Why alternative Packages?

- Identify promising combinations of highway and transit improvements
- Understand how components perform together within BIA
- Inform major decisions, such as:
  - Transit mode (narrow to one or two modes for DEIS)
  - Supplemental or replacement bridge
  - Arterial lanes
  - Managed lanes
- Further narrow and shape the range of alternatives to be considered in the DEIS

Understanding the Pieces of the Packaging Puzzle

A. Bridge options to cross the river
B. Alternative packaging themes expressed by Task Force
C. High capacity transit mode(s) across river
D. Function of existing and new bridges
E. Location and use of I-5 managed lanes
F. Arterial crossing options
G. Other components (bike, ped, freight, roadways, TDM/TSM)
**Organization Tool - Alternative Package Matrix**

**Alt. Packaging Recap**

**A. Bridge Options to Cross the River**

- Existing Bridges Only
- Replacement Bridge
- Supplemental Bridge w/ Existing Bridges
- Alternative Package Themes

**Packaged River Crossing Components**

- RC-3: Replacement Bridge/Downstream/Mid-Level
- RC-4: Replacement Bridge/Upstream/Mid-Level
- RC-9: Supplemental Bridge/Downstream/Mid-Level
- RC-23: Arterial Crossing with I-5 Improvements
### B. Packaging Themes

#### Minimize Investment
- #1. Planned future improvements only
- #2. TDM/TSM emphasis
- #3. Min. I-5 investment

#### #8-11. Balance Hwy and transit
- #8: Max. transit ridership
- #9: Max. vehicle capacity
- #10: Balance Hwy and transit

### C. High Capacity Transit Modes Across River

Transit modes advanced through Step A Screening:
- TR-1: Express Bus in General Purpose (GP) Lanes
- TR-2: Express Bus in Managed Lanes
- TR-3: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)- Lite
- TR-4: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)- Full
- TR-5: Light Rail Transit (LRT)

### Service characteristics for High Capacity Transit

Service characteristics associated with High Capacity Transit are provided by LRT and BRT-Full.
C. Other Transit Modes Across River cont.

- BRT-Lite, express buses in GP or managed lanes, and local buses

D. Function of existing and new bridges

- Existing I-5 bridges suitable for:
  - local arterial general purpose auto/bus travel lanes
  - bike/pedestrian use
  - LRT?

- For operational and safety reasons, staff believes I-5 traffic should be carried on a new supplemental or replacement bridge wherever provided.

- Alternative #3 does not follow the logic outlined above, but is being carried forward to test a minimal I-5 investment solution while providing a transit corridor. Serious feasibility concerns persist (e.g., design/safety issues).

E. Location and use of I-5 managed lanes

- Gives preference to some users (freight, HOV, transit, etc.);
- Provided only with supplemental or replacement I-5 bridge;
- Managed lanes would be created as follows:
  - A single I-5 managed lane in each direction within project area;
  - Re-stripe I-5 wherever possible between 139th Street in Clark County and approximately Alberta Street;
  - No current I-5 general lanes converted for managed use;
  - Freight, HOV, and/or transit vehicles can bypass ramp meters.
- Consistent with Delta Park EA direction
F. Arterial Crossing Options

- Interest exists in exploring arterial connections between Vancouver and Portland;
  - Removes some short-distance trips from I-5
  - Arterial extending south of Hayden Island allows potential removal of the I-5 interchange at Hayden Island.
- Arterial crossing options exist only when a supplemental bridge is provided (alternatives #3 through #7);
- Project staff believes I-5 traffic should be carried on a new supplemental or replacement bridge wherever provided.
  - So, arterial function provided by existing I-5 bridges only as shown in alternatives #4 - #7.

G. Other components (bike, ped, freight, roadways, TDM/TSM)

- Alternatives are primarily formed with consideration to linking river crossing and transit components.
- Other components are predicated on the river crossing/transit combination and chosen to be complimentary to the different alternatives.

4. Recommended Alternative Packages

- Project team believes these 12 alternative packages allow appropriate and sufficient performance testing of the components.
5. Evaluating Alternative Packages

- Alternative packages to undergo the following study during summer 2006:
  - Travel demand forecast modeling;
  - Conceptual design refinement;
  - Staff evaluation among design, traffic, transit, and environmental teams using adopted screening criteria
  - For criteria previously deferred to the packaging step, performance measures will be developed. Other previously qualitative measures will become as quantitative as possible.
  - Staff will begin to report study results in fall 2006.

6. What follows Alternative Packaging

- Selection of range of alternatives
- New round of modeling and evaluation during EIS
- Task Force opportunities during summer 2006 to participate in review/comment of roadway and transit designs being presented to the public

Task Force Comments on Alternative Packages

- From the June 14, 2006 meeting, the project team heard the following comments:
  - I-5 CRC alternatives need to be consistent with findings from the Delta Park EA (e.g., three lanes per direction south of Columbia Blvd.);
  - There needs to be a future opportunity to apply what we learn from studying alternative packages and re-mix them into optimally performing alternatives prior to the EIS;
  - Replacement bridge components need to retain the flexibility to provide arterial function in addition to highway function;
  - BRT-Full needs to retain flexibility to integrate with potential future LRT in Clark County
Upcoming Task Force Meetings

- July: Recommendations on Packaging
- August/September: Introduce Package Design Concepts
- October/November/December: Review evaluation results; adopt recommendations for DEIS alternatives
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