p> <b>Suggest continuing study, but consider another station location on same alignment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed perspective on community connectivity</li> <li>• Area of significant traffic congestion</li> <li>• Concerns about traffic and visual impacts of elevated structure</li> <li>• Could compromise future development opportunities in the area</li> <li>• Concerns about need for environmental remediation prior to construction</li> </ul>	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine station location to consider business impacts</li> </ul>
<b>TD 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most convenient access for people walking, biking, taking transit, or driving</li> <li>• More opportunities for housing and business development near station</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>	<p> <b>Suggest continuing study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good access to local transit</li> <li>• Concerns about traffic and visual impacts of elevated structure; consider below grade station</li> </ul>	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interested in this alignment, consolidate to one station between TD 2 and TD 3</li> </ul>
<b>TD 3</b>		<b>3</b>	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good access to local transit</li> <li>• Good development opportunities that could spread west to Tacoma Dome Station and TD 2 area</li> <li>• Potentially requires rezoning to encourage development</li> <li>• Station design could provide enhanced connections to other services</li> </ul>	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interested in this alignment, consolidate to one station between TD 2 and TD 3</li> </ul>
<b>TD 4</b> [2 alternative routes]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least challenging to extend future line to Tacoma Mall under I-705</li> <li>• Has more direct access to Tacoma Dome</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for cut and cover station</li> <li>• Tail track at D Street could block access</li> <li>• Potential impacts to development currently planned at D St &amp; 26th St</li> <li>• Concerns about traffic and visual impacts of elevated structure</li> </ul>	<p></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located on Puyallup Tribal trust land, requiring an easement</li> </ul>
<b>Alternatives with greater challenges</b>				
<b>TD 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least convenient access to multimodal transportation center</li> <li>• Constructability challenges through steep slope area</li> <li>• Lower potential for housing and business development near station</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>	<p> <b>Suggest not continuing study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of multimodal connectivity</li> <li>• Difficult ingress/egress to 27th St, particularly during Tacoma Dome events</li> </ul>	<p> No comment</p>