

## Memorandum

November 21, 2006

360/737-2726

503/256-2726

To: Task Force

FROM: Doug Ficco, CRC Project Director

John Osborn, CRC Project Director

SUBJECT: Preliminary Alternative Package Results – Nov 2006 Task Force

Meeting

The project team continues to evaluate the 12 Alternative Packages relative to the screening criteria adopted by Task Force in the project's Evaluation Framework. Performance for many of these criteria were assessed and reported during the October 25 Task Force meeting. This month, the project team will report on most of the remaining criteria, though some will not be evaluated until later phases of the project when more detailed design information is available. Table 1 (attached) shows when each criterion has been or will be evaluated.

Results from this month's evaluations have been summarized similar to the previous month's data. Results are presented at three levels:

**Component Findings** – These provide the most concise roll-up of findings for the two major decisions to be made in this phase. There is a summary for River Crossing options and one for Transit options. Each summary provides an overview of how the options perform on the screening criteria that have been measured to-date.

**Value Performance** – These provide more detailed findings organized according to each of the project's adopted Values. There is a separate sheet for each Value.

**Criterion Performance** – These provide the most detailed results. There is a separate sheet for each of the criteria that were used to evaluate how well the project components and alternatives meet the adopted values.

The findings are largely focused on River Crossing options and Transit modes. The intent is to use these findings to narrow River Crossing and Transit options for packaging of alternatives to be evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS). A brief summary of the findings for River Crossings and Transit in this latest round of evaluation is as follows:

Replacement bridges (upstream or downstream) generally provide better performance than Supplemental Interstate or New Arterial bridge options. Traffic throughput, congestion, and travel time is comparable or better for Replacement bridges. A Replacement bridge provides substantially better transit performance because transit vehicles are not subjected to delays and reliability problems associated with bridge lifts. Freight trucks receive the same benefits as autos and transit from a Replacement bridge. While capital costs for River Crossings have not been calculated yet, maintenance and operation of a Replacement bridge is a small fraction of Supplemental bridge options (\$35,000/year versus \$3 million/year).

Transit findings have shown Express Bus service, paired with either Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail Transit (LRT), provides the best overall performance. Pairing these modes allows transit to reach the most households and employers while providing competitive travel times and good reliability, particularly when paired with a Replacement bridge. Placing transit on the existing bridges, as a Supplemental Interstate option would, would not provide an equitable distribution of benefits; automotive users would benefit from improved travel time and reliability afforded by a new fixed-span crossing while transit

 $\hbox{C:} \hbox{LDOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{STREIFALOCAL SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{OLK74LTASK FORCE COVER MEMO (2).} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES:} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS:} \hbox{DOCUMENTS AND SE$ 

patrons would experience delay and poor reliability across the existing bridges. When a distinction can be made, LRT generally performs better than BRT. LRT has greater capacity and lower annual operating costs than BRT (\$0.35 per transit seat \$1.92/seat respectively). However, LRT has the highest capital costs.

For a more detailed summary of River Crossing and Transit findings, please consult the Component Findings described above.

Table 1. Criteria evaluation	Distributed for October Task Force Mtg	Distributed for November Task Force Mtg	To be evaluated later
1 Community Livability and Human Resources			
1.1 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable reduce, noise levels			
1.2 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, neighborhood cohesion			
1.3 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, air quality			
1.4 Avoid or minimize residential displacements     1.5 Avoid or minimize business displacements			
1.6 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts, and where practicable, preserve historic, prehistoric, and cultural			
resources			
1.7 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, public park and recreation resources			
Support development/redevelopment opportunities consistent with local comprehensive plans, including jurisdiction-approved neighborhood plans			
1.9 Incorporate aesthetic values of the community in the project design			
2 Mobility, Reliability, Accessibility, Congestion Reduction, and Efficiency			
Reduce travel times and delay in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area for passenger vehicles			
2.2 Reduce travel times and delay in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area for transit modes			
2.3 Reduce the number of hours of daily highway congestion in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area			
2.4 Enhance or maintain accessibility of jobs, housing, health care and education to travel markets served by the I-5 Columbia River crossing			
2.5 Improve person throughput of I-5 Columbia River crossing			
2.6 Improve vehicle throughput of I-5 Columbia River crossing			
3 Modal Choice			
3.1 Provide for multi-modal transportation choices in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area			
3.2 Improve transit service to target markets in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area			
3.3 Improve bike/pedestrian connectivity in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area			
3.4 Increase vehicle occupancy in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area			
4 Safety			
4.1 Enhance vehicle/freight safety			
4.2 Enhance bike/pedestrian facilities and safety			
4.3 Enhance or maintain marine safety 4.4 Enhance or maintain aviation safety			
4.5 Provide sustained life-line connectivity			
4.6 Enhance I-5 incident/emergency response access within the bridge influence area			
5 Regional Economy; Freight Mobility			
5.1 Reduce travel times and reduce delay for vehicle-moved freight on I-5 within the bridge influence area			
5.2 Reduce travel times and reduce delay for vehicle-moved freight in the I-5 corridor			
5.3 Enhance or maintain efficiency of marine navigation			
5.4 Improve freight truck throughput of the bridge influence area			
5.5 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to the parallel freight rail corridor			
5.6 Enhance or maintain access to port, freight, and industrial facilities			
6 Stewardship of Natural Resources			
6.1 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, threatened or endangered fish or wildlife habitat			
6.2 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, other fish or wildlife habitat			
6.3 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, rare, threatened, or endangered plant species			
6.4 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, wetlands			
6.5 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, water quality			
6.6 Minimize total energy consumption of construction and transportation system operations			
6.7 Avoid, then minimize adverse impacts to, and where practicable enhance, waterways  7 Distribution of Benefits and Impacts			
7.1 Avoid or minimize disproportionate adverse impacts on, and where practicable, improve conditions for low			
income and minority populations			
7.2 Provide for equitable distribution of benefits to low income and minority populations  8 Cost Effectiveness and Financial Resources			
8.1 Minimize the cost of construction.			
8.2 Ensure transportation system construction cost effectiveness.			
8.3 Ensure transportation system maintenance and operation cost effectiveness.			
8.4 Ensure a reliable funding plan for the project			
9 Growth Management/Land Use			
9.1 Support adopted regional growth management and comprehensive plans			
10 Constructability			
10.1 Maintain transportation operations during construction			
10.2 Minimize adverse construction impacts			
10.3 Provide flexibility to accommodate future transportation system improvements			
10.4 Use construction practices and materials that minimize environmental impact			