

## C-TRAN Conditions from Resolution BR-08-019

Overall Status Classification:



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD but further refinement and decision-making after the FEIS/ROD will be required



Conflict or inconsistency between jurisdictions; or issue is unresolved; or issue needs additional work

OVERALL STATUS CATEGORY	NUMBER	ISSUE	EXPLANATION OF STATUS
	1	River Crossing – Construct two bridges with three through lanes and the minimum number of auxiliary lanes in each direction.	The plan being advanced consists of two bridges with three through lanes and two auxiliary lanes in each direction. Under the direction of PSC and IPS, additional studies were conducted during summer 2010 to evaluate the number of auxiliary lanes.
	2	High Capacity Transit – Select light rail transit as the high capacity transit mode.	Light rail transit was selected as the high capacity transit mode.
	3	High Capacity Transit Northern Terminus – Select Clark College as the northern terminus without use of satellite park-and-ride lots.	Clark College was selected as the northern terminus of the light rail transit system. Satellite park-and-ride lots are not being proposed.
	4	High Capacity Transit Alignment – Develop the terminus, station placement, alignment and design to allow for future extensions and connections.	Extensive analysis and planning has been conducted for the light rail alignment in Vancouver and each light rail station. The Vancouver Working Group, the Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee have been involved in helping develop and refine the Vancouver portion of the LRT system. The project has sought to coordinate with C-TRAN's plan for bus rapid transit.
	5	High Capacity Transit Alignment – Design the system to permit local bus route access along the high capacity transit alignment in downtown Vancouver.	The project has been developed to accommodate local bus operations. Certain operational issues can occur if local buses operate on the light rail transit alignment and will need to be addressed as operations planning continues.
	6	High Capacity Transit Financing (Capital) – Structure the high capacity transit component of the project such that C-TRAN is not required to ask voters for capital construction funding.	The project's Financial Plan does not anticipate voter approval for capital funding for the light rail transit component of the project. An application for \$850 million has been submitted under the FTA's New Starts program.

	7	High Capacity Transit Financing (Operations) – Seek voter approval for any means of financing high capacity transit operations.	C-TRAN has scheduled a vote for operating funding in November 2011.
	8	High Capacity Transit Financing (General) – Provide a net service benefit to existing C-TRAN patrons with the initiation of high capacity transit service.	The project's ridership forecasts, preliminary operations planning, and Financial Plan indicate there will be an overall benefit to C-TRAN patrons. Further details and refinement of C-TRAN's operations will be required as the project progresses toward construction and operations.
	9	High Capacity Transit Financing (Cost Sharing between States) – Divide construction, operations and maintenance costs in proportion to the length of the new high capacity transit corridor in each state.	The project's Financial Plan has not gone to this level of detail. The cost sharing between C-TRAN and TriMet will be subject to further negotiations.
	10	Sustainability and Other Principles – Design and construct the project following principles of sustainability, cost efficiency, context sensitivity, and avoidance and minimization of impacts.	The project seeks to follow these principles. Key participants include a sustainability working group with members from the partner agencies, the Urban Design Advisory Group, and other committees that have helped advance the project. Further details will be developed following these principles as the project proceeds toward construction.
	11	Formal Oversight Committee – Create a formal oversight committee with representatives from the partner agencies and two representatives of the public.	The Project Sponsors Council with representatives from the partner agencies was established and is guiding the project.

## Metro Conditions from Exhibit A to Resolution No. 08-3960B

Overall Status Classification:



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD but further refinement and decision-making after the FEIS/ROD will be required



Conflict or inconsistency between jurisdictions; or issue is unresolved; or issue needs additional work

OVERALL STATUS CATEGORY	NUMBER	ISSUE	EXPLANATION OF STATUS
Cyan	A	Tolling – Implement tolling on I-5 as soon as legally and practically permissible; consider diversion to I-205 and tolling of that facility with revenues used for projects in the region.	<p>The project has undertaken various analyses of tolls and the impact of tolling, though additional studies and analysis will need to be undertaken as the project advances. At this point, tolling of I-5 is an essential element of the project, both to manage congestion and as part of the funding package for the CRC project along with federal and state funding.</p> <p>Tolling of interstate facilities must be consistent with the provisions of Title 23 U.S.C. Section 129, the federal law that specifies the circumstances under which interstate facilities may be tolled. The CRC project qualifies, though tolling of I-205 does not because federal regulations allow tolling of existing facilities only if a project involves reconstruction or replacement of that facility. Reconstruction or replacement of I-205 is not being proposed as part of the CRC project nor is tolling being proposed for I-205 in connection with the CRC project. At this time, tolling is not being considered to fund other projects in the region. Further information on federal requirements can be found at: <a href="http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/tolling_pricing/toll_agreements.htm">http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/tolling_pricing/toll_agreements.htm</a></p> <p>Tolling of I-5 during construction of a new facility is permissible under federal statutes, but no recommendations or decisions about tolling during construction have been made. Tolling during construction could serve as a demand reduction measure to reduce traffic during the construction phase. An aggressive construction phase Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program has been developed and tolling during construction is still a possibility. Specific decisions on tolling, including the possibility of advance tolling as well as toll rates and toll structure, will be made by the appropriate bodies after consultation with the project’s local partners and a public outreach and education process. Under current statutory authority, the Washington Transportation Commission and the Oregon Transportation Commission have tolling authority in their respective states. The issues of tolling and tolling authority may also be explored in the forthcoming discussions on governance related to the project.</p> <p>Analyses conducted for the CRC project included using the regional traffic forecasting model to assess the impact of various tolls on total traffic and diversion to I-205. The Tolling Study Report, released in January 2010, included analyses of a no-build scenario, a no-toll build scenario, and ten other scenarios with varying toll structures and some with tolling of the I-205 and I-5 bridges. Key findings from the analysis undertaken for the CRC project included:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The regional travel forecasting models project that under the base tolling scenario, the CRC project will reduce auto travel on I-5 across the Columbia River, as compared to the No Build. The CRC project will also reduce overall person trips on I-5, as compared to the No Build due to the effect tolls have on shifting some cross river trip origins and destinations.</li> <li>• When looking at the tolled vs. no toll scenarios, tolling and transit improvements reduce auto travel across the river on I-5 by approximately 40,000 trips per day for the base tolling scenario (the numbers of trips vary by tolling scenario).</li> <li>• At the Columbia River, there is an approximate 4.5% shift of auto trips on an all day basis from I-5 to I-205 as compared to the Build No-Toll scenario. More diversion to I-205 is predicted in the off-peak hours when capacity is available than during peak hours. On I-205 south of I-84, the models estimate that diversion will be approximately 1% on an all day basis as compared to the no build.</li> </ul> <p>The Tolling Study Report had three principal conclusions about diversion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For most of the I-5 only toll scenarios, the majority of drivers would not change their travel patterns. Some would choose a new destination or a non-tolled route. Additional diversion to transit is minimal due to the already significantly increased ridership associated with project improvements.</li> <li>• Higher tolls on I-5 would cause more route diversion; however, the percentage of diversion tends to be lower during peak periods when travelers' willingness to pay tolls may be higher and/or alternative routes are congested, and thus, time-consuming and diversion during off-peak periods occurs when available capacity can accommodate the diversion.</li> <li>• For scenarios that toll both the I-5 and I-205 bridges, traffic levels would be higher on I-5 and lower on I-205 compared to tolling only the I-5 bridge. However, compared to the No Toll "No Build" project scenario, total cross-river traffic demand would be less on both the I-5 and I-205 bridges as many trips would divert to transit or not be made across the Columbia River. The No Toll "No Build" scenario would result in the most significant congestion in the I-205 corridor due to diversion from the I-5 corridor due to the severe congestion bottleneck in that corridor.</li> </ul> <p>Additional information about the impact of tolling and diversion to I-205 can be found in The Tolling Study report at:  <a href="http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/Tolling/CRC_TollingStudyCommitteeReport.pdf">http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/Tolling/CRC_TollingStudyCommitteeReport.pdf</a></p>
	B	Number of Auxiliary Lanes – Determine the number of auxiliary lanes across the Columbia River.	<p>During summer 2010, additional study was undertaken through the Integrated Project Staff (IPS) and the Project Sponsors Council (PSC). Developing performance measures and a more robust Transportation Demand Management Plan were among the actions considered to reduce the need for auxiliary lanes. The IPS recommendation forwarded to the PSC on August 5, 2010 was for a configuration with three through lanes and two auxiliary lanes in each direction and with standard 12-foot shoulders. The new recommendation results in narrower bridges than were previously recommended. PSC concurred and forwarded its recommendation to the Governors on August 13, 2010.</p> <p>The decision on the number of lanes will be confirmed and finalized with the publication of the Final EIS and the issuance of the Record of Decision. Both are expected in 2011.</p>

	C	<p>Impact Mitigation and Community Enhancement – Mitigate for adverse human health impact of the project or existing health impacts in the project area; implement community enhancement projects that address environmental justice.</p>	<p>The project is committed to providing users and the surrounding neighborhoods with a safe and reliable transportation facility. The project is working with and within the surrounding communities to help build upon and support their community goals. The CRC project has been working with and will continue to work with the community to blend the transportation system enhancements and improvements into the fabric of the community. The project’s goals include designing and constructing the project with as little disruption to the community as possible and developing the project such that it enhances the transportation and livability of the community and preserves the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, natural and social resources of the area.</p> <p>The philosophy of the project is to leave the area better off and to provide enhancements within the community as part of the overall project design rather than providing a funding source for enhancement elements separate and disjointed from the rest of the project. Many enhancements are included in the project, such as improved local street connections in downtown Vancouver and Hayden Island, the provision of light rail transit in the corridor, replacement of substandard facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians with new “world class” facilities, local auto access from North Portland to Hayden Island on a separate arterial bridge and a safer highway network for all users.</p> <p>Human health issues are embedded in the National Environmental Policy Act’s intent and in its implementation. The analyses conducted for the Columbia River Crossing DEIS, and further updates for the FEIS, address all potentially significant human health impacts that could reasonably result from the proposed action. The project, with planned mitigation, would not have adverse health impacts. Key findings leading to the conclusion that the project would not have adverse health impacts include analyses related to air quality, noise and vibration, climate change and greenhouse gases, and water quality. These four areas are highlighted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All criteria air pollutants and mobile source air toxins will be lower, in some cases significantly lower, in 2030 than they are today. Some pollutants will be slightly higher in some areas with the project than with the no-build, but emissions will be substantially below today’s levels and will be well within relevant standards established to promote public health and welfare. Long-term mitigation for air quality impacts is not proposed. The FEIS will describe measures to reduce impacts from construction emissions.</li> <li>• Noise impacts from highway traffic will be lower with the project than without due to proposed mitigation, primarily sound walls. All light rail noise can be mitigated.</li> <li>• The project will reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions compared to the no-build. The project will implement recommendations from the Governor’s Climate Change Integration Group regarding how transportation in Oregon can reduce GHG emissions.</li> <li>• Currently, all runoff from the river crossing and most runoff from I-5 in the project area discharges untreated into the Columbia River and other surface waters. The project will provide water quality treatment for 115 percent of the new impervious surface, including the entire river crossing and most of I-5 in the project area that is currently untreated. These changes are beneficial to the health of aquatic species and people.</li> </ul> <p>The Draft EIS included and the Final EIS will include more detailed information, including analysis, applicable standards, conclusions, and mitigation where appropriate on the following topics related to human health:</p>
--	---	---	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Air Quality</li> <li>· Noise and Vibration</li> <li>· Land Use and Economics</li> <li>· Neighborhoods</li> <li>· Pedestrians and bicycles</li> <li>· Traffic and Transit</li> <li>· Visual and Aesthetics</li> <li>· Parks and recreation</li> <li>· Public services</li> <li>· Environmental justice· Hazardous materials</li> <li>· Water Quality</li> </ul> <p>The major steps to the impact analysis that followed or occurred simultaneously with data collection were: neighborhood resource mapping, the completion of displacement surveys, review of potential impacts and benefits from other disciplines (such as air quality), evaluation of potential impacts to low-income housing developments, and a robust outreach and communication program.</p> <p>In response to questions raised by various parties commenting on the DEIS, including the Multnomah County Health Department, the project team did undertake additional analyses including assessing greenhouse gases, additional air quality and noise studies. The Final EIS will include substantially more documentation than the DEIS related to health impacts.</p> <p>The CRC website will provide access to the FEIS and technical reports upon their publication.</p>
--	--	--	---

	D	Demand Management – Develop state-of-the-art demand management techniques in addition to tolls to influence travel behavior and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	<p>The TDM Working Group developed both a Construction Phase and a Post-Construction Phase TDM program. The recommended Construction Phase program is a bi-state, multi-pronged approach that seeks to maximize use of alternative modes of travel through targeted marketing and additional services. The IPS has also endorsed a Post-Construction TDM Program with the goal of shifting as much as an additional 11 percent of peak person trips to non-SOV modes above the level assumed in the travel forecasts generated for the project, resulting in a non-SOV mode share that could exceed 50 percent. The Construction Phase TDM Plan was endorsed by the PSC. Additional follow-on work has been recommended to move toward implementation.</p> <p>To facilitate the active management of the corridor, the PSC adopted the concept of a Mobility Council on March 6, 2009. The Mobility Council would regularly assess all aspects of the corridor and the direct and indirect impacts. The PSC vision of the Mobility Council would include active management in four areas: the toll rate structure, the use of through and auxiliary lanes; transit policies; and transportation demand management strategies. During 2009 and 2010, the PSC oversaw the development and endorsed the TDM plans. TDM Plans were presented to and endorsed by the PSC on January 22, 2010 and on August 9, 2010.</p> <p>The PSC also established a Performance Measures Advisory Group to help establish performance measures, targets and strategies to help inform the design of the CRC project and to manage the system after construction. Key performance measures focused on freight, commuter and transit travel times; safety; greenhouse gas emissions; financial considerations; and the benefit/cost ratio. The Performance Measures Advisory Group recommendations were presented to and endorsed by the PSC on January 22, 2010 and August 9, 2010.</p>
	E	Financing Plan – Develop a financing plan for presentation to the project partners and the public that indicates federal, state and local funding and how the project could impact other expenditures in the region.	<p>A Conceptual Finance Plan was developed and shared with the PSC on January 22, 2010. The plan illustrates how the project could be funded using a combination of federal and state funds and toll revenues. On May 14, 2010, the PSC received additional presentations related to tolling and federal funding priorities. The funding plan in the FEIS is based on these concepts and will be updated as appropriate. The funding plan will be continually reviewed with the PSC as it evolves and will be finalized prior to the FTA approval of entry into final design, which is anticipated in the fall of 2011. The federal funding sources being sought for the project are principally those for which no other projects in the region are eligible. Financing issues will continue to evolve with consultation among the project partners.</p> <p>Additional work remains on the financing plan with each additional step requiring more detailed analyses in accordance with requirements of the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration. After the approval of the Final EIS, additional financial analysis and commitment will be required before federal agencies authorize entering into final design. An even more detailed financial analysis and a higher level of commitment will be required before federal agencies enter into a full funding grant agreement. Since issuance of bonds for the construction of the project is envisioned, a formal investment grade bond revenue analysis and a determination of bonding capacity will be required in the future.</p> <p>The Tolling Study can be found at: <a href="http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/Tolling/CRC_TollingStudyCommitteeReport.pdf">http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/Tolling/CRC_TollingStudyCommitteeReport.pdf</a>  Information presented to the PSC about funding from federal sources can be found at:  <a href="http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/MeetingMaterials/PSC/PSC_WorkshopMaterials_051410_1of2.pdf">http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/MeetingMaterials/PSC/PSC_WorkshopMaterials_051410_1of2.pdf</a></p>

	F	<p>Capacity Considerations, Induced Demand and Greenhouse Gases – Conduct additional analysis of GHG and induced automobile demand; prominently display the results in the FEIS; include comparisons of the auxiliary lanes; pursue reductions in VMT in support of targets established by the states.</p>	<p>In November 2008, the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Expert Review Panel was convened to review the GHG and climate change methodology used in the project’s Draft EIS. In its report issued on January 8, 2009, the panel validated the methodology and confirmed the findings in the Draft EIS - that the CRC project would be expected to reduce GHG emissions relative to the No-Build. They made suggestions for future analyses that will be incorporated into the FEIS. This updated analysis has been completed including use of the latest EPA MOVES model, taking into account mode shift to transit, bike and pedestrian, the effect of speeds on emission rates and the reduction of emissions due to crashes and bridge lifts. This analysis shows similar results to the DEIS analysis but with even greater GHG reductions than previously estimated. Additionally, the GHG and Climate Change analysis in the CRC Draft EIS received the 2009 NEPA Excellence Award from the National Association of Environmental Professionals. The Greenhouse Gas Expert Review Panel’s report can be found at:  <a href="http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/TechnicalReports/GHG_PanelReport_010809.pdf">http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/TechnicalReports/GHG_PanelReport_010809.pdf</a></p> <p>Since release of the DEIS, several groups, including the Transportation Demand Working Group, the Performance Measures Advisory Group, and the IPS, have worked on strategies designed to enhance mobility, especially through promotion of alternative modes of travel that reduce both GHG emissions and VMT. The strategies and plans of each of these groups have been endorsed by PSC. Additional work relating to implementation of these strategies and plans will be needed as the project advances. Further discussion relating to the recommendations and implementation of transportation demand management strategies can be found in Issue D, above.</p> <p>A qualitative analysis of the potential for induced travel demand was conducted by the Travel Demand Expert Review Panel. In its report dated November 25, 2008, the panel concluded that “the CRC project finding that the project would have a low impact to induce growth is reasonable for this corridor because the project is located in a mature urban area.” The report can be found at:  <a href="http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/TechnicalReports/TravelDemandModelReview_PanelReport.pdf">http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/TechnicalReports/TravelDemandModelReview_PanelReport.pdf</a></p> <p>An additional study of induced growth was conducted by Metro during summer 2010 using its Metroscope model. This quantitative study also concluded “that the proposal would have negligible impact on population and employment growth in Clark County, when comparing the projected growth that would occur with the project with the projected growth that would occur even with no change to the existing bridge.” According to Metro, the three main conclusions from its summer 2010 analysis using Metroscope were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CRC project produces a minor difference in regional growth relative to the no-build alternative and almost no change compared to the No-Build if tolls are imposed on I-5.</li> <li>• The results using Metroscope reinforce the previous qualitative analysis with its quantitative approach.</li> <li>• The no-build and build scenarios result in basically the same growth patterns for population and employment and confirm the validity of the approach used for forecasting traffic volumes in the Draft and Final EIS involving holding population and employment forecasts constant between the Build and No-Build scenarios.</li> </ul> <p>Results of the Metroscope analysis were summarized by Metro in its news release that can be found at:  <a href="http://news.oregonmetro.gov/1/post.cfm/metro-finds-columbia-river-crossing-toll-bridge-with-light-rail-would-have-negligible-impact-on-growth">http://news.oregonmetro.gov/1/post.cfm/metro-finds-columbia-river-crossing-toll-bridge-with-light-rail-would-have-negligible-impact-on-growth</a></p>
--	---	--	---

	G	<p>Preservation of Freight Access – Describe the physical improvements and tolling methods that will be used to ensure trucks are granted priority due to their importance relative to single-occupant autos; ensure that freight capacity at interchanges is not diminished by industrial land use conversion.</p>	<p>The importance of freight has been recognized throughout the project. The Freight Working Group provided key input to the design process, including the design of key interchanges such as the Marine Drive interchange. The design standards used for the project seek to accommodate trucks used in commerce. The ramp terminals, ramps, and interchanges have been sized to provide needed capacity for trucks. Freight-only lanes and ramps were considered, but were not recommended by the Freight Working Group.</p> <p>The project’s plan for the Marine Drive interchange includes a flyover ramp from eastbound Marine Drive to northbound I-5 and braided ramps on southbound I-5 between the Marine Drive and Interstate/Victory Boulevard interchanges. Analyses conducted for the project indicate that neither of these is required short-term and can be delayed until after year 2030. Both projects, however, are considered part of a long-term solution because of the importance of accommodating freight movements, particularly those associated with the Port of Portland and other industrial uses along Marine Drive. The revised plan for the Hayden Island Interchange includes provision of an arterial bridge across the Portland Harbor, connecting Hayden Island to North Interstate Avenue and Martin Luther King Blvd in lieu of ramp connections through the I-5/Hayden Island interchange complex to the Marine Drive interchange. This has a beneficial impact for freight by removing this auto traffic from the key freight access interchange, the Marine Drive interchange.</p> <p>Electronic tolling is planned for the project. It is currently assumed that trucks will pay more based on number of axles or weight.</p> <p>Both DOTs share the concern about capacity being used up by unplanned non-industrial development, but must rely upon the partners with land use authority to prevent industrial lands from being converted to other uses with unacceptable transportation impacts. One of the relatively new methods of protecting the capacity of interchanges being used in Oregon is an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP). An IAMP identifies long-range improvements, access management strategies, and land use tools that are used to protect the interchange. IAMPs are adopted by the local jurisdiction and by the Oregon Department of Transportation. Development of IAMPs is underway for both the Hayden Island and Marine Drive interchanges. Adoption by the City of Portland and the Oregon Transportation Commission are expected sometime during 2011.</p>
	H	<p>Light Rail Transit – Implement light rail transit as a required element in any plan that moves forward.</p>	<p>Light rail transit was selected as the high capacity transit mode and is being advanced as a key element of the project. Confirmation of the selection of light rail transit as a project element will be with the publication of the Final EIS and the issuance of the Record of Decision. Both actions are expected in 2011.</p>
	I	<p>Design of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities – Undertake additional design to include “world class” bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the bridge, approaches and throughout the bridge influence area; meet or exceed standards; be adequate to meet the</p>	<p>A “world class” facility for pedestrians and bicyclists is being advanced. It will feature a facility for bicyclists and pedestrians on the main span with more width than other facilities in the Portland-Vancouver region and far exceeds minimum standards. The capacity of the facility is calculated to be more than adequate for the predicted use. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) spent considerable effort helping develop a complete system that features a river crossing using one of the lower-level sections of the bridge for the main river crossing. PBAC helped develop appropriate connections at both ends of the project and for Hayden Island. PBAC also recommended development of a future maintenance and security plan that has been endorsed by PSC and committed to by the Oregon and Washington DOTs.</p> <p>Connections for bicyclists and pedestrians to the local network in downtown Vancouver, Hayden Island, and streets and multi-use paths in the vicinity of Marine Drive and Delta Park are still undergoing refinement. The project is committed to providing good connections that meet or exceed all applicable standards, such as width and grade, that avoid or minimize conflicts among modes of travel, and that seeks to improve the</p>

		demand considering tolls and other transportation demand measures.	existing circuitous routing patterns in the area. Many features needed to implement this vision for a world class facility in the corridor, such as the precise locations, widths, grades, etc will be determined in the final design phase including consultation with local agencies and stakeholders.
	J	Urban Development Impacts at Re-designed Interchanges – Undertake additional evaluation of the impact of redesigned interchanges and urban development potential; preserve and improve access to the Expo Center.	<p>Several of the interchanges, especially the Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchanges, have undergone considerable additional analyses. Key participants in these evaluations have been the Marine Drive Stakeholder Group and the Portland Working Group.</p> <p>Several options for the Marine Drive interchange were explored. Key issues considered in the designs for the Marine Drive interchange included the impact on freight movements, access to existing industrial uses in the area, access to the Expo Center, and the creation of parcels that could be put to beneficial uses.</p> <p>The Hayden Island interchange also underwent additional study designed to further the Hayden Island Plan and implement features that are supportive of transit, seek to implement a “main street” for Tomahawk Island Drive, and minimize the footprint of the project on Hayden Island. Additional analyses led to a new concept (known as Concept D) utilizing an arterial bridge to provide access between Hayden Island and N. Expo Road with a corresponding elimination of direct freeway ramps within the project design between Hayden Island and the Marine Drive interchange. Efforts are currently underway to incorporate this into a design that will be included as the preferred option in the Final EIS. Additional refinement work addressing urban design characteristics will continue as the project advances toward construction. The Portland Working Group and other stakeholders will be consulted as the project seeks to advance the design.</p> <p>Overall, the combination of improvements at and around the Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchanges substantially improves local connectivity and access apart from the freeway improvements and the resulting removal of the congestion bottleneck.</p> <p>Access to/from Expo is substantially improved and representatives from Expo have been involved in the process.</p>
	K	Bridge Design – Consider bridge type and aesthetics before the final design.	<p>In seeking to achieve a quality design meeting aesthetic values, the project has made extensive use of advisory groups including the Urban Design Advisory Committee (UDAG), a Sustainability Working Group, the Independent Review Panel (IRP), the Hayden Island Design Group, and a constructability working group. The Urban Design Advisory Committee (UDAG) developed design guidelines and recommended a two-level, two-bridge concept that is being advanced. Overall guidance has been provided by the IPS and PSC to meet these objectives. UDAG’s recommended guidelines are currently being developed into “architectural standards” by WSDOT and CRC staff to use as the project moves into final design. These standards will be shared with UDAG, the cities of Portland and Vancouver, and other stakeholders and will be used for the bridge and other elements of the project.</p> <p>Beginning on November 3, 2010, the Bridge Expert Review Panel began reassessing bridge types, and constraints. The Bridge Expert Review Panel is expected to complete its work by the end of January 2011 and is expected to provide its findings on design and aesthetics in a manner integrated with their review of the bridge type. The Panel’s recommendations will be used by the project to advance the project to final design with changes as appropriate.</p> <p>Design and aesthetic conversations will continue with the public and advisory groups as the project advances.</p>

## City of Portland Conditions

Overall Status Classification:



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD but further refinement and decision-making after the FEIS/ROD will be required



Conflict or inconsistency between jurisdictions; or issue is unresolved; or issue needs additional work

OVERALL STATUS CATEGORY	NUMBER	ISSUE	EXPLANATION OF STATUS
	LPA 1	Replacement Bridge – Select the replacement bridge option.	The replacement bridge concept with two structures is being advanced.
	LPA 2	Transit Component – Select light rail transit.	Light rail transit is being advanced.
	LPA 3	Facility Size – Conduct additional analysis and seek public involvement focusing on selecting the smallest bridge to meet project needs.	Considerable effort has been undertaken focusing on selecting the most appropriately sized bridge. The efforts have included the formation of the TDM Working Group to craft strategies to reduce travel demand; the formation of a Performance Measures Advisory Committee to develop performance measures to help inform the size and design of the facility; a special study commissioned by the City of Portland to review CRC work and develop other alternatives for Hayden Island and the river crossing; a review of the project conducted by the Independent Review Panel; and additional work focusing on Hayden Island by the Hayden Island Design Group and the Portland Working Group. Public input has been included in key work efforts including the Independent Review Panel and the Hayden Island efforts. In addition, ongoing work is being conducted by the IPS and overseen by the PSC. The PSC recommendation forwarded to the Governors in August 2010 is a facility with 3 through lanes and two auxiliary lanes in each direction and 12-foot shoulders on the main span.
	LPA 4	Architectural Design – Employ the highest quality architectural design allowed by engineering and cost constraints for the North Portland Harbor Bridge and Columbia River Main span; and reconsider the navigation and airspace constraints.	The Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) developed design guidelines that have been used to develop design standards employed for the project. UDAG reviewed various bridge features and design elements and recommended a two-bridge, two-level bridge configuration consistent with the design being advanced for the Columbia River main span. Key factors leading to UDAG’s recommendation included fewer piers in the river, a narrower corridor, a lesser environmental footprint, more desirable views, and aesthetic opportunities. Driven by cost considerations, the project is advancing a concept that seeks to reuse, rather than replace, the North Portland Harbor span. Beginning on November 3, 2010, the Bridge Expert Review Panel began reassessing constraints, including airspace and navigational requirements, and the feasibility of bridge types. Design and aesthetic conversations will continue with the public and advisory groups as the project advances.

	LPA 5	Pedestrian/Bicyclist Facility – Provide a “world class” facility for pedestrians and bicyclists across the river and throughout the area.	<p>A “world class” facility for pedestrians and bicyclists is being advanced. It will feature a facility for bicyclists and pedestrians on the main span with more width than other facilities in the Portland-Vancouver region and far exceeds minimum standards. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) spent considerable effort helping develop a complete system that features a river crossing using one of the lower-level sections of the bridge for the main river crossing. PBAC helped develop appropriate connections at both ends of the project and for Hayden Island. PBAC also recommended development of a future maintenance and security plan that has been endorsed by PSC and committed to by the Oregon and Washington DOTs.</p> <p>Refinement work is continuing in cooperation with the Portland Working Group on connections through the Hayden Island transit station area, to Hayden Island’s roads and paths, across North Portland Harbor and to the street network and paths south of North Portland Harbor. Refinements are being explored to minimize circuitous travel and conflicts with motor vehicles. The location and design of facilities for pedestrians’ and bicyclists’ access across North Portland Harbor and for access to the main bridge span is still being explored through the work of the Portland Working Group.</p>
	LPA 6	Sustainability – Provide the highest level of sustainability design and construction including a stormwater strategy and minimal impact on fish, wildlife, and watershed health.	<p>The project will implement a multi-modal solution in the corridor that will reduce greenhouse gases and energy consumption, thus adding to the sustainability of the entire region. The project has made extensive use of advisory groups relating to design elements, modes of transportation, and sustainability practices. The project’s sustainability strategy document, including a section on sustainable construction practices, is currently undergoing refinement. The project’s stormwater management approach seeks to meet or exceed all applicable requirements. Additional consultation with permitting agencies and increased emphasis on threatened and endangered species and the regulatory agencies was recommended by the Independent Review Panel (IRP) in its July 2010 report.</p>
	LPA 7	Transportation Demand Management and Tolling – Develop a comprehensive TDM program that includes variable-price tolling in perpetuity.	<p>The TDM Working Group developed both a Construction Phase and a Post-Construction Phase TDM program. The recommended program is a bi-state, multi-pronged approach that seeks to maximize use of alternative modes of travel through targeted marketing and additional services. The IPS has also endorsed a Post-Construction TDM Program to shift an additional 11 percent of peak person trips to non-SOV modes. The TDM Plans have been endorsed by the PSC. Additional follow-on work has been recommended to move toward implementation. The project assumes variable-price tolling that can have an impact on travel demand, but decisions on tolling structure will be decided at a later date.</p>
	LPA 8	VMT Reduction – Contribute to a reduction in VMT per capita in the bi-state region.	<p>Meeting state and regional goals for VMT reduction will require comprehensive state and regional strategies. The CRC Locally Preferred Alternative has incorporated aggressive TDM strategies into the project and will more than double transit ridership compared to the no-build scenario, as well as reduce vehicle travel across the Columbia River as compared to the no-build scenario. However, there will need to be a broader strategy adopted by Metro and RTC to accomplish the overall VMT reduction goal, as any one project has a limited effect on a goal of this magnitude. A VMT analysis was conducted to assess the difference between the LPA and the No-Build. Calculations of the regional, 9-hour VMT (4-hour AM peak, the one-hour mid-day peak, and the 4-hour PM peak) showed that the LPA reduced regional travel by 0.78 percent relative to the No-Build. This can be attributed to the use of congestion pricing, extension of light rail, and improved interchange performance would draw vehicles back to the interstate that would have otherwise traveled greater distances on local street networks to avoid heavily congested segments of I-5.</p>

	LPA 9	Freight Movement – Consider long-range plans for freight movement by truck and rail including improvements to rail facilities.	Improving conditions for freight movement was one of the original elements of the project’s Purpose and Need. Early work for the CRC project included developing a technical memorandum “Feasibility of Diverting Truck Freight to Rail in the Columbia River Corridor.” This memorandum provided analysis of freight characteristics in the region and identified constraints that are expected to cause trucks to carry an increasing share of regional freight. Freight continues to be a priority and accommodating trucks at the key interchanges and on the mainline has been included in the project being advanced. The LPA has been shown to significantly reduce freight travel times in the corridor. The Freight Working Group met twelve times to consider and address freight issues. The impact of the existing Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF) bridge, just downstream from the I-5 corridor, has been considered, as well. The scope of the project does not include improvements to privately-owned railroad facilities, including the BNSF bridge, other than mitigation for direct impacts.
	LPA 10	MWESB Contracting – At a minimum, follow City of Portland requirements for employing MWESB contractors.	The project expects to exceed federal requirements for contracting and will be working with the project partners to implement more aggressive contracting strategies. MWESB contracting opportunities have been considered in the development of construction contract packages. Outreach to MWESB contractors has begun and will be intensified with the help of the project partners as the project moves toward construction.
	LPA 11	Financing Plan – Develop a detailed financial plan with federal, state and local sources; identify impact on other transportation projects in the region; develop Oregon gas tax increases that do not detract from allocations to cities and counties.	A Conceptual Financial Plan has been developed and shared with PSC. It illustrates how the project could be funded using a combination of federal funds, state funds, and toll revenues. The project is seeking federal funding from discrete programs for which other projects in the region are not eligible. The federal funding anticipated for the project include the Federal Transit Administration’s “New Starts” program and US Department of Transportation’s “Projects of National Significance,” which has provided some of the funding for planning conducted thus far. The mechanism for the State of Oregon’s contribution to the project will be determined by the legislature. Historically, increases in Oregon’s gas tax have resulted in more, not less, revenue being allocated to cities and counties.
	LPA 12	Greenhouse Gases and Induced Travel Demand – Contract for independent analyses of GHG and induced travel demand for the project.	A Greenhouse Gas Expert Review Panel was convened (report January 8, 2009) and found the "CRC analysis and findings to be reasonable and commends the efforts of the staff to conduct a greenhouse gas analysis for a single project." and that the "Panel agrees with the CRC finding that the locally preferred alternative would generate lower greenhouse gas emissions than the no build alternative." During summer 2010, the Independent Review Panel also reviewed the GHG analyses and concluded CRC had responded appropriately in undertaking GHG analyses. Additional GHG analyses are currently being conducted and will be included in the FEIS. A Travel Demand Model Review Panel was convened (report November 25, 2008) and found the results of the CRC VMT analysis to be reasonable. During summer 2010, the project contracted with Metro to conduct additional analysis with additional runs of its Metroscope model. In July 2010, Metro released the results of its study in which they concluded "the Columbia River Crossing toll bridge with light rail would have negligible impact on growth."
	HI 1	Hayden Island LRT Station – Provide ultra high-quality LRT station that provides a community focal point and safe, attractive and accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Considerable effort has been focused on the Hayden Island station location and design. Many alternatives and refinements have been considered. Refinement work continues as the project seeks to incorporate the Concept D design for access to Hayden Island and to meet the goals of the Hayden Island Plan adopted by the City of Portland. The Hayden Island Design Group and Portland Working Group are among those that have contributed to the effort. Public outreach has been an important part of the refinement process. IPS and PSC have received status reports on

			the work related to Hayden Island and the LRT station.
	HI 2	Hayden Island Street Network – Develop arterials accessing the interchange that serve community needs, accommodate bicycles, pedestrians and street trees; consider smaller scale arterials than in the DEIS.	Development of the street network serving Hayden Island continues as the project seeks to advance Concept D for access to Hayden Island. Concept D features an arterial connection from Hayden Island to Portland’s street network in the vicinity of Marine Drive. The extension of Tomahawk Drive as an east-west connection serving pedestrians, bicyclists, and autos on Hayden Island is another key feature of the Hayden Island street network. Participation in the development of the transportation network for Hayden Island has included the Hayden Island Design Group and the Portland Working Group. Public outreach has been an important part of the refinement process. Many alternatives have been developed and refined. All concepts have included accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians and refinement of traffic forecasts has led to the advancement a design that has smaller scale streets in many areas than that presented in the DEIS. Work is continuing on detailed street design of local streets, including those associated with the arterial bridge connection between Hayden Island and streets in the vicinity of Marine Drive. This effort is being conducted with participation by the City of Portland and stakeholders.
	HI 3	Hayden Island Drive and Janzen Beach Drive – Extend both arterial streets to the planned north-south arterial street 600 feet west of the interchange ramp terminals.	The extension of both arterials is part of the project design being advanced. Both will extend to the major north-south street west of the existing shopping center.
	HI 4	Tomahawk Drive – Design this extension under the freeway as a community main street highlighting the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and local traffic access.	The Hayden Island Design Group and Portland Working Group have been instrumental in refining the concept. The project is advancing Tomahawk Drive following this guidance; it is designed as a main street with bike lanes and wide sidewalks.
	HI 5	Areas North of Hayden Island Drive – Consider using areas north of Hayden Island Drive for open space, stormwater management, and habitat restoration.	The project seeks to make optimal use of whatever areas are acquired and balance uses to provide the maximum benefit. The current plan anticipates all of these uses on land north of Hayden Island Drive and beneath or adjoining I-5.
	HI 6	Hayden Island Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) - ODOT and the City will cooperate in the development of an IAMP.	The project has provided technical support to ODOT and the City during their development of the IAMP.
	MD 1	Marine Drive Interchange Refinement – Continue to evaluate interchange design alternatives for this key freight interchange; consider land use opportunities, Expo center needs, and wetlands.	The Marine Drive interchange has been the subject of considerable effort including a special study commissioned by the City of Portland that evaluated new design concepts, and shifting the alignment of the interchange and Marine Drive to minimize impacts to Expo center. Work has been assisted by the Marine Drive Stakeholder Group, the Freight Working Group, the Portland Working Group and IPS. The selection of Concept D included a consensus decision on the design of the Marine Drive Interchange. One of the benefits of Concept D is the improvement for freight movements though the interchange resulting from the relocation of certain Hayden Island automobile movements that will occur on an arterial bridge instead of traveling through the Marine Drive interchange. The concept for the Marine Drive interchange is considered to be settled, but some refinement will continue during

			final design in consultation with the Portland Working Group or through the work being undertaken with ODOT on the Interchange Area Management Plan.
	MD 2	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities – Implement pedestrian and bicycle facilities to improve connectivity including Bridgeton to Hayden Island.	Considerable planning has gone into the planning of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians in the vicinity of Marine Drive. Advisory groups helping with the effort have included the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC), the Freight Working Group, and the Portland Working Group. Designs for pedestrian/bicycle facilities included in the current plan include connections from the bridge to the Expo LRT station, to pathways along the south side of the Columbia River and to streets (N. Vancouver Way, N. Marine Drive and N. Expo Road). Refinement of the designs for these connections is continuing.
	MD 3	Bridgeton Trail Extension – Extend the pedestrian and bicycle facilities to Bridgeton including the first phase of the Bridgeton Trail.	The designs included in current plan include connections from the bridge to the pathways along the Columbia River. Construction of the Bridgeton Trail itself is not proposed as part of the project since it is outside the project limits. All critical connections for bicyclists and pedestrians, including connections to the Bridgeton Trail are being evaluated. Finalizing these trail connections will be part of the regional multi-use path evaluation process discussed under LPA 5 above.
	MD 4	Local Street Connection to Kenton – Evaluate the potential for non-freeway connection to Kenton.	Planning in the area of the Marine Drive interchange has always sought to retain local street connections. The current plan, based on Concept D, provides better connections between Hayden Island and Kenton than have other options. Concept D provides a non-freeway connection between Hayden Island and N. Expo Road, through the Expo Transit station area, which enhances the local street network and access to Kenton.
	MD 5	Marine Drive Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) – ODOT, the City and the CRC project will cooperate in the development and adoption of an IAMP.	The project has provided technical support to ODOT and the City during their development of the IAMP.
	PB 1	Facilities for Bicyclists and Pedestrians – Provide three separated facilities: northbound cyclists, southbound cyclists, and pedestrians adjacent to the high-capacity transit facility.	This specific recommendation of providing facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians along the high-capacity transit facility was based on the prior “three bridge” concept that has since been abandoned. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee recommended, and PSC endorsed a concept providing for a bicycle and pedestrian facility using the lower level of one of the two bridges. The PBAC recommendation provides for separation between pedestrians and bicyclists. Refinement work is continuing in cooperation with the Portland Working Group on connections through the Hayden Island transit station area, to Hayden Island’s roads and paths, across North Portland Harbor and to the street network and paths south of North Portland Harbor. The location and design of facilities for pedestrians’ and bicyclists’ access across North Portland Harbor and for access to the main bridge span is still being explored through the work of the Portland Working Group.
	PB 2	Facilities for Bicyclists and Pedestrians – Provide rest areas and lookout points on the river crossing bridges.	These specific elements are contained in the plan being advanced.

	PB 3	Facilities for Bicyclists and Pedestrians – Provide a continuous design and connect the Hayden Island and Expo transit stations.	The plan being advanced provides for a pedestrian/bicycle facility on the lower deck of the main span across the Columbia River. Across Hayden Island, the path will run parallel with the LRT tracks. For the crossing of North Portland Harbor, the plan provides for the pedestrian/bicycle connection to be on the bridge carrying LRT and a local street connection from Hayden Island to N. Expo Road. The Portland Working Group is still examining other possibilities to improve connections for bicyclists and pedestrians that reduce conflicts among modes and with motor vehicle traffic.
	PB 4	Pedestrian Connection from Bridgeton to Hayden Island – Provide an urban standard pedestrian facility on the east side of the Portland Harbor Bridge.	The PSC recommended that the pedestrian connection between Bridgeton and Hayden Island be provided on the new bridge, west of I-5, which accommodates LRT, a local street connection, and facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists. Locating the facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists on this structure has benefits for the entire interchange design. The Portland Working Group is still examining other possibilities to improve connections for bicyclists and pedestrians that reduce conflicts among modes and with motor vehicle traffic.
	PB 5	Facilities for Bicyclists and Pedestrians at the Hayden Island and Marine Drive Interchanges – Implement identified improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians at these two interchanges.	The plan being advanced provides for a pedestrian/bicycle facility on the lower deck of the main span across the Columbia River. Across Hayden Island, the path will run parallel with the LRT tracks. For the crossing of North Portland Harbor, the plan provides for the pedestrian/bicycle connection to be on the bridge carrying LRT and a local street connection from Hayden Island to N. Expo Road. The plan allows bicyclists and pedestrians to avoid most of the high-volume ramps and roadways as they traverse these areas. The design of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians was developed in consultation with the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee and the Portland Working Group.
	UD 1	Bridge Design – Produce a signature distinctive design for the bridges given physical limitations and cost considerations.	The Urban Design Advisory Committee developed a set of design guidelines that have been used to advance project elements. UDAG endorsed a two-level, two-bridge concept featuring an open-web design allowing LRT and pedestrian/bicycle facilities on the lower levels of the bridges. There continue to be discussions about the design and aesthetics with UDAG and with the general public. The Bridge Expert Review Panel, which convened in November 2010, is reviewing possibilities for creating a signature design as well as reviewing the navigation and aviation constraints.
	UD 2	Marine Drive Interchange – Consider a new interchange configuration that strengthens the connection of publicly-owned properties with the North Portland Harbor waterway and provides opportunities for redevelopment.	A wide range of alternatives was explored for the Marine Drive Interchange. Important factors included serving existing uses and creating parcels of sufficient size and configuration that provide development opportunities for appropriate uses. Key participants included the Marine Drive Stakeholder Group, the Freight Working Group, and the Portland Working Group. The interchange design being forwarded balances the needs of all groups and does strengthen connections and provide opportunity for redevelopment. The concept for the Marine Drive interchange is considered to be settled, but some refinement will continue during final design in consultation with the Portland Working Group.
	UD 3	Hayden Island Interchange and Transit Station – Integrate the design and function of the interchange and transit station and support the Hayden Island Concept Plan.	Many options have been considered in design of the Hayden Island interchange and the Hayden Island LRT station. They have undergone considerable evaluation and refinement. All concepts have been evaluated in the context of the Hayden Island Plan. Key participants in the process have included the Hayden Island Design Group and the Portland Working Group. Refinement work continues as the project seeks to integrate Concept D with the plans for the Hayden Island LRT station and interchange.

	UD 4	North Portland Harbor Design Elements – Consider making iconic design elements for North Portland Harbor analogous to those used at the future iconic Evergreen Street lid in Vancouver.	The decision to reuse, rather than replace, the North Portland Harbor Bridge leads to considering the design elements for the new, local street/LRT/bicycle/pedestrian bridge. A design for the Evergreen Street lid has not been developed.
	EJ 1	Impact of Tolls on Low- Income People – Assess the impact of tolls on low-income people, including toll avoidance and limited access to technology for payment of tolls.	This has been assessed and will be documented in the Final EIS. As currently conceived, tolls will be applied on the basis of trips by vehicle type with large trucks paying more than autos. For all users of the facility, there will be alternatives to paying tolls including public transit, bicycle and pedestrian alternatives. Transportation demand management options including vanpooling and carpooling can reduce the impact of tolls. Tolls were found to have an impact, but would not have a disproportionate adverse impact on low income people. This conclusion is based on guidance contained in FHWA Order 6640.23, which defines a disproportionate adverse impact as one that is “appreciably more severe” than that borne by non-minority or non-low income populations. A variety of methods would be used to help assure low-income drivers would have access to transponders used by the electronic tolling system.
	EJ 2	Impact of the Project on Access to Affordable Housing and Employment – Assess the impact of the project on low-income and minority populations in regard to affordable housing and employment.	This has been assessed and will be documented in the Final EIS. There is not a disproportionate impact on low-income and minority populations. The major steps to the impact analysis that followed or occurred simultaneously with data collection were: neighborhood resource mapping, the completion of displacement surveys, review of potential impacts and benefits from other disciplines (such as Air Quality), evaluation of potential impacts to low-income housing developments, and a robust outreach and communication program.
	EJ 3	Impact of the Project on Populations Below the Poverty Level – Assess the impact of the project on populations at or below the poverty level.	This is being assessed and will be documented in the Final EIS. There is not a disproportionate impact on low-income populations. U.S. Census and other data on poverty status were used to identify the geographic distribution of low-income populations. Gathering data was the first major effort in conducting a demographic analysis and was largely completed prior to the impact analysis. Additional baseline information included: Information relevant to EJ from the I-5 Strategic Plan, Percentages of environmental justice populations in the primary and secondary study areas, existing community facilities and resources such as services, businesses, parks, and community centers, and current noise, air quality, and transportation conditions.
	PR 1	City of Portland Participation – The City asserts its right to participate in post-LPA decisions; the City will conduct hearings on post-LPA decisions; the City declares financial, GHG, and design constraints to be immediate priorities.	The City of Portland is a key partner in the project and has representatives on PSC, IPS and provides staff support for all appropriate working groups and advisory committees. The project has responded to the City’s priorities by undertaking financial planning, engaging an expert panel to review greenhouse gas estimates, and using the PSC and IPS to address a variety of issues relating to the size and design of the facility. For key issues raised in PR2 of the City of Portland’s Resolution No. 36618, also see the responses to Conditions LPA 3, LPA 4, LPA 5, LPA 7, LPA 10, LPA 11, PB 1, HI 1, HI 6, and MD 1, above.
	PR 2	Continuation of Advisory Groups – Continue using advisory groups for freight, pedestrians/bicycles, urban design and environmental justice; consider combining design advisory groups.	The project continues to make use of these advisory groups and others to advance the project. The IRP suggested a revised advisory committee approach. The IPS and PSC continue to provide guidance on the project and review advisory group recommendations.

	PR 3	Bi-State Coordinating Committee Role – The Committee should review post-LPA project recommendations and offer comments. The committee should consider strengthening its land use accord.	The PSC has assumed the role of guiding the project and reviewing post-LPA project recommendations.
--	------	--	---

## Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Conditions from Resolution 07-08-10

Overall Status Classification:



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD



Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD but further refinement and decision-making after the FEIS/ROD will be required



Conflict or inconsistency between jurisdictions; or issue is unresolved; or issue needs additional work

OVERALL STATUS CATEGORY	NUMBER	ISSUE	STATUS
	1	River Crossing – Construct two bridges with three through lanes in each direction with the number of auxiliary lanes to be determined and reconstructed interchanges.	The plan being advanced consists of two bridges with three through lanes and two auxiliary lanes in each direction. Under the direction of PSC and IPS, additional studies were conducted during summer 2010 to evaluate the number of auxiliary lanes.
	2	High Capacity Transit – Select light rail transit as the high capacity transit mode.	Light rail transit was selected as the high capacity transit mode.
	3	High Capacity Transit Northern Terminus and Alignment – Select Clark College as the northern terminus with Washington-Broadway and McLoughlin as the preferred route.	Clark College has been selected as the northern terminus. Washington-Broadway is the north-south route. Additional studies resulted in the selection by Vancouver and C-TRAN of 17 <sup>th</sup> Street instead of McLoughlin.
	4	Multi-Modal Project – Produce a balanced, multi-modal project with highway, high capacity transit, freight movement, transportation demand management and bicycle and pedestrian improvements.	The project will implement a multi-modal corridor solution in a corridor. Key elements include the addition of light rail transit and improved facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists. The project seeks to improve freight access in key locations. A transportation demand management plan has been developed.
	5	Formal Oversight Committee – Create a formal oversight committee with representatives from the partner agencies and two representatives of the public.	The Project Sponsors Council with representatives from the partner agencies was established and is guiding the project through the current phase of the project.
na	6	Regional Bottlenecks – Direct the Bi-State Coordination Committee to evaluate other regional bottlenecks.	The project team has focused its efforts addressing the issues on project’s Purpose and Need statement. The CRC project team does not have the authority to direct the work of the Bi-State Coordination Committee, but the project’s partner agencies are all represented on the Bi-State Coordination Committee.

	7	Cost Sharing – River crossing costs should be shared equally between the states; roadway and interchanges should be funded within each state; transit capital, operation, and maintenance costs should be shared in proportion to length of new track in the corridor in each state.	The project's Financial Plan has not gone to this level of detail though it is generally assumed that the cost sharing would generally follow this arrangement for highway elements. The transit operation and maintenance cost sharing between C-TRAN and TriMet will be subject to further negotiations. An application for \$850 million has been submitted under the FTA's New Starts program.
	8	Equity Associated with Tolling Revenues – Consider alternative methods to achieve equity related to tolling such as providing Washington residents with Oregon income tax credits.	Tolling issues and equity issues will be addressed overtime by the CRC advisory and governing bodies, which will include a Mobility Council, and by the Transportation Commissions and legislatures of each state. Proposals relating to Oregon income taxes would require action by the state legislature.
	9	Financing Plan – Develop a financing plan including costs and revenues for presentation to the project partners and the public.	A Conceptual Finance Plan was developed and shared with the PSC in December, 2009. The plan illustrates how the project could be funded using a combination of federal and state funds and toll revenues. Subsequently, the PSC received additional presentations related to tolling and federal funding priorities. Additional work is proceeding on various financial topics and will be shared with IPS and PSC and included in the FEIS as appropriate. Financing issues will continue to evolve with consultation among the project partners.
	10	Tolling Revenues – Develop a plan to educate the public about tolls; limit the cost of tolls to that necessary to fund the local share; maximize use of all other state and federal funding.	A significant public outreach effort was conducted during the 2009 Tolling Study. Conversations with the public will continue until the rates are set by the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions. The project's Conceptual Financial Plan, presented to the PSC, proposed to maximize state and federal funding. Further discussions of costs and revenues will occur among project partners.
	11	High Capacity Transit Operations Financing – Submit any transit operations financing plan to voters.	C-TRAN is planning to place a ballot measure for operational funding on the November 2011 election.
	12	Sustainability, Cost Efficiency and Context Sensitivity and Greenhouse Gasses – Design the project following principles of sustainability, cost efficiency, context sensitivity; undertake additional analysis of greenhouse gasses from the project.	The project seeks to follow these principles. Key efforts include a sustainability working group with members from the partner agencies, the Urban Design Advisory Group, and other committees that have helped advance the project. Further details will be developed following these principles as the project proceeds toward construction. A Greenhouse Gas Expert Review Panel was convened (report January 8, 2009) and found the "CRC analysis and findings to be reasonable and commends the efforts of the staff to conduct a greenhouse gas analysis for a single project." and that the "Panel agrees with the CRC finding that the locally preferred alternative would generate lower greenhouse gas emissions than the no build alternative." During summer 2010, the Independent Review Panel also reviewed the GHG analyses and concluded CRC had responded appropriately in undertaking GHG analyses. Additional GHG analyses are currently being conducted and will be included in the FEIS.

## TASK FORCE CONDITIONS FROM FINAL RESOLUTION 6/24/2008

Overall Status Classification:

- Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD
- Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD but further refinement and decision-making after the FEIS/ROD will be required
- Conflict or inconsistency between jurisdictions; or issue is unresolved; or issue needs additional work

OVERALL STATUS CATEGORY	NUMBER	ISSUE	EXPLANATION OF STATUS
	1	Mitigation Plan - develop a mitigation plan with avoidance of adverse impacts where possible.	Avoiding and minimizing adverse impacts has been a principal objective throughout the project's development. Mitigation for many project impacts was identified in the Draft EIS. Additional mitigation was developed in response to public and agency comments and will be presented in the Final EIS.
	2	Sustainability Plan - develop a sustainability plan and form a sustainability working group.	A sustainability working group with representatives from partner agencies was formed to help guide the development of a sustainability strategy. The strategy, which incorporates the many sustainability principles of the partner agencies, is currently underway. Refinements are anticipated to occur as the project proceeds toward construction.
	3	Auxiliary Lanes - determine number for safety and functionality.	During summer 2010, additional study was undertaken through the Integrated Project Staff (IPS) and the Project Sponsors Council (PSC). The IPS recommendation forwarded to the PSC on August 5, 2010 was for three through lanes and two auxiliary lanes in each direction and with 12-foot shoulders. PSC concurred and forwarded its recommendation to the Governors on August 13, 2010.
	4	Enhancements - provide enhancements within potentially impacted communities.	The project seeks to enhance the livability of the region and the communities through which it passes by solving existing transportation problems and providing multi-modal transportation options and opportunities including light rail transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and a safer highway network where users experience less congestion. Examples of enhancements include rebuilding sections of local streets in downtown Vancouver in connection with light rail, rebuilding streets on Hayden Island, including the creation of a new street, improving access to the Columbia River in the vicinity of the Marine Drive interchange, and a world class bicycle facility over the Columbia River with enhanced connections to the local bicycle network. Mitigation, which is a similar but different concept, is also proposed within the potentially impacted communities.
	5	Enhancement Fund - establish an enhancement fund, in addition to mitigation, for use in the impacted areas.	The philosophy of the project is to leave the area better off and to provide enhancements within the community as part of the overall project design rather than providing a funding source for enhancement elements separate and disjointed from the rest of the project. Significant enhancements are part of the project (see Issue 4, above). Washington DOT can use its funds only for mitigation with a nexus to the project. An enhancement fund is not currently being considered.

	6	Interchanges - design to meet state(s) and federal safety and engineering standards while minimizing impacts.	Designing interchanges to meet applicable standards or achieve the best possible design given the constraints has been a guiding principle in the project's development. The interchange designs have been vetted through a process involving the project partners and advisory groups, including the Freight Working Group, the Hayden Island Working Group, and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee. Some design exceptions or deviations from standards will be required and are being processed according to the procedures of the respective DOTs.
	7	Interchanges - design to be freight sensitive and improve mobility while minimizing impacts.	Designing interchanges to accommodate existing and forecast freight movements has been a guiding principle of the project's development. The interchange designs, especially the Marine Drive interchange, have been vetted through a process involving the project partners and the Freight Working Group.
	8	Advance Tolling - implement tolls as soon practical and permissible to manage travel demand and provide funding.	Various tolling scenarios have been developed and shared with the PSC. The scenarios included some with early implementation of tolls. Tolling of I-5 during construction of a new facility is permissible under federal statutes, but no recommendations or decisions about tolling during construction have been made. Decisions on tolling, including the possibility of advance tolling as well as toll rates and toll structure, will be made by the appropriate bodies after consultation with the project's local partners and a public outreach and education process. Under current statutory authority, the Washington Transportation Commission and the Oregon Transportation have tolling authority in their respective states. The issues of tolling and tolling authority may also be explored in the forthcoming discussions on governance related to the project.
	9	Public Vote - conduct a public vote as applicable for the implementation of light rail.	C-TRAN has scheduled a public vote related to funding of light rail for November 2011.
	10	Bridge Design - develop an aesthetically pleasing, sustainable, and cost-efficient river crossing.	<p>In seeking to achieve these attributes, the project has made extensive use of advisory groups including the Urban Design Advisory Committee (UDAG), a Sustainability Working Group, the Independent Review Panel (IRP), the Hayden Island Design Group, and a constructability working group. The Urban Design Advisory Committee (UDAG) developed design guidelines and recommended a two-level bridge that is being advanced. Overall guidance has been provided by the IPS and PSC to meet these objectives. Beginning on November 3, 2010, the Bridge Expert Review Panel began reassessing bridge types, and constraints.</p> <p>The Bridge Expert Review Panel is expected to complete its work by the end of January 2011 and is expected to provide its findings on design and aesthetics in a manner integrated with their review of the bridge type. The Panel's recommendations will be used by the project to advance the project to final design with changes as appropriate.</p>
	11	Sustainability - design the river crossing, transit and pedestrian/bicycle facilities to be a model of sustainable design and construction serving the built and natural environment.	The project will implement a multi-modal corridor solution in a corridor thus adding to the sustainability of the entire region. Key elements include the addition of light rail transit and improved facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists. The project has made extensive use of advisory groups relating to design elements, modes of transportation, and sustainability practices. An advisory group with membership from the partner agencies is developing a sustainability strategy that will be refined as the project moves toward construction.

	12	Light Rail Stations - develop stations to meet the highest standard for operation and design.	Extensive analysis and planning has been conducted for each light rail station. The Portland Working Group, Hayden Island Design Group, and Vancouver Working Group have been most heavily involved in the design efforts. UDAG was instrumental in developing design guidelines that have been used to help integrate all elements of the project's design. Work continues on light rail station design including a major effort currently underway on the Hayden Island station and incorporating the design consistent with "Concept D."
	13	Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility - develop a "world class" facility and consider provisions for scooters, mopeds, and neighborhood electric vehicles.	The plan for bicyclists and pedestrians being advanced meets or exceeds all applicable standards and is far superior to the existing, substandard facilities. Careful work has been undertaken, including reviews by PBAC, the Portland Working Group and Vancouver Working Group, to assure good connections with existing and planned facilities on both ends of the bridge and on Hayden Island. The overall path width across the Columbia River is greater than any other structure in the Portland/Vancouver region. PBAC did review information on the status of scooter, moped and neighborhood electric vehicle use, but did not recommend shared use of the planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Under current law, these vehicles are also prohibited from using Interstate highways.
	14	Overall - Solve safety, congestion and mobility problems while reinforcing statewide goals to reinforce density in the urban core and compact development.	The project seeks to address existing safety problems, reduce congestion and improve mobility through a multi-modal solution in the corridor. Work by advisory groups, such as the Performance Measures Advisory Group, have sought to identify measures that help achieve the safety, congestion relief, and mobility metrics while avoiding negative consequences associated with increases in capacity for motor vehicles. Further refinements were overseen by the IPS during the summer 2010. Among other analyses, the results of Metro's Metroscope modeling indicated that the project being advanced at this time would have negligible impact on growth.
	15	TDM - develop program to encourage more efficient use of road capacity	The TDM Working Group developed both a Construction Phase and a Post-Construction Phase TDM program. The recommended program is a bi-state, multi-pronged approach that seeks to maximize use of alternative modes of travel through targeted marketing and additional services. The IPS has also endorsed a Post-Construction TDM Program to shift an additional 11 percent of peak person trips to non-SOV modes. The Construction Phase TDM Plan was endorsed by the PSC. Additional follow-on work has been recommended to move toward implementation.
	16	Greenhouse Gas - seek independent validation of GHG and climate change analysis presented in the DEIS to determine effect on air quality, carbon emissions and VMT.	A Greenhouse Gas Expert Review Panel was convened (report January 8, 2009) and found the "CRC analysis and findings to be reasonable and commends the efforts of the staff to conduct a greenhouse gas analysis for a single project." and that the "Panel agrees with the CRC finding that the locally preferred alternative would generate lower greenhouse gas emissions than the no build alternative." During summer 2010, the Independent Review Panel also reviewed the GHG analyses and concluded CRC had responded appropriately in undertaking GHG analyses. Additional GHG analyses are currently being conducted and will be included in the FEIS.

	17	GHG and VMT Reduction Strategies - include strategies aimed at helping achieve both states' goals.	Since release of the DEIS, several groups, including the Transportation Demand Working Group, the Performance Measures Advisory Group, and the IPS, have worked on strategies designed to enhance mobility, especially through promotion of alternative modes of travel that reduce both GHG emissions and VMT. The strategies and plans of each of these groups have been endorsed by PSC. Additional work relating to implementation of these strategies and plans will be needed as the project advances. There will also need to be a broader strategy adopted by Metro and RTC to accomplish the overall VMT reduction goal, as any one project has a limited effect on a goal of this magnitude.
	18	Finance Plan - develop a more detailed finance plan defining funding from federal, state, and local sources with equity locally, within the region and between the states.	A Conceptual Finance Plan was developed and shared with the PSC in December, 2009. The plan illustrates how the project could be funded using a combination of federal and state funds and toll revenues. Subsequently, the PSC received additional presentations related to tolling and federal funding priorities. Additional work is proceeding on various financial topics and will be shared with IPS and PSC and will be included in the FEIS as appropriate. Financing issues will continue to evolve with consultation among the project partners.
	19	Feasibility and Risks and Regional Funding – conduct independent review of feasibility and risks, and relationship to funding of other regional projects	Work has been undertaken on the feasibility and risks associated with the project including constructability reviews, a Cost Estimate Validation Process, and analysis of past work by the IRP during summer 2010. Additional work, including a scheduled CEVP session in December 2009, is planned. Issues relating to the construction and financing of the project were discussed in the IRP report. Additional work relating to project financing is also underway with some being updated for inclusion in the FEIS.
	20	Health Effects – continue to study health impacts such as those identified in Multnomah County Health Department submittal to Task Force	Potential impacts to human health have been documented in the DEIS and will be in the FEIS. Among the positive impacts attributable to the project are improvements in some air quality categories and improvements that make active transportation more available in the project area.
<b>Task Force Recommendations for “Regional Consideration”</b>			
na	21	I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Study – revisit the remaining recommendations of the Strategic Final Plan from September 2002	This is a recommendation by the Task Force for “regional consideration.”
na	22	Regional Bottlenecks – evaluate other regional bottlenecks within the system (e.g., I-405 / I-5 loop, Rose Quarter, etc.)	This is a recommendation by the Task Force for “regional consideration.”

na	23	Regional Traffic Demand Management – develop a regional plan that promotes reduction in VMT per capita.	This is a recommendation by the Task Force for “regional consideration.”
na	24	Regional High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) System – Evaluate the effectiveness of a regional system.	This is a recommendation by the Task Force for “regional consideration.”
na	25	Regional Freight Plan – Develop a regional plan for freight that considers the work of the Transportation and Trade Partnership and the CRC project work with the CRC Freight Working Group.	This is a recommendation by the Task Force for “regional consideration.”
na	26	Web-based Transit Trip Planning – develop a web-based transit trip planning resource to plan transit trips in the Portland-Vancouver Region.	This is a recommendation by the Task Force for “regional consideration.”



## TriMet Conditions from Resolution 08-07-58

Overall Status Classification:

- Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD
- Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD but further refinement and decision-making after the FEIS/ROD will be required
- Conflict or inconsistency between jurisdictions; or issue is unresolved; or issue needs additional work

OVERALL STATUS CATEGORY	NUMBER	ISSUE	EXPLANATION OF STATUS
	1	Oversight Committee – Create a formal oversight committee to guide the project.	The Project Sponsors Council with representatives from the partner agencies was established and is guiding the project.
	2	LPA Refinement – Refine the LPA with continued use of the Freight Working Group, Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, Urban Design Advisory Group, Community and Environmental Justice Group and the Sustainability Working Group.	The Locally Preferred Alternative has been refined with the help of these groups. Examples include refinement of the Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchanges, the selection of the two-bridge, two-level crossing, and the pedestrian/bicyclist facilities included in the bridge.
	3	Vancouver Transit Alignment – Develop options and define impacts and costs for the Vancouver alignment accounting for development opportunities, safety and efficiency, traffic movement, construction costs and impacts.	Extensive analysis and planning has been conducted for the light rail alignment in Vancouver and each light rail station. The Vancouver Working Group, the Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee have been involved in developing and refining the Vancouver portion of the LRT system. A preferred alignment has been selected based on this process and will be advanced in the Final EIS.
	4	Park and Rides – Conduct further analysis on the size and design of park and rides accounting for ridership and cost-effectiveness, impacts on the street network and integration with the surrounding land uses; document in the FEIS.	Extensive analysis and planning has been conducted for the project’s park-and-ride facilities. The Vancouver Working Group and the Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee have been involved in helping develop and refine all elements of the LRT system. More detail on the preferred system and facilities will be provided in the Final EIS.
	5	Downtown Transit Alignment Design and Treatments – Develop stations, furnishings, roadwork and sidewalk elements in character appropriate to downtown Vancouver.	The Vancouver Working Group and the Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee have been involved in helping develop and refine the Vancouver portion of the LRT system. Design principles developed by the Urban Design Advisory Group have also been used to inform the designs. Additional refinement will occur as the project moves toward construction.
	6	Transit Station Locations – Refine station locations accounting for safety, compatibility with surrounding uses, cost-effectiveness and efficiency of operations.	Refinement of all station locations has been undertaken. The location of a new station at Expo has been selected after studying several options. Refinement of the station at Hayden Island is continuing as the project team works to integrate Concept D into the project. A public process is currently underway. Extensive analysis and planning has

			<p>been conducted for the light rail alignment in Vancouver and each light rail station. The Vancouver Working Group and the Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee have been involved in developing and refining the Vancouver portion of the LRT system. Locations of Vancouver transit stations have been endorsed by Vancouver and C-TRAN and are being advanced in the Final EIS.</p>
--	--	--	--

## City of Vancouver Conditions from “Framework for Project Related Mitigation and Enhancements” (attached to Resolution M-3663)

Overall Status Classification:

- Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD
- Issue is settled or on track to be settled with the conclusion of the FEIS and ROD but further refinement and decision-making after the FEIS/ROD will be required
- Conflict or inconsistency between jurisdictions; or issue is unresolved; or issue needs additional work

OVERALL STATUS CATEGORY	NUMBER	ISSUE	EXPLANATION OF STATUS
	1	Vancouver City Center Vision – Support connections identified in the Vancouver City Center Vision and minimize barriers especially those between downtown and the Historic Reserve. Seek to enhance the seven community connections specified in the Resolution’s Attachment A.	The project seeks to implement key elements of the Vancouver City Center Vision and minimize the impact of changes in the I-5 corridor. Some of the specified connections, including the Evergreen Freeway Lid, the extension of Main Street, and opening up land along Columbia Way and the river, are being advanced as part of the project.
	2	Construction Disruption – Dedicate resources to manage construction disruption and alleviate direct and indirect impacts to travel and business conditions. Mitigation measures include additional public transit, business support, and support of a transportation management association or similar group, and direct or indirect financial aid to minimize construction impacts.	The project is committed to minimizing construction impacts and mitigation by all appropriate measures. As part of the effort, the PSC has already endorsed a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan with Pre-Construction and Construction Phases. Additional work will be undertaken as the project advances including more detailed analysis of project phases, the identification of construction impacts, and plans to mitigate. This will be a major effort as the project advances. Input will be sought from Vancouver staff, businesses, property owners, and residents.
	3	Mitigate for Pavement Deterioration from Construction – Restore or otherwise mitigate for direct impacts of construction activity.	The project is committed to appropriate mitigation for all construction impacts including degradation of pavement.
	4	Bridge Design – Produce a signature design using the highest quality bridge architecture allowable by engineering limitation and reasonable cost.	The Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) developed design guidelines that have been used to develop technical standards for the project. UDAG reviewed various bridge types and design elements and recommended a two-level bridge consistent with the design being advanced for the Columbia River main span. Future conversations with UDAG and the broader public will help inform the aesthetic design.
	5	Bridge Design – Employ iconic elements and design principles for the main span and all bridges between SR-14 and SR-500.	The Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) developed design guidelines that were presented in its July 2008 report, Design Guidance for the Columbia River Crossing. The report included design concepts for various elements of the CRC project, including interchanges and other project elements in Vancouver between SR-14 and SR-500. The UDAG design standards will be employed to the design of other bridges as the project advances. Future conversations with

			UDAG and the broader public will help inform the aesthetic design.
	6	Sustainability – Provide the highest level of sustainable design and construction to assure least cost environmental footprint given the project’s scale and diversity of infrastructure.	The project will implement a multi-modal corridor solution in the corridor thus adding to the sustainability of the entire region. The project has made extensive use of advisory groups relating to design elements, modes of transportation, and sustainability practices. The sustainability strategy developed with the support of a sustainability working group with representatives of the project partners is currently undergoing refinement.
	7	Design of Light Rail System and Structures – Meet high-quality architectural and street design standards; design the facilities for maximum rider and community safety using design principles and supplemental technology.	Extensive analysis and planning has been conducted for the light rail alignment in Vancouver and each light rail station. The former Vancouver Working Group and the existing Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee have been involved in developing and refining the Vancouver portion of the LRT system. UDAG was instrumental in developing design guidelines that have been used to help integrate all elements of the project's design. Work continues on light rail station design including connections with parking facilities, the local streets, and the downtown core. Further refinement will continue as the design progresses.
	8	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities – The river crossing should be designed to a “world class” standard and should contemplate non-auto vehicle classes in the future.	The plan being advanced meets or exceeds all applicable standards and is far superior to the existing, substandard facilities. Careful work has been undertaken, including reviews by Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Portland Working Group and former Vancouver Working Group, to assure good connections with existing and planned facilities on both ends of the bridge and on Hayden Island. The overall path width across the Columbia River is greater than any other structure in the Portland/Vancouver region. PBAC did review information on the status of scooter, moped and neighborhood electric vehicle use, but did not recommend shared use of the planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Under current law, these vehicles are also prohibited from using Interstate highways.
	9	Transportation Demand Management – Use TDM to help manage peak period auto demand and support downtown Vancouver’s circulation goals.	The TDM Working Group developed both a Construction Phase and a Post-Construction Phase TDM program. The recommended program is a bi-state, multi-pronged approach that seeks to maximize use of alternative modes of travel through targeted marketing and additional services. The IPS has also endorsed a Post-Construction TDM Program with a goal of shifting an additional 11 percent of peak person trips to non-SOV modes. The TDM Plans have been endorsed by the PSC. Additional follow-on work has been recommended to move toward implementation.
	10	Pedestrian and Bicycle Linkages to LRT Stations – Provide good connections to LRT stations including infill of missing sections.	The importance of good connections to the LRT stations is clearly understood by the former Vancouver Working Group, Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee and the project team. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee has also helped address connections. Most work thus far has focused on the immediate area of each station, further details will be developed and the analysis will be expanded as the project proceeds toward construction.
	11	Transit Stations and Park and Ride Facilities – Design active, secure facilities that support the surrounding community; consider ground floor retail and public/private development.	Working with the former Vancouver Working Group and current Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee, the project is advancing designs that follow these principles. Ground floor retail is a key element of the park and ride facilities.

	12	Transit System Safety and Security – Deploy strategies and measures to assure maximum security and safety for patrons and the adjacent community.	Working with the former Vancouver Working Group and current Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee, the project is advancing designs that seek to implement a secure and safe system for both patrons and the community. Emphasis has been on location of facilities. Safety and security will continue to be priorities as the project advances through design, construction, and operation. A Safety and Security Committee is currently developing a formal Safety and Security Management Plan to address issues for all phases of the project. Safety and security issues are being addressed related to station design and operation, on-board passenger safety, as well as operations, enforcement and legal aspects.
	13	Transit Park and Ride Facilities – Design facilities to integrate with surrounding neighborhoods; control and mitigate for traffic impacts and prevent neighborhood overflow parking.	Extensive analysis has been undertaken, including work with the former Vancouver Working Group, the current Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee, and the broader Vancouver community to evaluate and select the preferred light rail transit alignment, transit stations and park and ride facilities. The locations of park and ride facilities, especially the SR 14 facility, have undergone multiple revisions. The traffic analyses have all used park and ride facility capacity to assess impacts and determine the extent of local street system improvements. Additional work will be undertaken as the project moves toward construction and operations.
	14	Transit Park and Ride Facilities – Design facilities to facilitate non-park and ride traffic circulation and minimize impact of buses serving transfer stations.	Particular attention has been paid by the project team to the impact of traffic destined for the park and ride facilities. This information has been shared with the former Vancouver Working Group. Traffic using the sites has been included in modeling undertaken to assess traffic impacts. Access to and from the facilities has been developed to assure that non-park and ride traffic is not unreasonably impacted. Continued refinement will occur as the project moves toward construction.
	15	Light Rail Station Planning – Engage the community; design and construct stations to create great urban places, not just transit stops.	The former Vancouver Working Group and existing Vancouver Transit Advisory Committee have been heavily involved in light rail station planning. Additional public outreach, including workshops and tours open to the community and businesses, has occurred and will continue as the project progresses.
	16	Freeway Access Streets – Provide additional traffic management, intelligent transportation system, and pedestrian/bicycle enhancements in these corridors to fulfill operational functions and complement the downtown street character.	In consultation with the former Vancouver Working Group (VWG), the Urban Design Advisory Group, the Freight Working Group (FWG), the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) and others, the project has sought to fulfill these objectives. The VWG considered one-way and two-way street networks, sidewalk widths and various other issues. The FWG weighed in on access to the Port of Vancouver, turn radii and other issues important to trucks. PBAC, for example, was instrumental in helping develop designs of interchanges and other crossings of I-5 in Vancouver. Key attributes of the project include ramp metering at key locations to protect freeway operations, provision of adequate through lanes and turns lanes to provide sufficient capacity at ramp terminals, provision of bike lane, sidewalks and islands to accommodate these users. CRC project staff has worked with Vancouver staff to assess the impact of planned growth in the downtown and port areas on the arterial street network and on interchanges. Continued refinement will occur as the project progresses toward construction.
	17	Intra and Inter-neighborhood Multi-Modal Traffic Circulation – Retain and enhance multi-modal transportation especially in the vicinity of freeway overcrossings.	The project is advancing designs that retain and enhance overcrossings of I-5 including those at Evergreen Boulevard, 29 <sup>th</sup> Street and 33 <sup>rd</sup> Street. Improvements at the freeway interchanges are also being planned to enhance the opportunities for non-motor vehicle movements between neighborhoods. Continued refinement will occur as the project progresses toward construction.

	18	Project Mitigation Elements – Evaluate and mitigate for project impacts after considering alternatives.	The project seeks to avoid impacts where possible and mitigate for impacts that cannot be avoided. It is recognized that mitigation measures can also have impacts. The former Vancouver Working Group, the Urban Design Advisory Group, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Community and Environmental Justice Group and others have been consulted with regard to impacts and mitigation measures and strategies. More detailed mitigation conversations with the communities are planned prior to the release of the Final EIS.
	19	Direct Impacts – Specifically address: Section 4F, Right-of-way, noise, water quality, shorelines, habitat, air quality, vibration, light and glare, transportation, construction disruption.	Most of the listed impacts have been extensively evaluated and documented in the Draft EIS and will receive additional attention in the Final EIS. The project is following best practices in complying with applicable criteria. Additional refinement of the mitigation measures and strategies will be conducted as the project advances. Input will be sought from Vancouver staff and public stakeholders.