## Transportation Results



## Overview of Concept Packages

## Concept Packages Evaluated

- Existing Conditions (2000)
- No Build (2020)
- Baseline (2020)
- West Arterial
- Express Bus/3 Lanes
- LRT/3 Lanes
- Express Bus/4 Lanes
- LRT/4 Lanes


## Congested Lane-Miles <br> On I-5 and I-205 (PM Peak)



## Vehicle Hours of Delay <br> In the Study Area (PM Peak)



## Congestion on Truck Routes

Congested Lane-Miles (PM Peak)


## Value of Truck Delay

(In the Study Area)


Option Package

## 2020 PM Peak Northbound Traffic Patterns Across the Columbia River



## 2020 PM Peak Northbound Truck Patterns Across the Columbia River



## Task Force Draft Bridge Influence Area Recommendations

- Provide three through lanes throughout corridor.
- Provide more capacity across the Columbia River (up to 2 new lanes in each direction for vehicles and 2 light rail tracks).
- Consider interchange improvements between SR500 and Columbia Blvd., where necessary for the Interstate to function smoothly and safely.
- Make the Columbia Blvd. interchange into a full interchange to facilitate freight movement.


## Bridge Influence Area Concepts

## Range of River Crossing Concepts

- Supplemental vs. replacement bridge concepts
- Joint use (LRT-highway) vs. separate bridges
- Alignments east and west of existing bridges
- Freeway lanes and arterial lanes



## Existing configuration:

Two three-lane, low-level lift span bridges


## Concept 1: <br> Five-lane supplemental bridge w/LRT, west of existing bridges

1. Southbound traffic on new five-lane bridge, LRT on lower deck
2. Low- to mid-level bridge, with lift span over existing navigation channel
3. Northbound traffic would be split between the two existing bridges


## Concept 2: <br> Five-lane supplemental bridge east of existing bridges, separate LRT bridge to the west

1. Northbound traffic on new five-lane bridge
2. LRT on new "stand-alone" bridge
3. Low- to mid-level bridges, with lift spans over existing navigation channel
4. Southbound traffic would be split between the two existing bridges, providing five to six lanes


## Concept 3:

 Ten lanes on double-deck fivelane bridge, with LRT retrofitted on existing bridge1. Low- to mid-level bridge with lift span over existing navigation channel
2. Requires retrofitting existing bridge for LRT
(feasibility may be questionable)


## Concept 4: <br> Ten lanes on doubledeck bridge, with LRT on separate new bridge

1. Mid- to high-level bridges. Navigation channel relocated to center of river
2. Potential fixed spans for highway and LRT (with Coast Guard reduction of existing lift requirements), or lift spans


## Concept 5: <br> New six-lane supplemental bridge, use existing bridges for collector-distributor, new LRT bridge

1. Through traffic on new six-lane bridge
2. Existing bridges used for collector-distributor (moving freeway access away from through traffic)
3. LRT on new bridge
4. Low- to mid-level bridges, with lift span over existing navigation channel


## Concept 6:

Four-lane supplemental bridge w/LRT, west of existing bridges

1. Provides for new fourlane bridge with LRT
2. Low- to mid-level bridge with lift span over current navigation channel
3. Use four-lane bridge as collector-distributor (i.e., ramp access for Hayden Island, etc.). Requires flyover ramps north and south, as shown in the schematic on the left


## Concept 7: <br> LRT bridge with twolane arterial, plus new three-lane supplemental bridge for freeway traffic

1. Provides for new fourlane bridge with LRT
2. Low- to mid-level bridges with lift spans over current navigation channel
3. Two lanes on existing northbound bridge could be used for HOV, express lanes, or (potentially) reversible lanes


## Concept 8:

Eight-lane supplemental bridge east of existing bridges, LRT retrofit and two-lane arterial

1. Through traffic on new eight-lane bridge
2. Existing northbound bridge converted to local arterial between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver
3. LRT on retrofitted southbound bridge
4. Low- to mid-level bridge, with lift span over existing navigation channel

## River Crossing Concepts Evaluated

Concepts with ten freeway lanes (\#1-4):
\# 1: New five lane southbound bridge with LRT
\# 4: New double deck freeway bridge, with separate new LRT bridge

Concepts with 6 freeway lanes plus 4-lane CD system(\#5-6)
\# 6: New four lane/LRT bridge for ramp traffic
Concepts with 8 freeway lanes and 2 arterial lanes (\#7-8)
\# 7: New LRT bridge with two arterial lanes, plus new three lane freeway bridge

## Transportation Performance

## Findings

- Additional freeway capacity is needed to address the "bottleneck" caused by the existing bridges and to serve future demand.
- Additional river-crossing capacity plus interchange improvements significantly enhance system performance compared to today and compared to 2020 priority baseline.
- Concepts with 10 freeway lanes, and concepts with 8 freeway plus arterial lanes, appear promising. Trade-offs to be evaluated in future studies should include the balance of traffic on the freeway vs. local streets.


## Findings

- Concepts that split freeway traffic across the river (i.e., supplemental bridge plus existing bridge) do not perform as well as concepts that keep traffic in contiguous lanes.
- HOV utilization and performance is highly dependent on the facilities provided:
- Additional river crossing capacity is needed for HOV system continuity
- Direct access ramps should be considered at key locations (i.e., SR 500)
- Bridge design affects HOV performance (separated bridges limit access)
- add arterial summary bullet


## Performance Measures

- Bridge Influence Area (BIA) Freeway Performance
- Arterial River Crossing Performance
- Regional Changes in Travel Volumes on Affected Arterials


# Bridge Influence Area Freeway Measures of Effectiveness 

- Traffic Volumes
- Travel Time
- Speed
- Delay
- Queuing


## Southbound Travel Demands <br> Along I-5 (AM Peak Hour)



## Northbound Travel Demands

Along I-5 (PM Peak Hour)


## Average Speed <br> I-5 Southbound - Main St. to Lombard (All Traffic)



## Average Speed

I-5 Northbound - Main St. to Lombard (All Traffic)


## Demand and Vehicle Hours of Delay

 (AM and PM Peak Periods)

## Served Demand AM and PM Peak Hours



## Two-Lane Arterial Results

- Projected Demands vs. Capacity
- Travel Patterns
- Travel Distances


## Arterial Travel Demands

- Two-lane arterial modeled from:
- Vancouver CBD to Hayden Island
- Hayden Island to Marine Drive
- Marine Drive to Denver Avenue
- Vancouver CBD - Hayden Island segment would operate at capacity conditions during PM peak - slightly under during AM peak


## Arterial Travel Demands

- 10\% of PM Arterial traffic from/to I-5
- $24 \%$ of AM Arterial traffic from/to I-5
- Arterial reduces peak direction volumes on I-5 bridge by 1,100-1,500 during peak hour


## Arterial Travel Patterns <br> Northbound Across Columbia River (PM Peak Period)



## Average Trip Distances Dave needs to ask Metro for Mainline Results for Option 7 Northbound Across Columbia River (PM Peak Hour)



Option Package

# Changes in Volumes on Affected Roadways 

- Freeway System
- Arterials


## Northbound Travel Demands

Along I-5 (PM Peak Hour)


## Increased Trips Across the Columbia River from Major Arterials

Northbound traveling to I-5 Columbia River Bridge (PM Peak Period)


## Traffic Distribution of Increased Trips Across the Columbia River

Northbound traveling to I-5 Columbia River Bridge (PM Peak Period)


## Northbound Travel Demands

Along I-5 (PM Peak Hour)


## Northbound Travel Demands <br> Along Denver/Interstate Corridor (PM Peak Period)



## Northbound Travel Demands

Along MLK Blvd. Corridor (PM Peak Period)


## Traffic Distribution of Increased Trips Across the Columbia River

Northbound traveling to I-5 Columbia River Bridge (PM Peak Period)


## SR 500 - east of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## Northbound Travel Demands <br> Along I-5 (PM Peak Hour)



Northbound Travel Demands
Along Mill Plain/4th Plain Blvds. - west of I-5 (PM Peak Period)


## Northbound Travel Demands

Along Mill Plain/4th Plain Blvds. - east of I-5 (PM Peak Period)


## Northbound Travel Demands

Along Columbia/Washington Corridor - (PM Peak Period)


## Northbound Travel Demands

Along SR 14 - east of I-5 (PM Peak Period)


## Findings

- Additional freeway capacity is needed to address the "bottleneck" caused by the existing bridges and to serve future demand.
- Additional river-crossing capacity plus interchange improvements significantly enhance system performance compared to today and compared to 2020 priority baseline.
- Concepts with 10 freeway lanes, and concepts with 8 freeway plus arterial lanes, appear promising. Trade-offs to be evaluated in future studies should include the balance of traffic on the freeway vs. local streets.


## Findings

- Concepts that split freeway traffic across the river (i.e., supplemental bridge plus existing bridge) do not perform as well as concepts that keep traffic in contiguous lanes.
- HOV utilization and performance is highly dependent on the facilities provided:
- Additional river crossing capacity is needed for HOV system continuity
- Direct access ramps should be considered at key locations (i.e., SR 500)
- Bridge design affects HOV performance (separated bridges limit access)


# SR 14 - east of I-5 

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## Fourth Plain Blvd. - west of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## Fourth Plain Blvd. - east of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## Mill Plain Blvd. - west of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## Mill Plain Blvd. - east of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## Main St. - south of Fourth Plain Blvd.

(4-Hour PM emmel2)


## Columbia St. - south of Mill Plain Blvd.

(4-Hour PM emmel2)


## Washington St. - south of Mill Plain Blvd.

(4-Hour PM emmel2)


## Marine Dr. - west of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## N Portland Rd. - south of Marine Dr.

(4-Hour PM emmel2)


## Columbia Blvd. - west of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


## Columbia Blvd. - east of I-5

(4-Hour PM emme/2)


