

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3948
METRO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS	)	
IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT	)	Introduced by Councilors Robert Liberty,
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	)	Carl Hosticka & Carlotta Collette
FOR THE COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING	)	
PROJECT	)	
	)	

WHEREAS, in February 2005, a Columbia River Crossing (“CRC”) Task Force was formed by the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Transportation for the purpose of performing a transportation investment alternatives analysis and an environmental analysis in order to select a Locally Preferred Alternative for the I-5 corridor between SR 500 in Washington State and Columbia Boulevard in Oregon; and

WHEREAS the CRC Task Force and its staff have spent more than three years and \$25 million to study congestion, safety and related issues in the I-5 study area; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force research has identified a spectrum of opportunities to increase safety, reduce congestion and decrease freight delay; and

WHEREAS, the CRC Task Force has provided important cost estimates for different possible investments in the corridor it studied; and

WHEREAS, the CRC Task Force published its Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation for the Interstate 5 Columbia River Crossing Project on May 2, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has concluded (as part of the adopted Federal component of the Regional Transportation Plan) that even if the state gas tax was increased by 1 cent every year for the foreseeable future, there would still be 22% of the roads in the region in poor condition; and

WHEREAS, public opinion research presented to the Metro Council in November 2007 indicated that the public’s highest priorities for spending additional transportation taxes were “Repair or replace structurally deficient bridges, such as the Sellwood” and “Maintain and preserve existing roads and bridges where they are substandard”; and

WHEREAS there are three bridges across the Willamette River that are older than the I-5 bridge opened in 1917 (Hawthorne 1910, Steel 1912 and Broadway 1913) and four other bridges that are older than the second I-5 span opened in 1958 (Burnside, Sellwood, Ross Island and St. Johns); and

WHEREAS, according to the Oregon Department of Transportation's 2007 Bridge Condition Report, the two I-5 bridges both have a structural integrity rating of "fair", the same as many other bridges in the region; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has concluded (as part of the adopted Federal component of the Regional Transportation Plan) that the region faces a \$7 billion shortfall in funding for transportation investments in the Oregon part of the region between now and 2035, not counting an additional \$4 billion for the replacement bridge alternative developed by the CRC Task Force and various other proposals including funding for new streetcar lines; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Trust Fund will be running a deficit starting next year, creating great uncertainty about available funding for transportation projects across the nation; and

WHEREAS, on October 19, 2006, all members of the Metro Council signed and transmitted a letter to the co-chairs of the CRC Task Force stating that "we believe that transportation solutions must take into consideration cost, feasibility, and the place any one project may have in the overall transportation improvement picture....we would be very concerned that if a very costly project (initial capital costs as well as ongoing maintenance and preservation costs) were financed with revenues other than toll revenues, this could displace all other projects or greatly reduce the number of other projects because of limited funding resources," and

WHEREAS, in January 2008, the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation approved the Federal component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and adopted as one of the goals for the regional transportation system, "Regional transportation planning and investment decision ensure the best return on public investments in infrastructure and programs"; and

WHEREAS, when the voters of the region approved the Metro Charter, they designated as "its most important service, planning and policy making to preserve and enhance the quality of life and the environment for themselves and for future generations;" and

WHEREAS, the 2007 report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that "warming of the climate system is unequivocal," that "most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations," and that the impacts of climate change are likely to be more drastic and immediate than was previously expected; and

WHEREAS, Metro has the potential to reduce and/or sequester greenhouse gas emissions through its specific responsibilities for transportation planning, and planning for long-term growth; and

WHEREAS, the State of Oregon's 2007 greenhouse gas reductions targets call for arresting the growth of greenhouse gas emissions by 2010, reducing emissions to at least 10 percent below 1990 levels by 2020, and reducing emissions to at least 75 percent below 1990 levels by 2050; and

WHEREAS, Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski stated on April 11, 2008 that "while it will be a challenge to improve and diversify our transportation infrastructure – while reducing our overall carbon footprint – this is a challenge we are capable of meeting" and

WHEREAS, Governor Kulongoski said on April 11, 2008 that "We ... need to research new ways to reduce vehicle miles traveled," and that "the most significant thing we can do" to improve transportation efficiency "is introduce performance-based pricing into our highway system;" and

WHEREAS, the Final Report of the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Freight Feasibility and Needs Assessment (issued in 2001) recommended that the "region should maximize the capacity of the existing system" which "can be accomplished by encouraging demand and traffic management strategies, including transit, car-pooling, flex time, ramp metering, and incident response" as well as "managing additional demand through peak-hour pricing of new capacity"; and

WHEREAS, the Final Report of the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor study also recommended "instituting measures that would promote transportation-efficient development, including a better balance of housing and jobs on both sides of the river"; and

WHEREAS, in its October 19, 2006 letter to the CRC Task Force, the Council stated that "all transportation alternatives be evaluated for their land use implications ... [because] added lanes of traffic ... will have an influence on settlement patterns and development," and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council is mid-stream in updating the regional framework plan to shift the focus of transportation decision making as it updates the Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, in its October 19, 2006 letter to the CRC Task Force, the Council stated Metro "will need to work closely with you as your project proceeds and as the RTP policies are developed to ensure that your proposals are consistent with our new policies," and

WHEREAS, in January 2008, the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation adopted the Federal component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, and approved ten goals to guide transportation planning and investments; and

WHEREAS, both the Clark County Regional Transportation Commission and Metro have just initiated their own high capacity transit study,

WHEREAS, the region is fortunate to have a federally funded transportation research center, the Oregon Transportation Research and Education Center, at Portland State University; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Metro Council supports a cost-effective, multi-modal set of actions and investments to address congestion, safety, and mobility in the area of the Interstate 5 bridges over the Columbia River, and broader environmental and land use impacts, organized in three phases:

Phase I: (a) Redesign and rebuilding a few key entrance and exit ramps that contribute the most to merge-related congestion and accidents, especially the ramps at SR 14 and on Hayden Island; (b) Decrease rush-hour congestion by charging variable tolls; (c) Carry out a seismic upgrade for the existing bridges and approaches, paid for with toll revenues; (d) Increase investments in transportation systems and operations, including reduced response times for accidents and real time information to travelers; and (e) High priority improvements to ramps and arterials and freight rail facilities to facilitate freight movements to and from I-5 to the multi-modal facilities at the Ports of Portland and Vancouver.

Phase II: (a) Build alternate road, light rail, bicycle and pedestrian access to and from Hayden Island, so that persons making local trips within Portland do not need to use the freeway; and (b) If timing and funding allow, extend light rail from Hayden Island to Vancouver, with bike and pedestrian facilities; and (c) Develop and approve a coordinated bi-state regional agreement regarding land uses that will sustain the function of existing and future transportation investments, as was called for in the I-5 Trade Corridor Partnership Study.

Phase III: (a) Extend light rail to Clark County, assuming it is not built during the second phase and assuming that this extension is consistent with the County's high capacity transit plan; and (b) Build additional lanes for cars and trucks as needed after prior investments and as funding allows and consider possible improvements to the railroad bridge.

2. Before the Metro Council chooses a locally preferred alternative, it requires the following additional information:

(a) A detailed financing plan for the project, identifying amounts and sources of funds from federal program funds, bridge tolls on I-5 and I-205, state gas taxes from Oregon and Washington states, local gas taxes, general funds, toll credits, and all other sources. As part of this plan, the CRC Task Force is requested to identify the basis or principles for allocating costs between taxpayers in Oregon

and Washington. A part of this analysis should include identification of the project component costs by state location and the origins of trips by state.

(b) A comparison of the cost of congestion relief, by hour and value of the congestion relief, between the preferred alternative selected by the CRC Task Force, and other highway projects already included in the RTP or under study today. This list includes the proposal for widening Highway 217, for widening I-205 to six lanes, and the highway alternatives for the I-5 99W connector. Metro staff will carry out this comparison.

(c) The Metro Council respectfully requests the Oregon Global Warming Commission to advise it regarding whether or not any of the alternatives analyzed by the CRC Task Force, including those considered at an earlier phase of the project or aspects of the alternatives, would help achieve or frustrate the greenhouse gas reduction goals set for 2020 and 2050, and the lifetime carbon impacts of the alternatives.

(3) A proposed amendment of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan related to the Columbia River Crossing shall be considered

- (a) After completion of, and in conjunction with, the completion of the scenarios analysis and financial forecast that are part of the state component of the Regional Transportation Plan; and
- (b) After Washington State voters provide the approval required by Revised Code of Washington 81.104.030 030 (which requires transit agencies to secure “voter approval within their own service boundaries of a high capacity transportation system plan and financing plan”); and
- (c) After the Metro Council has determined whether the proposed investments and programs are in compliance with; (i) Metro’s Regional Framework Plan; (ii) the Regional Transportation Plan goals and policies; and (iii) Applicable statewide planning goals.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2008.

WITHDRAWN  
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

## STAFF REPORT

### IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3948, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING METRO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING PROJECT

---

Date: May 28, 2008

Prepared by: Richard Brandman  
Mark Turpel

## BACKGROUND

### Overview

The Columbia River Crossing (CRC) is a proposed multimodal bridge, transit, highway, bicycle and pedestrian improvement project sponsored by the Oregon and Washington transportation departments in coordination with Metro, TriMet and the City of Portland as well as the Regional Transportation Council of Southwest Washington, CTRAN and the City of Vancouver, Washington.

The project is designed to improve mobility and address safety problems along a five-mile corridor between State Route 500 in Vancouver, Washington, to approximately Columbia Boulevard in Portland, Oregon, including the Interstate Bridge across the Columbia River.

The project would be funded by a combination of FTA New Starts funding for the transit component, FHWA funding for highway, freight, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, with local match being provided by the states of Oregon and Washington through toll credits and other funding. Tolls are proposed on the new I-5 bridge to pay for a portion of the capital project and manage transportation demand.

Guiding the project is a 39 member CRC Task Force, of which Councilor Burkholder serves as the Metro representative. The Task Force is meeting on June 24<sup>th</sup> to discuss and recommend a locally preferred alternative (LPA). Metro Council has expressed its need to review the project and give policy guidance to its CRC Task Force member in the formulation of the draft LPA. In a separate action, scheduled for late July, the Metro Council will consider adoption of the Task Force's LPA recommendation.

### Project History

The CRC Project history begins in 1999, with the Bi-State Transportation Committee recommendation that the Portland/Vancouver region initiate a public process to develop a plan for the I-5 Corridor based on four principles:

- Doing nothing in the I-5 Corridor is unacceptable;
- There must be a multi-modal solution in the I-5 Corridor - there is no silver bullet;
- Transportation funds are limited. Paying for improvements in the I-5 Corridor will require new funds; and,
- The region must consider measures that promote transportation-efficient development.

Accordingly, the twenty-six member I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership was constituted by Governors Locke and Kitzhaber, including a Metro Council representative.

In June 2002, the Partnership completed a Strategic Plan and on November 14, 2002, the Metro Council, through Resolution No. 02-3237A, For the Purpose of Endorsing the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study Recommendations, endorsed the Strategic Plan recommendations including:

- Three through lanes in each direction on I-5, one of which was to be studied as an HOV lane, as feasible;
- Phased light rail loop in Clark County in the vicinity of the I-5, SR500/4th Plan and I-205 corridors;
- An additional or replacement bridge for the I-5 crossing of the Columbia River, with up to two additional lanes for merging plus 2 light rail tracks;
- Interchange improvements and additional auxiliary and/or arterial lanes where needed between SR 500 in Vancouver and Columbia Boulevard in Portland, including a full interchange at Columbia Boulevard;
- Capacity improvements for freight rail;
- Bi-state coordination of land use and management of the transportation system to reduce demand on the freeway and protect corridor improvement;
- Involving communities along the corridor to ensure final project outcomes are equitable and committing to establish a fund for community enhancement;
- Developing additional transportation demand and system strategies to encourage more efficient use of the transportation system.

Several of the recommendations from the Strategic Plan have been completed. For example, construction of the I-5 Delta Park Project has begun.

The I-5 bridge element began in February 2005 with the formation of a 39 member Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Task Force. This Task Force, which includes a Metro Council representative, developed a vision statement, purpose and need statement, screening criteria and analyzed 37 transportation modes/design options, before narrowing these to 12.

The adopted project purpose is to: 1) improve travel safety and traffic operation on the Interstate 5 crossing of the Columbia River; 2) improve the connectivity, reliability, travel times and operations of public transit in the corridor, 3) improve highway freight mobility and interstate commerce and 4) improve the river crossing's structural integrity.

More specifically, the following issues concerning the existing conditions were cited as need:

- Safety - the bridge crossing area and approach sections have crash rates more than two times higher than statewide averages for comparable urban highways. Contributing factors are interchanges too closely spaced, weave and merge sections too short contributing to sideswiping accidents, vertical grade changes that restrict sight distance and very narrow shoulders that prevent avoidance maneuvers or safe temporary storage of disabled vehicles.
- Seismic - neither I-5 bridges meet seismic standards, leaving the I-5 corridor vulnerable in the event of a large earthquake;
- Bridge Alignment - the alignment of the I-5 bridges with the downstream railroad bridge contributes to hazardous barge movements;
- Cost - rehabilitation of the existing bridges, bringing them to current standards would be more costly, both in money and some environmental impacts, such as water habitat conditions, than a replacement bridge;
- Traffic Impact - an arterial bridge would bring unacceptable traffic congestion to downtown Vancouver, Washington.

In October 2006, the Metro Council, after hearing CRC staff presentations and discussing the project, approved a letter to the CRC Task Force citing seven principles including:

- Recognize the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan;
- Use desired outcomes as a guide;
- Determine project priorities;
- Recognize financial limitations;
- Coordinate with the railroad bridge;
- Provide alternatives in the DEIS that demonstrate the fundamental choices before us;
- Provide thorough public vetting before closing options.

In November 2007, CRC staff, after further consideration of technical analyses and using the approved screening criteria and project purpose and need, recommended three alternatives be advanced to a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). These included:

- Alternative 1) No Action;
- Alternative 2) A Replacement Bridge and Bus Rapid Transit with Complementary Express Bus Service; and
- Alternative 3) A Replacement Bridge and Light Rail Transit with Complementary Express Bus Service.

Open houses were held to take public comment about whether these three alternatives should be advanced to analysis in the DEIS. The Metro Council, other project sponsors and some members of the public expressed interest in a less expensive, smaller project alternative. Accordingly, two supplemental bridge alternatives (one with bus rapid transit, the other with light rail transit) were proposed to be added to the alternatives studied in the DEIS.

The Metro Council concurred with these five alternatives in adopting Resolution No. 07-3782B: *For the Purpose of Establishing Metro Council Recommendations Concerning the Range of Alternatives to Be Advanced to a Draft Environmental Impact Statement For the Columbia River Crossing Project.*

In a meeting of the CRC Task Force, an informal poll of all members present found strong support for:

- A replacement bridge with tolls;
- Light rail transit extended to Vancouver, Washington;
- Bicycle and pedestrian path improvements.

(Councilor Burkholder, the Metro Council representative, deferred comment in this survey citing the need to confer with the full Metro Council).

In May 2008, a DEIS addressing the five CRC alternatives was released for public comment.

#### Decision-making Process and Schedule

There are several sets of decisions to be made about the CRC project including;

##### June 5, 2008 Decision

- Direction to Councilor Burkholder regarding how to represent the Metro Council at the CRC Task Force.

##### July 17, 2008 Decision

- Build or No Build?
- High capacity transit extension to Vancouver – bus rapid transit or light rail?



- Bridge investment – replacement or supplemental?
- Tolls – to toll the I-5 bridge or not? (other issues such as amount, variable or fixed to be determined later)
- Bicycle and pedestrian investments – affirm an investment in bicycle and pedestrian improvements with design details still to be determined.

#### Fall 2008 and Beyond Decisions

- Number of auxiliary travel lanes
- Bridge design details (such as bridge type, whether “Transit in a box” would work with the design and whether this aspect of the bridge should be pursued)
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) specifics
- Interchange design specifics
- Bicycle and pedestrian design details
- More specificity on finance plan

For the July decision, the CRC Task Force will meet on June 24 to consider a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Their recommendation will then be brought to local governments (the cities of Portland and Vancouver, TriMet and CTRAN, Metro (a July 17 Metro Council date has been tentatively reserved) and the Regional Transportation Council of Southwest Washington) for consideration of concurrence and corresponding transportation plan amendments. These actions will then allow ODOT and WSDOT to submit to the FTA an application to enter preliminary engineering and then prepare a final environmental impact statement (FEIS).

## ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** The CRC is a very large and complex transportation project. There are strong feelings – pro and con – associated with the project. Opposition to the project include concerns raised regarding the need for the project, greenhouse gas emissions that could be generated by the project, costs, tolls and light rail extension to Vancouver, Washington.

## 2. Legal Antecedents

### Federal

- National Environmental Policy Act
- Clean Air Act
- SAFETEA-LU
- FTA New Starts Process

### State

- State Planning Goals
- State Transportation Planning Rule
- Oregon Transportation Plan
- Oregon Highway Plan
- Oregon Public Transportation Plan
- Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

### Metro

- Resolution No. 02-3237A, *For the Purpose of Endorsing the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study Recommendations.*

- Resolution No. 07-3782B: *For the Purpose of Establishing Metro Council Recommendations Concerning the Range of Alternatives to Be Advanced to a Draft Environmental Impact Statement For the Columbia River Crossing Project.*
- Ordinance No. 07-3831B *For the Purpose of Approving the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update, Pending Air Quality Conformity Analysis.*
- Resolution No. 08-3911, *For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and Reconfirming the 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.*

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (federal component) as adopted by the Metro Council on December 13, 2007 includes a new bridge across the Columbia River. This item was reconfirmed with the adoption of the air quality conformity determination in February 2008.

3. **Anticipated Effects** See attachment A, a comparison of Resolution No. 08-3938 and Resolution 08-3948.
4. **Budget Impacts** If there is a role for Metro to play in the completion of the CRC Final Environmental Impact Statement (this could be additional updated travel forecasting, for example), the CRC project would reimburse Metro for any costs incurred for such work.

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

The Metro Council will consider Resolution No. 08-3938 and Resolution No. 08-3948 or an amended version as the Council may deem appropriate.

**Columbia River Crossing – Comparison of Proposed Metro Council Resolutions**

May 28, 2008

Resolution 08-3938 – Burkholder	Resolution 08-3948- Liberty, Hosticka & Collette
<p><b>Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides policy guidance to the Metro Columbia River Crossing (CRC) representative for June 24 CRC Task Force meeting – final policy determination occurs after Task Force meeting and advisory committee and sponsor agency recommendations.</li> <li>- Assumes a second Metro Council action of CRC Project in July that considers CRC Task Force recommendations for a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). This later action would also include a Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) amendment. These actions would set Metro policy.</li> <li>- This process would allow the project to meet its current schedule for submitting materials to the Federal Transit Administration for entry into Preliminary Engineering.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sets Metro CRC Project policy.</li> <li>- This Metro action occurs prior to CRC Task Force meeting establishing the CRC Task Force recommendation on draft Locally Preferred Alternative. No further Metro Council action until: a) detailed financing plan is produced; b) congestion cost comparison with other RTP highway projects is completed; and c) response received from Oregon Global Warming Commission regarding whether any CRC alternative, recent or in the past, would help achieve or frustrate greenhouse gas reduction goals.</li> <li>- Indeterminate delay in further Council action would not allow the CRC project to meet its schedule for submissions to the Federal Transit Administration for entry into Preliminary Engineering and would result in significant inflationary impact to the transit project.</li> <li>- Indeterminate delay in further Council action could affect ability to request and receive federal funds in the 2009 re-authorization of the federal transportation bill.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reaffirms Metro Council support for a multi-modal CRC project solution, including highway, high capacity transit, transportation demand management and bicycle and pedestrian improvements.</li> <li>- Is consistent with the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership recommendations, previous Metro Council actions, and alternatives recommended by the CRC Task Force to be analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).</li> <li>- Supports a CRC solution of: a) light rail to Vancouver; b) replacement bridge with three through lanes; c) tolls to manage travel demand and funding roadway capital costs and operations and maintenance, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be constructed on the light rail bridge.</li> <li>- Includes Exhibit A, with 15 identified issues and suggested solutions to be discussed by Metro Council and which could be used in discussions with CRC Task Force members in the formulation of the CRC Task Force Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) recommendations.</li> <li>- Identifies potential outstanding issues needing further Council involvement including: a) number of auxiliary lanes; b) overall finance plan and type and rates for tolls; c) bicycle and pedestrian facility design and location; d) travel demand approach and plan specifics; e) design of interchanges and integration into Hayden Island and Expo Center; and f) coordination with local agencies.</li> <li>- Locally Preferred Alternative and RTP amendment for CRC policy to be considered by Metro Council in July after LPA recommendations are made by CRC Task Force sponsor agencies, and JPACT.</li> <li>- Allows project to meet current schedules for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) process and re-authorization funding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significantly changes proposed project scope. Does not meet the Project’s purpose and need and would require restarting the NEPA process. Does not support construction of a replacement bridge for autos and calls for extension of light rail from Hayden Island to Vancouver with bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Phase II if timing and funding allows.</li> <li>- Affirms Metro Council support for a three-phased project utilizing existing bridges with seismic upgrades, transportation system management projects, and freeway ramp and arterial improvements, to be paid for by tolls. More details are outlined below.</li> <li>- Proposes a three phase approach: Phase 1 a) redesign and rebuild a few key I-5 ramps (not defined); b) charge peak hour variable tolls; c) complete seismic upgrade with toll proceeds; d) increase incident response and traveler information operations; e) provide truck and rail freight infrastructure to facilitate freight movement between ports of Portland and Vancouver. Phase 2 a) build alternative road, light rail, bicycle and pedestrian access to Hayden Island; b) if timing and funding allow, extend LRT, bike and pedestrian routes from Hayden Island to Vancouver; c) develop a bi-state land use agreement to protect the function of transportation investments. Phase 3 a) extend LRT to Clark County, if not done in Phase 2 and if consistent with the County’s High Capacity Transit plan; b) build additional lanes for cars and trucks on I-5 as funding allows and consider improvements to railroad bridge.</li> <li>- Prior to adoption of LPA requires: a) detailed financing plan, including identification of project costs by state location and trip origin by state; b) comparison of cost of congestion relief by hour and value of CRC and other Metro RTP highway projects, including widening Highway 217 and I-205 and the highway alternatives for the I-5 99W Connector; b) response from Oregon Global Warming Commission regarding whether any CRC alternative, recent or in the past, would help achieve or exacerbate greenhouse gas reduction goals.</li> <li>- Amendment of RTP shall be considered after: a) completion of RTP state component scenarios analysis and financial forecast; b) Washington State voters approve high capacity transit system plan service boundaries and financing plan; c) after Metro Council determination of compliance with Metro Regional Framework Plan; d) RTP goals and policies and e) applicable statewide planning goals. Would significantly delay action on Locally Preferred Alternative adding significant inflationary cost to the project.</li> </ul>

