Proposed Organization of Presentation Materials for Task Force Meetings

Draft – October 2, 2001

1. "Tier 3" Materials
   - Most detailed levels of information
   - Are tech memos, other products produced by Task Leaders

2. "Tier 2" Materials
   - For crowd below the clouds that wants some detailed info.
   - Will be actual data (minutes of travel, # of properties impacted, transit riders) corresponding to most criteria (e.g., 1.1a)
   - Organized by Decision Point to extent possible
   - Tabular format similar to Phase I Evaluation Matrices
   - Initially, develop data for all criteria for all options. Key differences can be described elsewhere (see below)
   - Note: Most "synthesis" has occurred for travel model output (e.g., data for multiple o/d pairs has been collapsed into a single aggregate or average statistic).
   - More detailed info should be sought in Tier 3 materials/from Task Leader.
   - Data is to inform/backup Tier 1 information (key findings/distinctions)
   - Will still be lots of information (which some will want to see). Should be distributed to all TF, but not discussed in detail. Organize discussion primarily around Tier 1 materials
   - Some sample formats developed

3. "Tier 1" Materials
   - Is most simplified information; completed last after reviewing data, but some work can begin earlier
   - Will include Consumer Reports style ratings (probably 3 or 4 scores: ++,+,0,-) for each sub-criteria. Scores are relative to other options
   - Will not include overall score (we agreed not weight criteria, and everyone will do this differently)
   - Will also include key findings/distinctions organized by Decision Point, in bullet text form. Include words and key statistics.
   - Good place for Task Leaders to note important differences they observed. Can have multiple cooks.
   - Sample format developed

Sample Tier 1 Information – Draft 10/2/01

Key Findings Pertaining to Decision Points
OR
Key Distinctions Between Option Packages

Decision 1: New West Arterial Road?

Strengths:

- The new roadway utilizes existing right of way, resulting in relatively fewer property acquisitions
- Trucks traveling between the Port of Portland, Hayden Island, and T-6 (X per day) will realize significant travel time savings and are the primary beneficiary of these improvements
- An elevated viaduct would look really cool
-
-
-

Weaknesses:

- Little traffic is diverted from I-5; congestion levels remain largely unchanged, and most truck travel utilizes I-5 for a portion of trips.
- The only users of the new capacity live in neighborhood X
- The new pink bridge to Hayden Island is ugly
-
-
-

Non-Impacts, Outstanding Issues (?):

- The costs for these improvements are in the middle range compared to other improvements
- Changing X could significantly improve transportation performance; additional study may be warranted

Decision 2: Commuter Rail?

???

Decision 3: Express Bus or LRT?

Strengths, Weaknesses, etc….

Express Bus to Expo

Strengths, Weaknesses, etc....

Express Bus to Downtown Portland
LRT to Clark College

Strengths, Weaknesses, etc....

LRT Loop

Strengths:

- The light rail loop achieves the highest transit ridership
- This option offers the greatest opportunity to focus desired development patterns (e.g., mixed-use, higher density) in Clark County
-
-

Weaknesses:

- The light rail loop is the most expensive transit option
- The light rail "loop" is likely to have the most significant environmental impacts (e.g., disturbed/relocated wetlands)
-
-
-
-

Non-Impacts, Outstanding Issues (?):

- The local cost of these improvements are likely to be reduced due to FTA contributions

Decision 4: Freeway 3 or 4 Lanes Wide?

Which options? Four?
Bus w/ 3, 4
LRT w/ 3,4

Decision 5: River Crossing?

Many permutations. Which ones do we describe/have travel impacts for? Are all costed?

Sample Tier 1 Information - Draft 10/2/01

Summary of Findings By Decision Point

Do by Option Package

	Baseline 1B	New West Arterial Road	Commuter Rail	Express Bus to Expo	Express Bus to Downtown Portla	LRT to Clark College	LRT Loop	Etc...
Maintain/Improve Transportation Performance								
Improve Travel Times	- 0 NA +							
Maintain/Reduce Congestion	- 0 NA +							
Promote Transportation Choices	- 0 NA +							
Enhance Public Safety	- 0 NA +							
Improve Travel Reliability	- 0 NA +							
Impacts on Other Streets	- 0 NA +							
Support Trade and Freight Movement								
Improve Strength of Regional Industrial Areas	- 0 NA +							
Increase Regional Business Savings	- 0 NA +							
Minimize Impacts to Water Navigation[1]	NA NA NA NA							
Reduce Freight Delay	- 0 NA +							
Maintain/Enhance Quality of Life								
R e Spillover Traffic	- 0 NA +							
Support Adopted City Plans (Avoid impacts to existing land uses)	- 0 NA +							
Air Quality Impacts	- 0 NA +							
Avoid/Minimize Right of Way, Displacements	- 0 NA +							
Minimize Average Commute Time	- 0 NA +							
Average Auto Occupancy	- 0 NA +							
Increase Transit Ridership	- 0 NA +							
Minimize Time Cost of Travel	- 0 NA +							
General Quality of Life (????)	- 0 NA +							
Avoid/Minimize Impacts to Environment								
Minimize Impacts to Historic/Cultural/Institutional Resources	- 0 NA +							
Minimize Air Quality Impacts	- 0 NA +							
Minimize Impacts to Natural Resources	- 0 NA +							
Support Regional Land Use Plans (Metroscope results)								
Mixed Use Development in Downtowns, Regional Centers	- 0 NA +							
Percentage of Population/Employment Forecasts Achieved	- 0 NA +							
Average Home to Work Trip Distance	- 0 NA +							
Employment in Industrial Centers	- 0 NA +							
Distribute Benefits, Costs, and Impact Equitably								
Travel Time by Neighborhood	- 0 NA +							
Property Impacts by Neighborhood	- 0 NA +							
Air Quality by Neighborhood (????)	- 0 NA +							
Ev e Costs								
Capital Costs	- 0 NA +							
Operating Costs	- 0 NA +							

-3 to +3 7 Scale

[1] Depends on final design (e.g., bridge pier placement). Encroachment into Pearson Airpark Space can also not be assessed.

I-5 Trade Corridor
Historic Resources Matrix

No.	Resource Name	Location	Designation Type	Option 1a	Option 1b	Option 1c	Option 1d	Option 2	Option 3b	Option 3c	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
21													
22													
23													
24													

Impacts:
Full (F)-The proposed option would require the removal or demolition of entire structure
Major (MA)-The proposed option would have some physical impact on property and may introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that would diminish the historic integrity of the site or structure
Minor (MI)-The proposed option would have no physical impacts on property, but would introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that could impact the historic integrity of the site or structure
No Impact (NI)-The proposed option would have neither physical nor visual, atmospheric, or audible impacts on the structure or site.