BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING METRO COUNCIL DIRECTION TO ITS DELEGATE CONCERNING KEY PRELIMINARY DECISIONS LEADING TO A FUTURE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE DECISION FOR THE PROPOSED COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING PROJECT	)))))))	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3938B Introduced by Councilor David Bragdon

WHEREAS, the Oregon and Washington sides of the metropolitan region are linked by critical transportation infrastructure vital to each community along the Columbia River; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 Interstate bridge carries approximately 130,000 people daily by car, truck, bus, bicycle and on foot; and,

WHEREAS, travel by transit between Portland and Vancouver currently must share a right-of-way with autos and trucks; and,

WHEREAS, the governors of Oregon and Washington initiated the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership in January 2001; and,

WHEREAS, in November 2002 the Metro Council approved Resolution 02-3237A, For the Purpose of Endorsing the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study Recommendations, that supported a multi-modal project including light rail transit (LRT) and either a new supplemental or replacement I-5 bridge; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study also included recommendations to widen I-5 to three lanes between Delta Park and Lombard, address finance issues, use travel demand tools including pricing (tolls), address environmental justice through use of a community enhancement fund, coordinate land use to avoid adverse impacts to transportation investments and improve heavy rail; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council selected and approved the 5.8 mile Interstate MAX light rail line extension to the Expo Center as the region's Locally Preferred Alternative, which now terminates on the Oregon side of the river adjacent to I-5 and within about one mile of Vancouver, Washington, and has been in operation since May, 2004; and,

WHEREAS, the states of Oregon and Washington have both established aggressive climate change strategies that include significant reductions in vehicle miles traveled and/or greenhouse gas emissions during the expected life of either a supplemental or replacement bridge; and,

WHEREAS, in Washington State the goal is to reduce vehicle miles traveled by 50 percent by 2050 and in Oregon the goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 75 percent below 1990 levels by 2050; and,

WHEREAS the Oregon Governor's climate change integration group in its final report dated January 2008 stated that "reducing vehicle miles traveled is the single most effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions"; and,

WHEREAS, in 2003, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 03-3388, For the Purpose of Endorsing a Bi-State Coordination Committee to Discuss and Make Recommendations about Land Use, Economic Development, Transportation and Environmental Justice Issues of Bi-State Significance, authorizing a committee charter for the Bi-State Coordination Committee and adding land use and economic development of bi-state significance to the committee charge; and,

WHEREAS, in February 2005, a Columbia River Crossing Task Force was formed by the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Washington State 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 in the bridge influence area; and,

WHEREAS, in 2007, the Metro Council endorsed the analysis of a wide range of alternatives for the Columbia River Crossing Draft Environmental Impact Statement through approval of 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, which included a request for fresh analysis of rehabilitating and continuing to use the existing spans which were built in 1917 and 1958; and,

WHEREAS, the Final Report of the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor study 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 to achievement of the 2040 Growth Concept 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, the CRC alternatives have been analyzed in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) which has been distributed for public review and comment; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council's delegate to the CRC Task Force will soon be required to convey the Council's opinions and concerns regarding the DEIS as part of the task force's deliberation on the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA); and,

WHEREAS, the task force's endorsement of an LPA is one "narrowing" step in a multi-step process and an important opportunity for the Metro Council to articulate its concerns which will be weighed at this and subsequent steps; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council will vote directly on several subsequent steps in this multi-step process including the LPA itself and amendment of the Regional Transportation Plan, and therefore wishes to signal now what its considerations will be as the project proposal evolves; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC DEIS analysis found that the segment of I-5 in the vicinity of the Columbia River has extended peak-hour travel demand that exceeds capacity, includes bridge spans that are over 50 and 90 years old and that do not meet current traffic safety or seismic standards, and,

WHEREAS, the CRC DEIS states that in the absence of tolls, absence of effective high-capacity transit service, and absence of safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities, automobile traffic and its resulting emissions and impact on climate change would continue to grow faster with the "no build" option than such automobile traffic and emissions would grow with the replacement bridge option that does include tolls, effective transit, and safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and,

WHEREAS, the greatest inhibition to the predictable flow of truck freight is single-occupancy automobile commuting, and according to the CRC analysis, in the absence of tolling, other demand management, and good public transit service the growth of such automobile commuting will contribute to the costs of truck delay; and,

WHEREAS, the current bridge designs impede commercial river traffic; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC analysis confirmed that current bus transit service in the I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver is also constrained by the limited highway capacity and congestion in the bridge influence area, greatly limiting peak hour bus transit reliability and speed and therefore discouraging ridership; and,

WHEREAS, the bicycle and pedestrian facilities for crossing the Columbia River along I-5 do not meet current standards, that demand for such facilities is expected to increase, and that experience on Portland bridges has proven that when safe bicycle facilities are provided, ridership grows dramatically; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge and/or rehabilitating and keeping the existing bridges, could improve safety by providing travel lane designs that meet safety standards including improved sight distance, greater lane widths, improved road shoulders and would eliminate bridge lifts which are indirectly a major cause of rear end accidents on and near the bridge; and

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would reduce auto and truck delays that result from bridge openings; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, could improve the seismic safety of those crossing the river by auto and truck, reducing the potential for economic disruption as a result of restricted truck freight movement from seismic damage as well as reduce the potential for river navigation hazards created by seismic events; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would improve river navigation allowing for a design that reduces ship and barge maneuvering in the river channel and eliminating the need for ships and barges to schedule or wait for bridge lifts; and,

WHEREAS, the current 1960's-era design of I-5 at Hayden Island is highly detrimental to urban livability; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge and related interchanges could encourage urban redevelopment opportunities on Hayden Island which are discouraged by the current design, and would require less property acquisition on Hayden Island than a Supplemental Bridge; and,

WHEREAS, high capacity transit in an exclusive right-of-way would provide greatly improved transit service with much better schedule reliability and service than mixed-use traffic operation; and,

WHEREAS, LRT would produce higher total transit ridership in the corridor than BRT; and,

WHEREAS, LRT is more cost effective than Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and is about one-half as expensive to operate per transit rider crossing the river; and,

WHEREAS, the potential for private investment and development in proximity to nearby transit stops or stations is greater with LRT than BRT; and,

WHEREAS, any of the bridge alternatives could result in greatly improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities for crossing the Columbia River; and,

WHEREAS, because of high demand and because only two road crossings of the Columbia exist in the metropolitan region, the I-5 and I-205 corridor is very well-situated for tolling, a revenue source and management tool currently not feasible for many other projects vying for public funds; and,

WHEREAS, because of its strategic interstate function, the CRC may be eligible for categories of federal funds which would not be applicable to other projects in the region; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC Project is guided, in part, by the recommendations of a 39 member Task Force, on which the Metro Council has a representative; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council desires to establish policy guidance for its representative on the Task Force concerning an upcoming vote on key issues which will lead to a future decision about which alternative should be selected as the locally preferred alternative; and; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council recommends the following policy guidance to its CRC Task Force representative:

1. The Metro Council continues to support a balanced multi-modal approach of highway, high capacity transit, transportation demand management, bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the Columbia River Crossing corridor, as well as compact land use development patterns with a mixture of uses and types of housing which minimize long commutes and reduce our citizens' automobile dependence.

2. Subject to the satisfaction of the conditions in Exhibit A, the Metro Council indicates it would support a CRC project that includes: a) Light rail transit (LRT) extended to Vancouver, Washington, b) a Replacement Bridge with three through lanes with the number of auxiliary lanes to be determined through a subsequent process and amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan and, c) Tolls designed to manage travel demand as well as provide an ongoing funding source for bridge construction, operations and maintenance.

3. The Metro Council provides notice to the project management team that the project considerations included in item 2, above and in Exhibit A, will need to be satisfactorily addressed as elements of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) are prepared, and that those considerations will be major factors when the Metro Council weighs approvals or disapprovals at subsequent steps of this process.

4. The Metro Council recognizes that significant project elements will not have been finalized at the time of LPA adoption, including many of the issues described in Exhibit A. The Council believes it is appropriate to move this process into the next design and financial analysis phase so that those issues can be satisfactorily resolved prior to a final "build / no build" decision point being presented to the involved governing bodies including the Metro Council.

5. The Metro Council recognizes that the Columbia River Crossing Project evaluated the environmental justice effects of the proposed alternatives in the DEIS. The Metro Council recommends that the Task Force and Oversight Committee identify and propose mitigation for any potential adverse human health impacts related to the project and also identify and propose mitigation of existing health impacts in the project area where feasible. The Metro Council recommends that the Task Force and Oversight Committee address environmental justice through a community enhancement fund similar to that created as part of the I-5 Delta Park project.

6. The Metro Council will require an independent analysis of greenhouse gas emissions and prominent display of the results of that analysis in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

7. The Metro Council respectfully suggests the following guiding principles for the project as it moves forward; commitment to develop state-of-the art demand management techniques in addition to tolls that would influence travel behavior and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, commitment to ensure that sufficient capacity on transit and through bicycle and pedestrian facilities is available to meet the demand generated by demand management strategies, commitment to support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project to achieve economic and livability goals, and commitment to reduce vehicle miles traveled to support stated greenhouse gas reduction targets as expressed by legislation in Oregon and Washington.

8. The Metro Council respectfully requests the Oregon Global Warming Commission or the Washington Climate Action Team 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, including greenhouse gas impacts associated with demolition, construction and construction related congestion. The Council encourages the Global Warming Commission or the Washington Climate Action Team to advise Metro about additional analysis that provides better information on this subject.

9. Tolls on the existing I-5 bridge designed to reduce congestion by managing travel demand as well as to provide an ongoing funding source for the project should be imposed as soon as legally and practicably permissible.

10. The Metro Council will consider approval of the LPA after consideration of public comment, the CRC Task Force, local jurisdiction and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) recommendations, and evaluation of how items 1 through 3 of this resolution and Exhibit A are addressed by any final proposal. An amendment of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan may be considered concurrent with the LPA decision. The Metro Council's action on this current resolution (08-3938B) is made without prejudice to future Metro Council action on subsequent steps when the Council will exercise its role.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 5th day of June 2008.

David Lincoln Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Officially Approved
Approvato Ufficialmente
METRO COUNCIL
Consiglio Metropolitano
Metro Council

M:\attorney\confidential\R-O\2008-R-O\Resolutions\Reso. 08-3938 Columbia Crossing.Bragdon.Benner\Reso. 08-3938B CRC Adopted 060508.doc
COU/OMA/DBC/sm 6/6/08

RESOLUTION 08-3938B
Exhibit A

Metro Council Concerns and Considerations
Columbia River Crossing "Locally Preferred Alternative"

The Metro Council recognizes that endorsement of a "Locally Preferred Alternative" is one important narrowing step that enables the project management team to proceed with further analysis of a reduced range of alternatives. The Council is cognizant that many important issues are generally still unresolved at the time of endorsement of an LPA, but that clear articulation of concerns is required to make sure that such unresolved issues are appropriately resolved during the next phase of design, engineering, and financial planning, with proper participation by the local community and its elected representatives. If those sorts of outstanding issues are not satisfactorily resolved during that post-LPA selection phase, then the project risks failing to win the approval of necessary governing bodies at subsequent steps of the process.

While instructing its delegate to endorse the general outlines of the LPA (Replacement Bridge with Light Rail and Tolls) as described in Resolution 3938B, the Metro Council simultaneously finds that the following issues will need to be satisfactorily addressed in the upcoming refinement of design, engineering and financial planning:

LOCAL OVERSIGHT DURING PLANNING, DESIGN, ENGINEERING, FINANCE AND CONSTRUCTION:

The Governors of the two states are respectfully requested to convene a Local Oversight Committee consisting of the following local agencies to make all major planning, design, engineering, finance and construction decisions in partnership with the two state governments:

- City of Vancouver and City of Portland
- Metro Council and R.T.C.
- C-Tran and TriMet

The decisions which would be made by this six-party group should include but would not be limited to:

- Number of total lanes ("through" and "auxiliary") on the replacement bridge across the Columbia River and throughout the bridge influence area.
- Size and design of the bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the replacement bridge across the Columbia River and throughout the bridge influence area.
- Design of the light rail transit facility across the Columbia River and throughout the bridge influence area.

Decisions about the foregoing three items should be by consensus among the six local agencies. Additional decisions which should require some level of official concurrence by the local governments on the respective sides of the river include but would not be limited to:

- Design of interchanges within the bridge influence area relative to their impact on urban development potential.

The two Governors are respectfully requested to propose a description and scope for the activities of this Local Oversight Committee prior to official consideration of the LPA.

FINANCING PLAN

A detailed financing plan showing costs and sources of revenue must be proposed and presented to the partner agencies and to the public. The proposed financing plan should indicate how the federal, state and local (if any) sources of revenue proposed to be dedicated to this project would impact, or could be compared to, the funds required for other potential expenditures in the region.

The purpose and use of the previously-introduced enhancement fund should also be addressed.

CAPACITY CONSIDERATIONS, INDUCED DEMAND AND GREENHOUSE GASES

An independent analysis is required of the greenhouse gas and induced automobile demand forecasts for this project. The results of the analysis must be prominently displayed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The analysis should include comparisons related to the purpose and function of the so-called "auxiliary" lanes.

PRESERVATION OF FREIGHT ACCESS

The design and finance phase of the CRC project will need to describe specifically what physical and fiscal (tolling) methods will be employed to ensure that trucks are granted a priority which is commensurate with their contributions to the project and their important role in the economy relative to single-occupancy automobile commuting.

LIGHT RAIL

As indicated in the Item 2 "resolved" in the body of the resolution, the Metro Council's endorsement of the LPA categorically stipulates that light rail must be included in the package. During the upcoming design, planning and finance period, light rail will need to be formally and irrevocably confirmed as a project element by all project partners.

DESIGN OF BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

More detailed design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities is required to inform the decisions of the local oversight panel described above.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS AT RE-DESIGNED INTERCHANGES

More design of the interchanges related to the CRC is required to more fully evaluate their community impact.

The Metro Council is also concerned that the Marine Drive access points preserve and improve the functionality of the Expo Center.

BRIDGE DESIGN

Aesthetics of the final design should be an important consideration in the phase of study that follows approval of the LPA and precedes consideration of the final decision.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS BY COUNCILOR BRAGDON

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING ~~ESTABLISHING~~ METRO COUNCIL DIRECTION ~~RECOMMENDATIONS~~ TO ITS DELEGATE CONCERNING KEY PRELIMINARY DECISIONS LEADING TO A FUTURE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE DECISION FOR THE PROPOSED COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING PROJECT	)))))))	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3938A Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder

WHEREAS, the Oregon and Washington sides of the metropolitan region~~Metro area and southwest Washington~~ are linked by critical transportation infrastructure including highway, bus transit and heavy freight and long-distance passenger rail connections that have created strong regional, national and international economic ties vital to each community along the Columbia River; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 Interstate bridge carries approximately 150,000 people daily by car, truck, bus, bicycle and on foot and is one of only two publicly-owned Columbia River crossings between Vancouver, Washington and Portland Oregon; and,

WHEREAS, travel by transit between Portland and Vancouver currently must share a right-of-way with autos and trucks that is so congested that current transit service is not reliable or easily marketable to most potential riders; and,

WHEREAS, Interstate 5 is the only continuous north/south ~~i~~Interstate ~~freeway~~ on the West Coast and ~~that this freeway~~ provides a critical local, national and international transportation link for motor vehicles and truck-hauled freight in the western-most United States; and,

WHEREAS, the governors of Oregon and Washington initiated the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership in January 2001; and

WHEREAS, in November 2002 the Metro Council approved Resolution 02-3237A, For the Purpose of Endorsing the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study Recommendations, that supported a multi-modal project ~~solution~~ including light rail transit (LRT) and either a new supplemental or replacement I-5 bridge; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study also included recommendations to widen I-5 to three lanes between Delta Park and Lombard, address finance issues, use travel demand tools including pricing (tolls), address environmental justice through use of a community enhancement fund, coordinate land use to avoid adverse impacts to transportation investments and improve heavy rail; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council~~,~~ selected and approved the 5.8 mile Interstate MAX light rail line extension to the Expo Center as the region's Locally Preferred Alternative, which now terminates on the Oregon side of the river ~~to a terminus that is located~~ adjacent to I-5 and within about one mile of Vancouver, Washington, and that the Interstate LRT has been in operation since May 2004; and,

WHEREAS, in 2003, the Metro Council approved an amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan to add the I-5 Delta Park-to-Lombard widening ~~improvements~~ to the I-5 freeway, with a design to add a southbound lane to I-5 so that there will be three lanes in both directions; and,

WHEREAS, in 2003, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 03-3388, For the Purpose of Endorsing a Bi-State Coordination Committee to Discuss and Make Recommendations about Land Use, Economic Development, Transportation and Environmental Justice Issues of Bi-State Significance, authorizing a committee charter for the Bi-State Coordination Committee and adding land use and economic development of bi-state significance to the committee charge, and;

WHEREAS, in February 2005, a Columbia River Crossing Task Force was formed by the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Washington State 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 in the bridge influence area in the vicinity of the Columbia River; and,

WHEREAS, in 2007, the Metro Council endorsed the analysis of a wide range of alternatives for the Columbia River Crossing Draft Environmental Impact Statement through approval of 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, which included a request for fresh analysis of rehabilitating and continuing to use the existing spans which were built in 1917 and 1958; and

WHEREAS, the CRC alternatives have been analyzed in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) which has been distributed for public review and comment; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council's delegate to the CRC Task Force will soon be required to convey the Council's opinions and concerns regarding the DEIS as part of the task force's deliberation on the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA); and,

WHEREAS, the task force's endorsement of an LPA is one "narrowing" step in a multi-step process and an important opportunity for the Metro Council to articulate its concerns which will be weighed at this and subsequent steps; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council will vote directly on several subsequent steps in this multi-step process including the LPA itself and amendment of the Regional Transportation Plan, and therefore wishes to signal now what its considerations will be as the project proposal evolves; and

WHEREAS, the CRC DEIS analysis found that the segment of I-5 in the vicinity of the Columbia River has extended peak-hour travel demand that exceeds capacity, includes bridge spans that are over 50 and 90 years old and that do not meet current traffic safety or seismic standards, and

WHEREAS, the CRC DEIS claims that in the absence of tolls, absence of effective high-capacity transit service, and absence of safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities, automobile traffic and its resulting emissions and impact on climate change would continue to grow faster with the "no build" option than such automobile traffic and emissions would grow with the replacement bridge option that does include tolls, effective transit, and safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and,

WHEREAS, the greatest inhibition to the predictable flow of truck freight is single-occupancy automobile commuting, and according to the CRC analysis, in the absence of tolling, other demand management, and good public transit service the growth of such automobile commuting will contribute to

the costs of truck delay ~~is estimated to~~ increasinge by an estimated140 percent to nearly $34 million annually by the year 2020~~ and the current bridge designs impede commercial river traffic, as well~~; and,

~~WHEREAS, the CRC analysis further found that the only other convenient alternative highway route, the Interstate 205 Bridge, is also reaching its peak hour period carrying capacity; and,~~

WHEREAS, the current bridge designs impede commercial river traffic; and

WHEREAS, the CRC analysis confirmed that current bus transit service in the I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver is also constrained by the limited highway capacity and congestion in the bridge influence area, greatly limiting peak hour bus transit reliability and speed and therefore discouraging ridership; and,

WHEREAS, the ~~CRC analysis also found that~~ bicycle and pedestrian facilities for crossing the Columbia River along I-5 do not meet current standards, ~~and~~ that demand for such facilities is expected to ~~will continue~~ to increase, and that experience on Portland bridges has proven that when safe bicycle facilities are provided, ridership grows dramatically ; and,

~~WHEREAS, the CRC DEIS has found that a Replacement Bridge with high capacity transit and tolls would have less average daily traffic and fewer hours of congestion than alternatives without high capacity transit or tolls (or both) or the No Build alternative; and,~~

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge and/or rehabilitating and keeping the existing bridges, ~~w~~could improve safety ~~on all travel lanes~~ by providing travel lane designs that meet safety standards including improved sight distance, greater lane widths, improved road shoulders and would eliminate bridge lifts which are indirectly a major cause of rear end accidents on and near the bridge; and

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would reduce ~~congestion and~~ auto and truck delays that~~as the~~ result from~~of eliminating~~ bridge openings; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, ~~w~~could ~~greatly~~ improve the seismic safety of those crossing the river by auto and truck, reducing the potential for economic disruption as a result of restricted truck freight movement from seismic damage as well as reduce the potential for river navigation hazards created by seismic events; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would improve river navigation allowing for a design that reduces ship and barge maneuvering in the river channel and eliminating the need for ships and barges to schedule or wait for bridge lifts; and,

WHEREAS, the current 1960's-era design of I-5 at Hayden Island is highly detrimental to urban livability; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge and related interchanges, if properly designed to serve the community rather than adhere to outmoded standards which exclusively emphasize automobile volume and speed, could encourage urban redevelopment opportunities on Hayden Island which are discouraged by the current design, and would require less property acquisition on Hayden Island than a Supplemental Bridge; and,

WHEREAS, high capacity transit in an exclusive right-of-way would provide greatly improved transit service with much better schedule reliability and service than mixed-use traffic operation; and,

WHEREAS, LRT would produce higher total transit ridership in the corridor than BRT; and

WHEREAS, LRT is more cost effective than Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and is about one-half as expensive to operate per transit rider crossing the river; and,

WHEREAS, the potential for private investment and development in proximity to nearby transit stops or stations is greater with LRT than BRT; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro area has made substantial investment in LRT and extending LRT to Vancouver Washington would ensure better high capacity transit system compatibility; and,

WHEREAS, any of the bridge alternatives ~~w~~could result in greatly improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities for crossing the Columbia River, if properly designed during the next phase of planning if this project moves forward; and,

WHEREAS, because of high demand and because only two road crossings of the Columbia exist in the metropolitan region, the I-5 and I-205 corridor is very well-situated for tolling, a revenue source and management tool currently not feasible for many other projects vying for public funds; and,,

WHEREAS, because of its strategic interstate function, the CRC may be eligible for categories of federal funds which would not be applicable to other projects in the region; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC Project is guided, in part, by the recommendations of a 39 member Task Force, on~~f~~ which the Metro Council has a representative; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council desires to establish policy guidance for its representative on the Task Force concerning an upcoming vote on key issues which will lead to a future decision about which alternative should be selected as the locally preferred alternative; and; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council recommends the following policy guidance to its CRC Task Force representative:

1. ~~As a general policy framework, t~~The Metro Council continues to support a balanced multi-modal approach of highway, high capacity transit, transportation demand management, bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the Columbia River Crossing corridor, as well as compact land use development patterns which minimize long commutes and reduce our citizens' automobile dependence.

2. Subject to the satisfaction of the conditions in Exhibit A, t~~T~~he Metro Council indicates it would support~~s~~ a CRC project~~solution~~ that includes: a) Light rail transit (LRT) extended to Vancouver, Washington, b) a Replacement Bridge with three through lanes with the number of auxiliary lanes to be determined through a subsequent process and amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan and, c) Tolls designed to manage travel demand as well as provide an ongoing funding source for bridge operations and maintenance.

3. The Metro Council provides notice to the project management team ~~recommends~~ that the project considerations included in item 2, above and in Exhibit A, will need to be satisfactorily addressed ~~be taken into account~~ as elements of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) are prepared, and that those considerations will be major factors when the Metro Council weighs approvals or disapprovals at subsequent steps of this process.

4. The Metro Council recognizes that significant ~~re are~~ project elements ~~that~~ will not have been finalized ~~determined~~ at the time of LPA adoption, including many of the issues described in Exhibit A. The Council believes it is appropriate to move this process into the next design and financial analysis phase so that those issues can be satisfactorily resolved prior to a final "build / no build" decision point being presented to the involved governing bodies including the Metro Council. ~~These elements may include: a) the number of through and auxiliary lanes on the Replacement Bridge, b) the type, rate amount and finance plan concerning tolls, c) bicycle and pedestrian facility design and location, d) the travel demand management approach and plan specifics and, e) the design of interchanges and how they would be integrated into the Hayden Island and Expo Center areas. If these elements are not addressed in the LPA, Metro Council would need to participate in these decisions either directly or through a Metro Council representative. This issue should be addressed in concert with the draft LPA.~~

5. The Metro Council will consider approval of the LPA after consideration of public comment, the CRC Task Force, local jurisdiction and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) recommendations, and evaluation of how ~~comparison with~~ items 1 through 3 ~~4~~ of this resolution and Exhibit A are addressed by any final proposal. An amendment of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan will be considered concurrent with the LPA decision. The Metro Council's action on this current resolution (08-3938A) is made without prejudice to future Metro Council action on subsequent steps when the Council will exercise its role.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this day of , 2008.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS BY COUNCILOR BRAGDON
Metro Council Concerns and Considerations
Columbia River Crossing "Locally Preferred Alternative" Process

The Metro Council recognizes that endorsement of a "Locally Preferred Alternative" is an important narrowing step which enables the project management to proceed with further analysis of a reduced range of alternatives. The Council is cognizant that many important issues are generally still unresolved at the time of endorsement of an LPA, but that clear articulation of concerns and a dedication to due diligence is required to make sure that such unresolved issues are appropriately resolved during the next phase of design, engineering, and financial planning. Of course, if those sorts of outstanding issues are not satisfactorily resolved during that upcoming phase, then the project risks failing to win the approval of necessary governing bodies at subsequent steps of the process.

While instructing its delegate to endorse the general outlines of the LPA as described in the project EIS, the Metro Council simultaneously finds that the following issues will need to be satisfactorily addressed in the upcoming refinement of design, engineering and financial planning:

Independent Audit of EIS Projections of Reduced Growth in Automobile Commuting Compared to "No Build" Alternative is Required

The Governors and legislatures of both Washington and Oregon have undertaken commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to combat climate change. Transportation, particularly automobiles, is a major source of these emissions. In turn, low-density land use patterns which force residents to travel long distances by automobile are a major contributor to the problem.

As an invariable rule, additions of highway capacity in growing urban and suburban areas provoke what traffic engineers and economists call "induced demand." When new lanes of highway are added, they fill up with more cars. Additionally, that new highway capacity also encourages dispersed land development patterns which do not pay for all their fiscal or societal externalities, further exacerbating the problem.

The CRC EIS claims that this proposed project would be a rare (if not unique) instance in which a new road facility does not induce new demand and create more traffic. The EIS finds that – most significantly, in the Metro Council's view – that the "build" option actually produces less growth in automobile traffic and emissions than the "no build" option would. The reasons given for this counter-intuitive claim are that (a) there would be little or no "new" capacity because the bridge is a replacement for an existing facility, (b) tolling – which would exist on a new bridge but is presumed not to exist on the existing bridges – will inhibit the demand which would otherwise grow faster, (c) the addition of high-quality transit and bike and pedestrian facilities, in combination with tolling, would provide attractive alternatives to the automobile that would not exist with

the no build option and probably would not exist (in many individuals' view) with a rehabilitation of the existing bridges.

This scenario is the basis for the CRC EIS finding that the "build" option has a more favorable greenhouse gas or climate change impact than the "no build" option does. Because this scenario runs counter to everything which has been proven about induced demand over the past half-century, it bears scrutiny. An independent, thorough evaluation of this claim needs to be conducted by a qualified, neutral party who has no preconceived interest in whether or not the project should be built.

Function, Cost and Impact of "Auxiliary" Lanes

Related to the foregoing issue of capacity and induced demand, the number of lanes proposed for a new bridge will be unresolved at the time of adoption of the LPA. Over the past fifty years, roads have generally been designed exclusively to maximize the volume and speed of automobiles, to the detriment of other values we now realize are important too, such as safety more broadly defined. The so-called "auxiliary" lanes proposed for the CRC are said to be justified on some basis of "safety," but it seems unclear from the EIS just what is meant by that term, and whether other methods would also achieve higher safety. Generally, it's unclear how the so-called "auxiliary" lanes (if any) affect the bridge's performance on a variety of measures. Before a final proposal is developed, the purpose(s) and impact(s) of "auxiliary" lanes (if any) will need to be documented relative to their cost and consequences.

Preservation of Freight Access

Much of the importance of the I-5 corridor is based on its role for north-south trucking, both within our region and between our region and other parts of the nation or world. It is well-known, however, that the most significant impediment to the flow of truck freight is automobile commuting, most of it with only one person per car. The design and finance phase of the CRC project will need to describe specifically what physical and fiscal (tolling) methods will be employed to ensure that trucks are granted a priority which is commensurate with their contributions to the project and their important role in the economy.

Financial Package

The Oregon side of the metropolitan region already has a very long list of desired transportation projects besides the CRC, with limited funds to pay for them. Clearly, before any final approval can be granted, the CRC will need to have a detailed, defensible financing plan largely reliant on tolls and federal and state funds, so that other priorities in the region are not jeopardized. Some method of comparing the return on public investment for different projects will be necessary.

The tolling aspect of the financing plan will also need to be linked to the demand management aspect of the operating plan and traffic and emissions modeling.

Light Rail

As indicated in the Item 2 "resolved" in the body of the resolution, the Metro Council's endorsement of the LPA categorically stipulates that light rail must be included in the package. During the upcoming design, planning and finance period, light rail will need to be formally and irrevocably confirmed as a project element by the approval required under 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." In the absence of such approval and clear commitment, it is doubtful this entire proposed project would continue to be considered as viable by the Oregon side.

Design of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

A cursory look at the EIS indicates that the current proposal may simply meet the bare minimum the project would be required to meet by law regarding the encouragement of non-motorized transport. Obviously, much more detailed design is yet to come and will be expected to meet the highest standard of service.

Urban Redevelopment Impacts at Re-designed Interchanges

During the era that Interstate 5 was built, interchanges usually destroyed the urban quality of life of the communities they were imposed upon. This detrimental impact is nationwide in scope and readily apparent on Hayden Island, where the presence of I-5 and the access ramps to and from it essentially prevents any human activity other than driving, and prevents any economic activity other than large auto-based establishments surrounded by parking lots. The interchanges related to the CRC will need to be designed and evaluated with regard to their community impact, rather than by the outmoded standards of the past fifty years which exclusively emphasized maximizing the volume and speed of automobiles without regard to other values.

More specifically, as the owner and operator of the Expo Center, the Metro Council is also concerned that the Marine Drive access points preserve and improve the functionality of the Expo Center.

Bridge Design

Much public comment has been made in favor of having an aesthetically pleasing design, and valid criticism has been made of the basic sketches which have been distributed thus far, which depict a new I-5 bridge which is as visually unappealing as the I-205 bridge is. Again, it would be premature to have a final design at the time of endorsement of the LPA, but the aesthetics of the final design should be an important consideration in the phase of study that follows approval of the LPA and precedes consideration of the final decision.

Shared Project Oversight During Design, Engineering and Finance Phase

The many, many detailed design, engineering, and finance issues which will be unresolved at the time of adoption of the LPA leads to one over-arching conclusion: for this project to be favorably received by the people of our region, the local jurisdictions will need to be engaged in a new, close partnership of equals with the two state governments. This imperative becomes even more important after the LPA is officially adopted and the current 39 member task force is disbanded. The Governors of both states should direct that a project management team consisting of the two city governments, the two metropolitan planning agencies, the two transit districts, and perhaps the two port authorities be convened and officially designated to share project management authority with the two state departments of transportation. Ultimate approval of this project by the local community will depend on those jurisdictions and their elected officials having a direct and intimate influence over the myriad of design and engineering and finance decisions which can help shape this project into one that the people of our region can embrace.

This newly enhanced relationship between the states and the leadership of our region should be officially announced ~~acknowledged~~ by the Governors simultaneously with the region's approval of the LPA, and should be set to continue formally through the ensuing major decision points.

~~**Metro Council Issues and Suggested Solutions concerning the Columbia River Crossing Locally Preferred Alternative**~~

~~**Issue 1: Implications for the Transportation System within the Metro Area.**~~

~~Overview: During the CRC project discussions there have been assertions by some parties that the CRC project is only part of the solution to the transportation challenges of the greater metropolitan region. As a transportation project in a single corridor, the CRC project was never meant to be the sole solution to regional needs. It is, however, part of Metro's coordinated regional system of highway, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and freight improvements as outlined in the RTP. There are other corridors with transportation problems now and in the future and these other corridors will require their own unique set of transportation improvements. We also recognize that improvements in the CRC project area do not commit the Oregon side of the region to make additional capacity improvements in the I-5 corridor south of the project area.~~

~~Suggested Solution: Approval of CRC project should not commit the Metro region to additional highway improvements in the I-5 corridor south of the project area, or in any~~

other corridor in the region. Language to this effect could be placed in the CRC Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation and the Metro RTP. Issues with respect to other corridors will be addressed in Metro's update of the RTP, State Component.

Issue 2: Number of Travel Lanes in Bridge Influence Area.

Overview: The number of general purpose travel lanes on the I-5 bridge, as well as the size and number of lanes for approaches, associated collector/distributor roads, auxiliary lanes and turn lanes has been a concern raised by many different stakeholders. These concerns included the effect of removing the I-5 capacity bottleneck and "flooding" the region with more traffic than the regional road system can handle.

Suggested Solution: Concerns about traffic "flooding" the regional system with removal of the I-5 bottleneck are not supported by the CRC project's analysis to date. Designs that consider three through lanes and either one, two, or three auxiliary lanes in each direction at the river should be advanced for further study, in keeping with adopted Metro Council policy. A preliminary analysis of the benefits and costs of various combinations of lane types should be provided by the CRC prior to selection of the LPA. The final results of that process should be reviewed with the Bi-State Coordination Committee and then forwarded to JPACT and then the Metro Council for approval and amendment of the RTP.

Issue 3: Air Quality

Overview: Concerns have been raised by the public about the affect of vehicle emissions on the health of residents who live in close proximity to I-5. The CRC project estimates that air pollutants will be substantially reduced in the future over present levels. For example, levels of benzene are expected to be over 60 percent less than existing levels. This kind of dramatic decrease is expected for the other air toxics measured as recommended by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality including 1,3-Butadiene, Formaldehyde, Acetaldehyde, Acrolein and Diesel PM. Further, all air toxic emissions will be lower with Build alternatives than for the No Build alternative. These improvements arise from congestion reduction and improvements in vehicle emissions anticipated by 2030. (For Greenhouse Gases, see Carbon Footprint, Issue 11).

Suggested Solution: As a means of addressing neighborhood concerns and confirming forecasts of future air quality improvements, air quality monitoring for North Portland should be conducted regularly to provide data to ensure that air quality meets (and likely is better than) applicable federal and state standards.

Issue 4: Carbon Footprint (Green House Gases)

Overview: The CRC alternatives analysis found that the build alternatives (with tolls), would result in fewer greenhouse gas emissions than any other Build alternative as well

as the No Build. However, concerns have been raised by several CRC Task Force members that the future may be very different than today with regard to oil availability and price, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

Suggested Solutions: The LRT element of the CRC project creates the opportunity for an all-electric transit mode with capacity far surpassing the ridership forecasts for 2030. The combined highway and transit project has the potential to carry very high volumes of people through the corridor with less reliance on petroleum than today. The project's Transportation System Management, Transportation Demand Management, bicycle and pedestrian strategies will also contribute to reduction of greenhouse gases with the build alternatives. As a result of LRT and tolls, the DEIS forecasts are that with a Replacement Bridge, there would be fewer autos crossing the Columbia River in the year 2030 than with the No Build, which translates to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Issue 5: Funding and Phasing Strategy

Overview: There is a scarcity of transportation funds in the Metro region. Any of the build alternatives represent a significant commitment of public resources. There is also a high level of interest from all geographic areas of the Metro region for transportation investments. There is concern that approval of the CRC project could require all of the available local, state and federal transportation funding for many years, even with a substantial contribution from project tolls.

Suggested Solution: This project is viewed as a high priority for highway and transit funding in the context of the overall implementation of the RTP. Given the national significance of the project, the CRC project is pursuing USDOT Corridor of the Future funding as well as tolls and state discretionary funding. FTA New Starts funding, together with State of Washington toll credits are being sought to fund up to 100% of transit improvements. In the event that there are not sufficient funds to construct the proposed project, ODOT, WSDOT, C-Tran, TriMet, Metro and the RTC should examine the proposed project for ways to either reduce project costs or phase improvements. For example, some of the interchange work could be postponed or some lanes phased in over a 5 to 10 year period. A minimum operable segment for light rail could also be pursued if funding for a full project is not available. (For discussion of possibly tolling I-205 Bridge, see Issue 7)

Issue 6: Tolling and Demand Management

Overview: Tolling, when implemented, could potentially function as a demand management tool as well as a revenue source to fund capital improvements. Some have suggested that tolls should only be imposed for capital funding and have suggested that tolling be eliminated once the initial project construction capital costs and debt have been retired. Removing tolls at that time – or greatly reducing tolls - could reduce or eliminate the demand management effect and result in inefficient use of the I-5 bridge over the Columbia River, as well as lead to lack of revenue for renewal and replacement.

Suggested Solution: Tolling decisions must consider the effect of demand management on the efficient use of the freeway lane capacity of I-5, as well as the need to fund Renewal and Replacement. Metro policy, included in the recently adopted federal RTP, allows for selective application of value pricing as a demand management tool. ODOT and WSDOT, working with Metro, RTC and the community should manage the tolls (rates, time of day imposed, vehicle differentials, etc.) during peak hours of demand. Performance standards should be developed that; 1) promote efficient use of freeway lane capacity, 2) provide travel speeds in the corridor which support truck freight movement, 3) promote transit use for people traveling in the corridor and 4) significantly discourage single occupant vehicle travel (also, see related suggestion in the greenhouse gas section).

Issue 7: Tolling – One Bridge or Two?

Overview: The CRC project focus is on I-5 and tolling a replacement or supplemental bridge on I-5 across the Columbia Rive is being considered. However, concerns have been raised that tolling only the I-5 corridor could potentially increase trips across the I-205 bridge and increase out of direction travel on arterial and other roads in the Metro area.

Suggested Solution: CRC analysis has shown that I-5 tolling does not cause substantial diversion to an untolled I-205 bridge. Tolling the I-205 bridge is currently not an option given federal regulations that prohibit tolling of existing freeways unless approved as a pilot project (the I-205 Bridge is not currently included in the federal toll pilot program list), or if improvements were made in that bridge influence area. As the project progresses, ODOT and WSDOT should work with Metro and the Regional Transportation Council to examine issues related to tolling both bridges and determine whether tolling of the I-205 bridge warrants further consideration.

Issue 8: Transit Funding Flow – Effect on Highway Project

Overview: The CRC project, as currently described, includes investments in transportation facilities serving a variety of modes including automobiles, trucks, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. This multi-modal approach is consistent with the Metro RTP, as it recognizes that there are a variety of transportation needs and a variety of modes that can serve these needs. However, funding sources and the timing of federal and state funding differ from mode to mode. There is a concern that the LRT investment not lag the freeway investments due to the FTA New Starts funding process and Congressional appropriation process.

Suggested Solution: In a recent joint highway and light rail project (Westside LRT and ODOT US 26 improvements), the opposite was true – highway funding and construction significantly lagged the FTA New Starts funding and construction of the LRT line. The LPA should include a recommendation that LRT and freeway investments advance simultaneously.

Issue 9: Bike and Pedestrian Lanes

Overview: Walking and bicycling will continue to be affordable and accessible travel options in the corridor – particularly with upgraded high quality facilities. If the CRC project includes a long, unimpeded stretch of bike lanes, it is likely that bike speeds could be high, causing potential conflicts between serious commuter cyclists and recreational riders and walkers on a shared facility. There is also a desire in the community to locate the bike facilities on the east side of the bridge to have an unobstructed view of Mount Hood and the Columbia Gorge.

Suggested Solution: It would be safer and more useable if bicycle and pedestrian paths were separated. In addition, bike lane widths would be safer if designed for at least 7 ½ feet per lane or greater (15 feet width if a two-way bike facility is pursued). Though the view from of the Columbia River and the Gorge is better from the east side of the northbound replacement bridge, it may not be feasible or cost-effective to locate the new bicycle and pedestrian in this location. Further, the establishment of a landmark or design feature at the boundary between Oregon and Washington along the scenic bike and pedestrian path in the manner of the famous "four corners" monument deserves consideration. CRC should further investigate this location and provide the results of their analysis.

Issue 10: Other Neighborhood Impacts

Overview: Historically, there have been some impacts along I-5 to residents in north and northeast Portland. The I-5 freeway severs east-west connection between neighborhoods. Investments made in neighborhoods could address the continuing impacts of the I-5 freeway. This principle was included in the recommendations of the *Strategic Plan of the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership*.

Suggested Solution: Create significant community enhancements adjacent to the I-5 freeway to be funded by the project. Funds should be expended on public improvements in the immediate area of I-5 in north and northeast Portland in consultation with the neighborhoods within the bridge influence area.

Issue 11: Hayden Island Accessibility.

Overview: Currently the Hayden Island area must rely upon one interchange on I-5 for accessibility. This is both a concern from a safety standpoint – emergency evacuation is limited, as well as an inconvenience at times when I-5 is congested due to either large amounts of traffic or an accident.

Suggested Solution: The DEIS documents how the Replacement Bridge provides better access to Hayden Island than the No-Build alternative. Further, ODOT should explore the feasibility of using one or more of the existing I-5 bridge spans or LRT span as an arterial connection between Hayden Island and the rest of Portland to the south.

Issue 12: Gateway

Overview: I-5 at the Columbia River is the gateway to Oregon, to the Metro area, and to the City of Portland. How the traveling public, whether for the first time or as a daily occurrence, sees this portal will reflect positively or negatively depending on the transportation facility design's sensitivity to the adjacent land uses and vistas.

Suggested Solution: ODOT and WSDOT should work with local jurisdictions to explore designs that will provide a distinctive and inspiring project, when designing the bridge and motor vehicle interchanges that will connect with the freeway. Given constraints on the bridge type imposed by navigation and aviation clearance issues, care should be taken to ensure that the total project design provides a recognizable gateway to Oregon and Washington.

Issue 13: Bi-State Coordination.

Overview: The CRC project includes portions of two states and will likely include light rail transit service between two states as well as tolling that would affect two states. Each of these items will require either navigating the laws of two states – or – could be addressed through a variety of coordinating entities.

Suggested Solution: ODOT and WSDOT are working with Metro, CTRAN, TriMet and the Regional Transportation Council to assess the pros and cons of the various coordination methods. These methods could include intergovernmental agreements, cooperative agreements or other mutually agreed upon coordination mechanisms such as a bi-state compact. Light rail transit operation and maintenance and collection and distribution of fares and toll revenues are all aspects of the project that could benefit from formal agreements.

Issue 14: Ongoing Project Advisory Process.

Overview: While the locally preferred alternative (LPA) will be selected soon, there will remain other issues related to the implementation of the LPA. A final environmental impact statement, final design and construction plan will need to be prepared in ways that reflect the interests and concerns of the I-5 facility users as well as nearby residents and communities.

Suggested Solution: ODOT and WSDOT are identifying options that include continuing involvement of affected local jurisdictions and public participation opportunities as implementing elements of the CRC LPA are being considered.

Issue 15: Marine Drive Interchange Design and Expo Center

Overview: Rebuilding the Marine Drive interchange to improve freight mobility could have significant impacts on the operations of Metro's Expo Center through loss of parking and/or necessary access for customers and exhibitors.

~~Suggested Solution: The CRC project should work closely with Metro and the Metropolitan Exposition and Recreation Commission to ensure that the Expo remains viable and continues to serve the economy of the region.~~

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING METRO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING KEY PRELIMINARY DECISIONS LEADING TO A FUTURE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE DECISION FOR THE COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING PROJECT	)))))))	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3938 Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder

WHEREAS, the Metro area and southwest Washington are linked by critical transportation infrastructure including highway, bus transit and heavy rail connections that have created strong regional, national and international economic ties vital to each community along the Columbia River; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 Interstate bridge carries approximately 150,000 people daily by car, truck, bus, bicycle and on foot and is one of only two Columbia River crossings between Vancouver, Washington and Portland Oregon; and,

WHEREAS, travel by transit between Portland and Vancouver currently must share a right-of-way with autos and trucks that is so congested that current transit service is not reliable; and,

WHEREAS, Interstate 5 is the only continuous north/south interstate freeway on the West Coast and that this freeway provides a critical local, national and international transportation link for motor vehicles and truck-hauled freight in the western-most United States; and,

WHEREAS, the governors of Oregon and Washington initiated the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership in January 2001; and

WHEREAS, on November 14, 2002 the Metro Council approved Resolution 02-3237A, For the Purpose of Endorsing the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study Recommendations, that supported a multi-modal solution including light rail transit (LRT) and a new supplemental or replacement I-5 bridge; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study also included recommendations to widen I-5 to three lanes between Delta Park and Lombard, address finance issues, use travel demand tools including pricing, address environmental justice through use of a community enhancement fund, coordinate land use to avoid adverse impacts to transportation investments and improve heavy rail; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council, selected and approved the 5.8 mile Interstate MAX light rail line extension to the Expo Center as the region's Locally Preferred Alternative to a terminus that is located adjacent to I-5 and within about one mile of Vancouver, Washington, and that the Interstate LRT has been in operation since May 2004; and,

WHEREAS, in 2003, the Metro Council approved an amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan to add the I-5 Delta Park-to-Lombard improvements to the I-5 freeway, with a design to add a southbound lane to I-5 so that there will be three lanes in both directions; and,

WHEREAS, on November 20 2003, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 03-3388, For the Purpose of Endorsing a Bi-State Coordination Committee to Discuss and Make Recommendations about Land Use, Economic Development, Transportation and Environmental Justice Issues of Bi-State

Significance, authorizing a committee charter for the Bi-State Coordination Committee and adding land use and economic development of bi-state significance to the committee charge, and;

WHEREAS, in February 2005, a Columbia River Crossing Task Force was formed by the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Washington State 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 in the bridge influence area in the vicinity of the Columbia River; and,

WHEREAS, on February 22, 2007, the Metro Council endorsed the analysis of a wide range of alternatives for the Columbia River Crossing Draft Environmental Impact Statement through approval of 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; and

WHEREAS, the CRC alternatives have been analyzed in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) which has been distributed for public review and comment; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC DEIS analysis found that the segment of I-5 in the vicinity of the Columbia River has extended peak-hour travel demand that exceeds capacity, includes bridge spans that are over 50 and 90 years old and that do not meet current traffic safety or seismic standards, and

WHEREAS, the costs of truck delay is estimated to increase by140 percent to nearly $34 million annually by the year 2020 and the current bridge designs impede commercial river traffic, as well; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC analysis further found that the only other convenient alternative highway route, the Interstate 205 Bridge, is also reaching its peak-hour period carrying capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC analysis confirmed that current bus transit service in the I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver is also constrained by the limited highway capacity and congestion in the bridge influence area, greatly limiting peak hour bus transit reliability and speed; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC analysis also found that bicycle and pedestrian facilities for crossing the Columbia River along I-5 do not meet current standards and that demand for such facilities will continue to increase; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC DEIS has found that a Replacement Bridge with high capacity transit and tolls would have less average daily traffic and fewer hours of congestion than alternatives without high capacity transit or tolls (or both) or the No Build alternative; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would improve safety on all travel lanes by providing travel lane designs that meet safety standards including improved sight distance, greater lane widths, improved road shoulders and would eliminate bridge lifts which are a major cause of rear end accidents on and near the bridge; and

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would reduce congestion and auto and truck delays as the result of eliminating bridge openings; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would greatly improve the seismic safety of those crossing the river by auto and truck, reducing the potential for economic

disruption as a result of restricted truck freight movement from seismic damage as well as reduce the potential for river navigation hazards created by seismic events; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge, unlike a Supplemental Bridge, would improve river navigation allowing for a design that reduces ship and barge maneuvering in the river channel and eliminating the need for ships and barges to schedule or wait for bridge lifts; and,

WHEREAS, a Replacement Bridge would require less property acquisition on Hayden Island than a Supplemental Bridge; and,

WHEREAS, high capacity transit in an exclusive right-of-way would provide greatly improved transit service with much better schedule reliability and service than mixed-use traffic operation; and,

WHEREAS, LRT would produce higher total transit ridership in the corridor than BRT; and

WHEREAS, LRT is more cost effective than Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and is about one-half as expensive to operate per transit rider crossing the river; and,

WHEREAS, the potential for private investment and development in proximity to nearby transit stops or stations is greater with LRT than BRT; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro area has made substantial investment in LRT and extending LRT to Vancouver Washington would ensure better high capacity transit system compatibility; and,

WHEREAS, any of the bridge alternatives would result in greatly improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities for crossing the Columbia River; and,

WHEREAS, the CRC Project is guided, in part, by the recommendations of a 39 member Task Force, of which the Metro Council has a representative; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council desires to establish policy guidance for its representative on the Task Force concerning an upcoming vote on key issues which will lead to a future decision about which alternative should be selected as the locally preferred alternative; and; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council recommends the following policy guidance to its CRC Task Force representative:

1. As a general policy framework, the Metro Council continues to support a balanced multi-modal approach of highway, high capacity transit, transportation demand management, bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the Columbia River Crossing corridor.

2. The Metro Council supports a CRC solution that includes: a) Light rail transit (LRT) extended to Vancouver, Washington, b) a Replacement Bridge with three through lanes with the number of auxiliary lanes to be determined through a subsequent process and amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan

and, c) Tolls designed to manage travel demand as well as providing capital construction funding and ongoing bridge operations and maintenance funding.

3. The Metro Council recommends that the project considerations included in item 2, above and in Exhibit A, be taken into account as elements of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) are prepared.

4. There are project elements that will not be determined at the time of LPA adoption. These elements may include: a) the number of through and auxiliary lanes on the Replacement Bridge, b) overall finance plan and the type and rate of tolls, c) bicycle and pedestrian facility design and location, d) the travel demand management approach and plan specifics and, e) the design of interchanges and how they would be integrated into the Hayden Island and Expo Center areas. If these elements are not addressed in the LPA, Metro Council would need to participate in these decisions either directly or through a Metro Council representative. This issue should be addressed in concert with the draft LPA.

5. The Metro Council will consider approval of the LPA after consideration of public comment, the CRC Task Force, local jurisdiction and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) recommendations, and comparison with items 1 through 4 of this resolution and Exhibit A. An amendment of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan will be considered concurrent with the LPA decision.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this day of , 2008.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Metro Council Issues and Suggested Solutions concerning the Columbia River Crossing Locally Preferred Alternative

Issue 1: Implications for the Transportation System within the Metro Area.

Overview: During the CRC project discussions there have been assertions by some parties that the CRC project is only part of the solution to the transportation challenges of the greater metropolitan region. As a transportation project in a single corridor, the CRC project was never meant to be the sole solution to regional needs. It is, however, part of Metro's coordinated regional system of highway, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and freight improvements as outlined in the RTP. There are other corridors with transportation problems now and in the future and these other corridors will require their own unique set of transportation improvements. We also recognize that improvements in the CRC project area do not commit the Oregon side of the region to make additional capacity improvements in the I-5 corridor south of the project area.

Suggested Solution: Approval of CRC project should not commit the Metro region to additional highway improvements in the I-5 corridor south of the project area, or in any other corridor in the region. Language to this effect could be placed in the CRC Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation and the Metro RTP. Issues with respect to other corridors will be addressed in Metro's update of the RTP, State Component.

Issue 2: Number of Travel Lanes in Bridge Influence Area.

Overview: The number of general purpose travel lanes on the I-5 bridge, as well as the size and number of lanes for approaches, associated collector/distributor roads, auxiliary lanes and turn lanes has been a concern raised by many different stakeholders. These concerns included the effect of removing the I-5 capacity bottleneck and "flooding" the region with more traffic than the regional road system can handle.

Suggested Solution: Concerns about traffic "flooding" the regional system with removal of the I-5 bottleneck are not supported by the CRC project's analysis to date. Designs that consider three through lanes and either one, two, or three auxiliary lanes in each direction at the river should be advanced for further study, in keeping with adopted Metro Council policy. A preliminary analysis of the benefits and costs of various combinations of lane types should be provided by the CRC prior to selection of the LPA. The final results of that process should be reviewed with the Bi-State Coordination Committee and then forwarded to JPACT and then the Metro Council for approval and amendment of the RTP.

Issue 3: Air Quality

Overview: Concerns have been raised by the public about the affect of vehicle emissions on the health of residents who live in close proximity to I-5. The CRC project estimates that air pollutants will be substantially reduced in the future over present levels. For example, levels of benzene are expected to be over 60 percent less than existing levels. This kind of dramatic decrease is expected for the other air toxics measured as recommended by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality including 1,3-Butadiene, Formaldehyde, Acetaldehyde, Acrolein and Diesel PM. Further, all air toxic emissions will be lower with Build alternatives than for the No Build alternative. These improvements arise from congestion reduction and improvements in vehicle emissions anticipated by 2030. (For Greenhouse Gases, see Carbon Footprint, Issue 11).

Suggested Solution: As a means of addressing neighborhood concerns and confirming forecasts of future air quality improvements, air quality monitoring for North Portland should be conducted regularly to provide data to ensure that air quality meets (and likely is better than) applicable federal and state standards.

Issue 4: Carbon Footprint (Green House Gases)

Overview: The CRC alternatives analysis found that the build alternatives (with tolls), would result in fewer greenhouse gas emissions than any other Build alternative as well as the No Build. However, concerns have been raised by several CRC Task Force members that the future may be very different than today with regard to oil availability and price, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

Suggested Solutions: The LRT element of the CRC project creates the opportunity for an all-electric transit mode with capacity far surpassing the ridership forecasts for 2030. The combined highway and transit project has the potential to carry very high volumes of people through the corridor with less reliance on petroleum than today. The project's Transportation System Management, Transportation Demand Management, bicycle and pedestrian strategies will also contribute to reduction of greenhouse gases with the build alternatives. As a result of LRT and tolls, the DEIS forecasts are that with a Replacement Bridge, there would be fewer autos crossing the Columbia River in the year 2030 than with the No Build, which translates to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Issue 5: Funding and Phasing Strategy

Overview: There is a scarcity of transportation funds in the Metro region. Any of the build alternatives represent a significant commitment of public resources. There is also a high level of interest from all geographic areas of the Metro region for transportation investments. There is concern that approval of the CRC project could require all of the available local, state and federal transportation funding for many years, even with a substantial contribution from project tolls.

Suggested Solution: This project is viewed as a high priority for highway and transit funding in the context of the overall implementation of the RTP. Given the national significance of the project, the CRC project is pursuing USDOT Corridor of the Future funding as well as tolls and state discretionary funding. FTA New Starts funding, together with State of Washington toll credits are being sought to fund up to 100% of transit improvements. In the event that there are not sufficient funds to construct the proposed project, ODOT, WSDOT, C-Tran, TriMet, Metro and the RTC should examine the proposed project for ways to either reduce project costs or phase improvements. For example, some of the interchange work could be postponed or some lanes phased in over a 5 to 10 year period. A minimum operable segment for light rail could also be pursued if funding for a full project is not available. (For discussion of possibly tolling I-205 Bridge, see Issue 7)

Issue 6: Tolling and Demand Management

Overview: Tolling, when implemented, could potentially function as a demand management tool as well as a revenue source to fund capital improvements. Some have suggested that tolls should only be imposed for capital funding and have suggested that tolling be eliminated once the initial project construction capital costs and debt have been retired. Removing tolls at that time – or greatly reducing tolls - could reduce or eliminate the demand management effect and result in inefficient use of the I-5 bridge over the Columbia River, as well as lead to lack of revenue for renewal and replacement.

Suggested Solution: Tolling decisions must consider the effect of demand management on the efficient use of the freeway lane capacity of I-5, as well as the need to fund Renewal and Replacement. Metro policy, included in the recently adopted federal RTP, allows for selective application of value pricing as a demand management tool. ODOT and WSDOT, working with Metro, RTC and the community should manage the tolls (rates, time of day imposed, vehicle differentials, etc.) during peak hours of demand. Performance standards should be developed that; 1) promote efficient use of freeway lane capacity, 2) provide travel speeds in the corridor which support truck freight movement, 3) promote transit use for people traveling in the corridor and 4) significantly discourage single occupant vehicle travel (also, see related suggestion in the greenhouse gas section).

Issue 7: Tolling – One Bridge or Two?

Overview: The CRC project focus is on I-5 and tolling a replacement or supplemental bridge on I-5 across the Columbia Rive is being considered. However, concerns have been raised that tolling only the I-5 corridor could potentially increase trips across the I-205 bridge and increase out of direction travel on arterial and other roads in the Metro area.

Suggested Solution: CRC analysis has shown that I-5 tolling does not cause substantial diversion to an untolled I-205 bridge. Tolling the I-205 bridge is currently not an option given federal regulations that prohibit tolling of existing freeways unless approved as a pilot project (the I-205 Bridge is not currently included in the federal toll pilot program

list), or if improvements were made in that bridge influence area. As the project progresses, ODOT and WSDOT should work with Metro and the Regional Transportation Council to examine issues related to tolling both bridges and determine whether tolling of the I-205 bridge warrants further consideration.

Issue 8: Transit Funding Flow – Effect on Highway Project

Overview: The CRC project, as currently described, includes investments in transportation facilities serving a variety of modes including automobiles, trucks, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. This multi-modal approach is consistent with the Metro RTP, as it recognizes that there are a variety of transportation needs and a variety of modes that can serve these needs. However, funding sources and the timing of federal and state funding differ from mode to mode. There is a concern that the LRT investment not lag the freeway investments due to the FTA New Starts funding process and Congressional appropriation process.

Suggested Solution: In a recent joint highway and light rail project (Westside LRT and ODOT US 26 improvements), the opposite was true – highway funding and construction significantly lagged the FTA New Starts funding and construction of the LRT line. The LPA should include a recommendation that LRT and freeway investments advance simultaneously.

Issue 9: Bike and Pedestrian Lanes

Overview: Walking and bicycling will continue to be affordable and accessible travel options in the corridor – particularly with upgraded high quality facilities. If the CRC project includes a long, unimpeded stretch of bike lanes, it is likely that bike speeds could be high, causing potential conflicts between serious commuter cyclists and recreational riders and walkers on a shared facility. There is also a desire in the community to locate the bike facilities on the east side of the bridge to have an unobstructed view of Mount Hood and the Columbia Gorge.

Suggested Solution: It would be safer and more useable if bicycle and pedestrian paths were separated. In addition, bike lane widths would be safer if designed for at least 7 ½ feet per lane or greater (15 feet width if a two-way bike facility is pursued). Though the view from of the Columbia River and the Gorge is better from the east side of the northbound replacement bridge, it may not be feasible or cost-effective to locate the new bicycle and pedestrian in this location. Further, the establishment of a landmark or design feature at the boundary between Oregon and Washington along the scenic bike and pedestrian path in the manner of the famous “four corners” monument deserves consideration. CRC should further investigate this location and provide the results of their analysis.

Issue 10: Other Neighborhood Impacts

Overview: Historically, there have been some impacts along I-5 to residents in north and northeast Portland. The I-5 freeway severs east-west connection between neighborhoods. Investments made in neighborhoods could address the continuing impacts of the I-5 freeway. This principle was included in the recommendations of the *Strategic Plan of the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership.*

Suggested Solution: Create significant community enhancements adjacent to the I-5 freeway to be funded by the project. Funds should be expended on public improvements in the immediate area of I-5 in north and northeast Portland in consultation with the neighborhoods within the bridge influence area.

Issue 11: Hayden Island Accessibility.

Overview: Currently the Hayden Island area must rely upon one interchange on I-5 for accessibility. This is both a concern from a safety standpoint – emergency evacuation is limited, as well as an inconvenience at times when I-5 is congested due to either large amounts of traffic or an accident.

Suggested Solution: The DEIS documents how the Replacement Bridge provides better access to Hayden Island than the No-Build alternative. Further, ODOT should explore the feasibility of using one or more of the existing I-5 bridge spans or LRT span as an arterial connection between Hayden Island and the rest of Portland to the south.

Issue 12: Gateway

Overview: I-5 at the Columbia River is the gateway to Oregon, to the Metro area, and to the City of Portland. How the traveling public, whether for the first time or as a daily occurrence, sees this portal will reflect positively or negatively depending on the transportation facility design's sensitivity to the adjacent land uses and vistas.

Suggested Solution: ODOT and WSDOT should work with local jurisdictions to explore designs that will provide a distinctive and inspiring project, when designing the bridge and motor vehicle interchanges that will connect with the freeway. Given constraints on the bridge type imposed by navigation and aviation clearance issues, care should be taken to ensure that the total project design provides a recognizable gateway to Oregon and Washington.

Issue 13: Bi-State Coordination.

Overview: The CRC project includes portions of two states and will likely include light rail transit service between two states as well as tolling that would affect two states. Each of these items will require either navigating the laws of two states – or – could be addressed through a variety of coordinating entities.

Suggested Solution: ODOT and WSDOT are working with Metro, CTRAN, TriMet and the Regional Transportation Council to assess the pros and cons of the various

coordination methods. These methods could include intergovernmental agreements, cooperative agreements or other mutually agreed upon coordination mechanisms such as a bi-state compact. Light rail transit operation and maintenance and collection and distribution of fares and toll revenues are all aspects of the project that could benefit from formal agreements.

Issue 14: Ongoing Project Advisory Process.

Overview: While the locally preferred alternative (LPA) will be selected soon, there will remain other issues related to the implementation of the LPA. A final environmental impact statement, final design and construction plan will need to be prepared in ways that reflect the interests and concerns of the I-5 facility users as well as nearby residents and communities.

Suggested Solution: ODOT and WSDOT are identifying options that include continuing involvement of affected local jurisdictions and public participation opportunities as implementing elements of the CRC LPA are being considered.

Issue 15: Marine Drive Interchange Design and Expo Center

Overview: Rebuilding the Marine Drive interchange to improve freight mobility could have significant impacts on the operations of Metro's Expo Center through loss of parking and/or necessary access for customers and exhibitors.

Suggested Solution: The CRC project should work closely with Metro and the Metropolitan Exposition and Recreation Commission to ensure that the Expo remains viable and continues to serve the economy of the region.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3938, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING METRO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING KEY PRELIMINARY DECISIONS LEADING TO A FUTURE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE DECISION 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 24th 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.

<u>Decision-making Process and Schedule</u>
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 pedestsrian 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 Reconforming 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

Attachment 1 to Staff Reports for Resolutions #08-3938 and #08-3948

	Resolution 08-3938 – Burkholder	Resolution 08-3948- Liberty, Hosticka & Collette
Process		
	- 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.	- Sets Metro CRC Project policy.
	- 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. - This process would allow the project to meet its current schedule for submitting materials to the Federal Transit Administration for entry into Preliminary Engineering.	- 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. - 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. - 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.
Policy		
	- Reaffirms Metro Council support for a multi-modal CRC project solution, including highway, high capacity transit, transportation demand management and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. - 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).	- 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. - 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.
	- 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. - 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.	- 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.
	- 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.	- 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.
	- 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. - Allows project to meet current schedules for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) process and re-authorization funding.	- 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.