

Bridge Choice – Considerations*

	No Build	Supplemental Bridge	Replacement Bridge
Community Livability and Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion and lack of bike/pedestrian improvements severely restrict mobility and access on Hayden Island • Growing cut-through traffic severely constrains mobility and access on Main Street and downtown Vancouver • Keeps historic bridge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes direct access between Marine Drive and Hayden Island • Closes 6th Street near Main, hindering access to Convention Center • Cut-through traffic in downtown Vancouver disrupts access and circulation to local businesses and residential development • Slightly less impact on Fort Vancouver Historic Reserve • Keeps historic bridge, but seismic retrofits might alter character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could impact the fewest floating homes on Hayden Island and could avoid removal of Safeway and Red Lion on Hayden Island • 6th Street stays open and maintains access to Vancouver Convention Center • Provides better access to waterfront via extension of Main Street • Improves pedestrian/bicycle connections • Removes historic bridge
Transportation Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound p.m. congestion grows to 8 hrs • Southbound a.m. congestion grows to 6 hrs • 78 – 87 percent of traffic demand met in peak hours • Reverse commute congestion occurs • Bridge lifts affect both northbound and southbound traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound congestion 7.5 hrs in p.m. • Southbound congestion 3 hrs in a.m. • 74 – 98 percent of traffic demand met in peak hours • Northbound traffic must stop for bridge lifts • Only 1/3 of demand served on Hayden Island • Drivers must make exiting decisions four miles in advance of Vancouver exits due to highway split at bridge • Seismic retrofit reduces spacing between piers, limiting marine navigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No northbound congestion in p.m. • Southbound congestion 3.5 hrs in a.m. • 94 percent of traffic demand met in peak hours • Removal of bridge lift improves mobility for bridge and marine traffic

*The CRC project’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement analyzes project effects for the categories above and many others. This table shows the areas where there is an appreciable difference between the alternatives. This table represents information available for the October 2007 CRC open houses and is subject to change.

Bridge Choice – Considerations* (continued)

	No Build	Supplemental Bridge	Replacement Bridge
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short on-ramps and closely spaced interchanges are not improved • Sight distance not improved on bridge • High crash rate expected to double with increase in congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some short on-ramps and closely spaced interchanges are not improved • Sight distance not improved for northbound drivers • Bridge lifts continue to contribute to high rear-end crash rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crash rate drops due to decrease in congestion and improved safety features
Cost (includes high capacity and highway lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$8.4 million annual operating and maintenance costs (2007 dollars) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1.0 – \$1.4 billion construction cost (year of expenditure dollars) • \$ 7.7 million annual operating and maintenance cost (2007 dollars) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1.2 - \$1.6 billion construction cost (year of expenditure dollars) • \$ 0.7 annual operating and maintenance cost (2007 dollars)
Constructability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No construction effects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installs more in-water columns that provide habitat for salmon predators • Treats stormwater from most of I-5 but cannot treat some stormwater on Interstate Bridge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves salmon habitat with better stormwater treatment and fewer in-water columns
Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No stormwater runoff treatment from Interstate Bridge or most of I-5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge/highway connections challenging to build • Significant safety concerns regarding retrofit of existing Interstate Bridge while traffic is flowing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New bridge constructed while all I-5 traffic remains on existing bridge

*The CRC project’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement analyzes project effects for the categories above and many others. This table shows the areas where there is an appreciable difference between the alternatives. This table represents information available for the October 2007 CRC open houses and is subject to change.

Transit Mode Choice – Considerations*

	No Build	Bus Rapid Transit	Light Rail
Transportation Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Express and local buses get caught in congestion with all other vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All non-express buses transfer at Expo Center Service expansion limited by number of buses Travel speeds somewhat slower in guideway due to high number of buses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No transfers at Expo Center Higher daily and annual ridership Faster transit travel times from seven Clark County areas to the five major Oregon destination areas Higher productivity and system efficiency
Cost (includes all possible alignments and lengths)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$0.47 – \$0.99 billion construction cost (year of expenditure dollars) Higher annual operating costs per passenger 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$0.53 - \$1.17 billion construction cost (year of expenditure dollars) Lower annual operating costs per passenger
Community Livability and Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little support or opportunity for transit-oriented development Few travel choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides high capacity transit to encourage transit-oriented development Less potential for transit oriented development than light rail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases opportunities for transit-oriented development, addressing local and regional land use goals Better addresses some local plans, including the Esther Short and Hough neighborhood plans
Constructability	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shorter construction duration than for light rail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer construction duration due to utility relocation and track placement Length of construction would create more temporary effects to businesses and community than bus rapid transit

*The CRC project’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement analyzes project effects for the categories above and many others. This table shows the areas where there is an appreciable difference between the alternatives. This table represents information available for the October 2007 CRC open houses and is subject to change.

Transit Alignment Choice – Considerations*

	No Build	I-5 Alignment	Vancouver Alignment
Community Livability and Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No property acquisitions • Neighborhoods do not benefit from improved transit access • Little opportunity for transit-oriented development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer property acquisitions than Vancouver alignment • Suburban commuters are the primary market served • 33rd Street station located at highway level, outside of neighborhood • Transit-oriented development would be constrained by highway to the east and single family zoning to the west 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More property acquisitions than I-5 alignment; Mill District terminus would avoid many of these property acquisitions • Neighborhood residents are the primary market served • 33rd Street station located in neighborhood • Improved transit access for pedestrians and bicyclists • Provides more opportunity than I-5 alignment for transit-oriented development and community investment
Cost (construction cost depends on bridge choice and transit mode selected)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction costs would be \$180 – \$200 million more than Vancouver alignment • Higher annual operating and maintenance costs than Vancouver alignment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction costs would be \$180 – \$200 million less than I-5 alignment • Lower annual operating and maintenance costs than I-5 alignment
Constructability	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction would require tunnels, bridges and shifting I-5, disrupting highway traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorter duration and less complicated construction than I-5 alignment • More construction impacts to Uptown Vancouver business district

*The CRC project’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement analyzes project effects for the categories above and many others. This table shows the areas where there is an appreciable difference between the alternatives. This table represents information available for the October 2007 CRC open houses and is subject to change.