

Project Sponsor's Council, 10-26-06

Speaking notes for project update:

- 1) The schedule of upcoming task force meetings and topics is shown in your packet. The focus of the next several meetings will be to narrow the river crossing and transit alternatives to be considered in the DEIS. We'll be talking more about those key decisions in a few moments.
- 2) Under upcoming activities, we have a lot of ongoing meetings, include the Task Force meetings, of course, as well as InterCEP meetings, working group meetings (transit/modeling, environmental, design, freight), and our community and EJ working group. In addition, we recently held a tribal coordination meeting for all the interested tribes. On top of that, of course, the analysis of modeling results is ongoing, and continued development of highway and transit design concepts.
- 3) CEVP: We conducted our first (of several planned) analysis of potential construction costs for the project, using WSDOT's CEVP process, which identifies the probability of potential risks and costs to derive a range of costs. (More explanation if needed). Results from that analysis will be coming out in the next few weeks. We expect that it will help us to focus on those risk areas that we can control, and also to point to areas where cost savings should be investigated.
- 4) InterCEP continues to meet monthly. They are concurrently reviewing the analysis results for the 12 alternatives (following the same time line as the Task Force). Selection of the DEIS alternatives is a concurrence point, so we will be asking for that concurrence early next year.
- 5) Communications: Barbara will give a quick summary of outreach activities and some of the general themes that we've been hearing. After that, Tom will do a brief update on the focus groups that we held over the last two weeks.



700 WASHINGTON STREET
 VANCOUVER, WA 98660
 360-737-2726 | 503-256-2726

PROJECT SPONSORS COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, November 21, 2006

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: CRC Project Office
 700 Washington Street, 2nd Floor Community Room
 Vancouver, WA

Members: Sam Adams - City of Portland Arch Miller - RTC
 Rex Burkholder - Metro Betty Sue Morris - C-TRAN
 Matt Garrett - ODOT Royce Pollard - City of Vancouver
 Fred Hansen - TriMet Don Wagner - WSDOT

Meeting Objectives:

- Review staff recommendations for DEIS alternatives

AGENDA

1:00 p.m.	Overview of Agenda	Discussion
1:05 a.m.	Update on Key Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Schedule and Milestones • Upcoming Activities • CEVP • Inter CEP • Public Outreach and Communications 	Discussion
1:30 p.m.	Key decisions and recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transit Modes - River Crossing - DEIS alternatives 	Discussion
2:45 p.m.	Wrap up. Next meeting date: December 21, 10:00 a.m. – Noon Schedule next meeting	Discussion
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

Materials to email to Project Sponsors Council and to PSC cc list:

- 1) agenda
- 2) meeting summary
- 3) issues discussion
- 4) memo re: evaluation framework
- 5) Evaluation framework
- 6) Upcoming meetings (Task Force/Open Houses/Project Sponsors Council)
- 7) Communications summary
- 8) Funding and cash flow: chart and text

PROJECT SPONSORS COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, January 18, 2007, 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.

Location: CRC Project Office, Vancouver
700 Washington Street, 2nd Floor Community Room

Members: Sam Adams - City of Portland Arch Miller - RTC
Rex Burkholder - Metro Betty Sue Morris - C-TRAN
Matt Garrett - ODOT Royce Pollard - City of Vancouver
Fred Hansen - TriMet Don Wagner - WSDOT

Meeting Objectives:

- Update on progress to date
- Discussion of key actions and decisions in 2007

AGENDA

9:30 a.m.	Overview of Agenda	Discussion
9:35 a.m.	Schedule Overview – Action Steps in 2007 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locally Preferred Alternative Hearings in October/November <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bridge alignment - Transit mode/alignment/station locations - Interchange configurations • Draft Financial Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New Starts Eligibility Evaluation - Transit Ownership/Operations 	
10:15 a.m.	Public Outreach on DEIS Alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress report on Outreach • Council/Board actions prior to Task Force action in February? 	Presentation /Discussion
10:45 a.m.	Urban Design Work Group – update	
11:00 a.m.	Update on BRT and LRT optimization process/schedule	Discussion
	Other?	Discussion
	Wrap up. Next meeting date:	Discussion
11:30 a.m.	Adjourn	

EXHIBIT F



LIBRARY/MAPS

- Biological Assessment/Opinion
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- Email Updates
- Fact Sheets
- Final Environmental Impact Statement
- General Project Documents
- Graphics, Photographs and Multimedia
- Independent Review Panel
- Maps
- Meeting Materials
- Memorandums
- Newsletters
- Open House and Listening Session Materials

Home » Library/Maps » Meeting Materials

Library/Maps

MEETING MATERIALS

Click headings to sort

Title	Date	Size
Task Force - July 12, 2006 Meeting Materials	07/12/2006	5 M
Task Force - June 14, 2006 Meeting Materials	06/14/2006	2 M
Community and Environmental Justice Group Charter	05/23/2006	31 K
Task Force - May 17, 2006 Meeting Materials	05/17/2006	4 M
Task Force - April 26, 2006 Meeting Materials	04/26/2006	12 M
Task Force - March 22, 2006 Meeting Materials	03/22/2006	7 M
Task Force - February 1, 2006 Meeting Materials	02/01/2006	929 K
Task Force - January 4, 2006 Meeting Materials	01/04/2006	5 M
Task Force - October 12, 2005 Meeting Materials	10/12/2005	413 K
Task Force - September 12, 2005 Meeting Materials	09/12/2005	4 M
Task Force - May 4, 2005 Meeting Materials	05/04/2005	465 K
Task Force - February 3, 2005 Meeting Materials	02/03/2005	61 K
Task Force - November 30, 2005 Meeting Materials	11/30/2004	4 M

EXHIBIT G

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Project Controls Report

June 2006





Title VI

The Columbia River Crossing project team ensures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from its federally assisted programs and activities.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

If you would like copies of this document in an alternative format, or are deaf or hard of hearing, please call the Columbia River Crossing Project office at (360) 737-2726 or (503) 256-2726.

Endorsement and Approval

<p>Prepared by:</p> <p>Tonja Gleason, CPA Project Controls Manager</p>	<p>Reviewed by:</p> <p>Ron Anderson Deputy Project Manager</p>
<p>Submitted by:</p> <p>Jay Lyman, PE Project Manager</p>	<p>Reviewed by:</p> <p>Lynn Rust Design Manager, WSDOT</p>
<p>Reviewed by:</p> <p>Rex Wong Transit Manager, WSDOT</p>	<p>Reviewed by:</p> <p>Heather Gundersen Environmental Manager, ODOT</p>
	<p>Approved by:</p> <p>Kris Strickler Deputy Project Director, WSDOT</p>
<p>Approved by:</p> <p>John Osborn Project Co-Director, ODOT</p>	<p>Approved by:</p> <p>Doug Ficco Project Co-Director, WSDOT</p>

Revision History			
Revision	Description	Author	Effective Date
0	First Edition	Tonja Gleason	6/30/06

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW.....	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 Legal Authority	1-1
1.3 Management Statement	1-2
1.4 Purpose and Need	1-2
1.4.1 Project Purpose	1-2
1.4.2 Project Need	1-2
2. PROJECT SCOPE, SCHEDULE, BUDGET	2-1
2.1 Scope	2-1
2.1.1 Phase I: Environmental Impact Statement Agreement No. Y-9245 – May 16, 2005.....	2-1
2.2 Draft Project Schedule	2-2
2.2.1 December 2005 — Define the Problem and Evaluation Criteria (completed January 2006)	2-2
2.2.2 Spring 2006 — Identify Range of Alternatives to Be Considered (In Progress).....	2-2
2.2.3 Fall 2006 — Identify Alternatives to Evaluate in the DEIS	2-2
2.2.4 March 2008 — Identify Locally Preferred Alternative.....	2-3
2.2.5 Fall 2008 — Secure Federal Approval.....	2-3
2.3 Project Budget.....	2-3
3. PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND CONTACTS	3-1
3.1 Project Development	3-1
3.1.1 Project Development Team	3-1
3.1.2 Sponsor Agency Senior Staff.....	3-3
3.1.3 Working Groups.....	3-4
3.2 Recommendations/Task Force	3-5
3.2.1 Composition.....	3-5
3.2.2 Membership	3-6
3.2.3 Responsibilities	3-7
3.2.4 Duration	3-7
3.3 Project Oversight.....	3-7
3.3.1 Project Sponsors Council	3-7
3.3.2 Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA).....	3-10
3.3.3 Interagency Collaborative Environmental Process	3-10
3.3.4 Executive Management Team	3-10
4. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION	4-1
4.1 Project Software	4-1
4.2 Network Drives	4-1
4.3 Project E-mail.....	4-2
4.4 Project Internet Use Policy	4-4
4.4.1 Policies	4-4
4.4.2 Guidelines.....	4-5

4.5 CRC IT Guidelines	4-6
4.6 Project Templates	4-6
4.7 Deliverable Logos.....	4-7
4.8 Confidentiality.....	4-8
5. CONSULTANT BILLINGS, PROGRESS REPORTS, AND CHARGE CODES.....	5-1
5.1 WSDOT Billing Requirements	5-1
5.2 Consultant Team Invoices	5-1
5.3 Project Tracking	5-2
5.4 Time Charged to the Project	5-3
5.5 Reimbursable Expenses	5-4
5.6 Retention of Records.....	5-4
6. PROJECT REPORTING AND TRACKING	6-1
6.1 Reporting.....	6-1
6.1.1 Bi-Weekly Reports	6-1
6.1.2 Monthly Reports.....	6-1
6.2 Meetings.....	6-1
7. CHANGE CONTROL	7-1
7.1 Change Control Strategy.....	7-1
7.1.1 Change Control Process.....	7-1
7.2 Risk Management	7-2
7.2.1 Risk Identification.....	7-2
7.2.2 Risk Analysis	7-2
7.2.3 Risk Response Strategy	7-3
7.2.4 Risk Monitoring and Control.....	7-3
8. COST CONTROL STRATEGIES, SOFTWARE, PROCEDURES	8-1
8.1 Cost Control Strategies	8-1
8.2 Cost Tracking Software	8-1
9. SCHEDULE CONTROL STRATEGIES, SOFTWARE, PROCEDURES	9-1
9.1 Strategy.....	9-1
9.2 Schedule Control System.....	9-1
9.2.1 Level 1 – Master Schedule	9-1
9.2.2 Level 2 – Coordinated Schedules	9-2
9.2.3 Schedule Work Breakdown Structure	9-2
10. DOCUMENT CONTROL STRATEGIES, SOFTWARE, AND PROCEDURES	10-1
10.1 Document Control Strategy	10-1
10.2 Reference Material	10-1
10.3 Project Workpapers.....	10-1
10.4 Official Project Files.....	10-1
10.4.1 Document Distribution and Filing Process	10-2

10.4.2 Data Entry Into Document Control Database.....	10-3
10.5 Document Control Master WBS File Code Index Structure.....	10-3
10.6 Document Control Software.....	10-5
10.7 Document Control Workflow.....	10-5
10.8 Columbia River Crossing: Public Disclosure of Records.....	10-7
11. COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT	11-1
11.1 Communications Program Overview.....	11-1
11.2 Public Involvement and Communications Plan	11-1
11.2.1 Key Messages	11-2
11.2.2 Target Audiences.....	11-2
11.3 Internal Communications Coordination	11-3
11.3.1 Meetings	11-3
11.3.2 Communications Working Group	11-3
11.3.3 E-mail Messages	11-3
11.4 External Communications Coordination	11-3
11.4.1 Neighborhood and Community Outreach	11-3
11.4.2 Jurisdictional, Institutional, and Elected Official Briefings	11-4
11.4.3 Communications Materials.....	11-5
11.4.4 Communications Tracking and Response	11-6
11.4.5 Media Support	11-6
12. SAFETY AND HEALTH.....	12-1
12.1 General	12-1
12.2 Authority and Responsibility	12-1
12.3 Office Safety.....	12-1
12.4 Fire Protection and Prevention.....	12-1
12.5 Emergency Evacuation and Response Procedures	12-1
12.5.1 CRC Building Evacuation Plan	12-2
12.6 Safe Work Practices and Housekeeping.....	12-4
12.7 Notification and Permission.....	12-4
13. QUALITY MANAGEMENT	13-1
13.1 Management Quality Statement.....	13-1
13.2 Program Requirements	13-1
13.3 CRC Quality Assurance Manager	13-1
13.4 Quality Assurance Plan	13-1
13.5 Deliverable Quality Procedures.....	13-2
13.5.1 Deliverable Reviewers	13-2
13.5.2 Production of Draft and Final Client Deliverables	13-2
13.5.3 Procedure for Pre-Draft Deliverable (QC Review)	13-2
13.5.4 Procedure for Submitting Draft Deliverables to the Client and Project Team	13-2
13.6 Resolving Technical Differences	13-2

List of Figures

Figure 3-1. PDT Organization Chart.....	3-2
Figure 4-1. Tier 1 Subdirectory.....	4-1
Figure 4-2. E-mail Web Access Logon.....	4-3
Figure 4-3. Outlook Web Access View.....	4-4
Figure 4-4. CRC Letterhead Template Drive Path	4-6
Figure 4-5. Team Logos.....	4-8
Figure 10-1. Document Control Flowchart	10-6
Figure 12-1. Columbia River Crossing Building Evacuation Plan.....	12-3

List of Tables

Table 2-1 Project Budget	2-3
Table 2-2 Current Project Funding.....	2-4
Table 2-3 Prime Contract.....	2-4
Table 3-1 PDT Contact Listing	3-3
Table 3-2 SASS Contact Listing.....	3-4
Table 3-3 Work Group Description and Participants	3-5
Table 3-4 PSC Contact Listing.....	3-9
Table 3-5 Agency Contact Listing	3-11
Table 4-1. List of Project Templates.....	4-7
Table 5-1. Billing Due Dates for Subconsultants.....	5-2
Table 8-1. WBS Structure for Cost Control	8-2
Table 8-2 Screenshot Examples of Reporting.....	8-2
Table 10-1. File Code Index Structure	10-3
Table 10-2. WBS Group Descriptions	10-3
Table 10-3. Copying Fees for Public Disclosure Requests	10-9

List of Appendices

Appendix 1. Columbia River Crossing Deliverable Process	
Appendix 2. WSDOT/ODOT Listing of Reviewers	
Appendix 3. Columbia River Crossing Summary Deliverable Tracking Report	
Appendix 4. Environmental Phase Baseline Project Schedule	
Appendix 5. Columbia River Crossing Quality Assurance Manual	
Appendix 6. Technical Document Preparation Quality Control Plan	
Appendix 7. Environmental Products Quality Control Procedure	
Appendix 8. Co-Location Guidelines and Co-Location Guidelines Receipt Acknowledgement Form	
Appendix 9. Statement of Qualifications for I-5 Columbia River Crossing	

ACRONYMS

CPM	Critical Path Method
C-TRAN	Clark County Public Transit Benefit Area Authority
DCS	Document Control Specialist
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EJWG	Environmental Justice Working Group
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FOIA	Freedom of Information Act
FTA	Federal Transportation Administration
I-5	Interstate 5
InterCEP	Interagency Collaborative Environmental Process
MPD	Managing Project Delivery
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
ODOT	Oregon Department of Transportation
PCM	Project Controls Manager
PDR	Public Disclosure Request
PDT	Project Development Team
PMP	Project Management Plan
PSC	Project Sponsors Council
RIN	Risk Identification Number
RTC	Regional Transportation Council
SASS	Sponsor Agency Senior Staff
TriMet	Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon
WBS	Work Breakdown Structure
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation

This page intentionally left blank.

1. Overview

1.1 Introduction

The ultimate purpose of the Project Management Plan (PMP) is to clearly define the roles, responsibilities, processes, and activities which will result in the Columbia River Crossing project being completed (1) on time, (2) within budget, (3) with the highest regard for quality, (4) in a safe manner for both the individuals working on the project and for the traveling public, and (5) in a manner in which the public trust, support, and confidence in the project will be maintained.

Due to the size and complexity of the Columbia River Crossing project, implementation of the project required that it be divided into smaller implementable phases that contribute to the overall goals of the program. The current plan addresses the environmental phase through the selection of a preferred alternative for the project, resulting in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Record of Decision and approximately 30 percent completion of the design. Project delivery will be phased as follows:

- Phase I: May 1, 2005 through March 31, 2007 – Initial project development through scoping, development of alternatives, and narrowing of alternatives that will be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).
- Phase II: January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2008 – Continued evaluation of alternatives in the DEIS, selection of a preferred alternative, final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and Record of Decision. The design will be developed to approximately the 30 percent level.
- Phase III: January 1, 2009 through March, 2011 – Completion of the final design and advertisement for construction. (Pending financing and method of delivery.)

The PMP will be refined and revised yearly (beginning May 31, 2007) or more frequently if necessary to maintain system-wide project goals all the way through the construction phases of the Columbia River Crossing project life cycle. In order to keep to a consistent plan, the Columbia River Crossing project team will ensure that the project will be managed holistically and as a continuum, i.e., not incrementally as the project progresses.

1.2 Legal Authority

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) entered into an Interstate Agreement, Funding Agreement for the Columbia River Crossing Project on January 3, 2006. WSDOT is authorized by the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 47.52.020, RCW 47.04.080, and RCW 39.34.030 to enter into this agreement, and ODOT is authorized by Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 190.410 to 190.440 and ORS 381.005 to 381.820) to enter into this agreement.

1.3 Management Statement

Through the WSDOT/ODOT project team, Washington and Oregon have developed an organization around the Columbia River Crossing project that ensures management commitment to an aggressive schedule. As such, it is expected that consultants will augment the WSDOT/ODOT project team workforce and together the consultant and WSDOT/ODOT staff will work as an integrated project team which will be referred to throughout this document as the Project Development Team (PDT). The overall success of the Columbia River Crossing project will be predicated on its ability to have the highest regard for accountability and quality. It is our project management's intent that accountability and quality will be a team effort and that this plan will be used as a roadmap for successfully obtaining each and every goal of the program.

1.4 Purpose and Need

The Columbia River Crossing project Purpose and Need Statement was approved by the Project Sponsors Council in December 2005 and is dated January 17, 2006.

The Interstate 5 (I-5) bridge across the Columbia River is actually two bridges side-by-side, built in 1917 and 1958 respectively. A second river crossing, the I-205 Glenn Jackson Bridge, opened in 1982. Together, the two crossings connect the greater Portland-Vancouver region, carrying over 260,000 trips back and forth across the Columbia River every day.

Now, nearly 90 years after the first bridge opened, growth in the region and in border-to-border commerce is straining the capacity of the two crossings. Growing hours of daily congestion stall commuters and delay freight, resulting in high costs and frustration for everybody. Concerned that a world-class economy cannot continue to grow and thrive without the support of world-class infrastructure, Washington and Oregon have joined together to address the problem.

1.4.1 Project Purpose

The purpose of the proposed action is to improve I-5 corridor mobility by addressing present and future travel demand and mobility needs in the Columbia River crossing Bridge Influence Area. The Bridge Influence Area extends from approximately Columbia Boulevard in the south to SR 500 in the north. Relative to the No-build alternative, the proposed action is intended to achieve the following objectives: a) improve travel safety and traffic operations on the I-5 crossing's bridges and associated interchanges; b) improve connectivity, reliability, travel times, and operations of public transportation modal alternatives in the Bridge Influence Area; c) improve highway freight mobility and address interstate travel and commerce needs in the Bridge Influence Area; and d) improve the I-5 river crossing's structural integrity.

1.4.2 Project Need

The specific needs to be addressed by the proposed action include:

- **Growing Travel Demand and Congestion:** Existing travel demand exceeds capacity in the I-5 Columbia River crossing and associated interchanges. This corridor experiences heavy congestion and delay lasting 2 to 5 hours during both the morning and afternoon peak travel periods and when traffic accidents, vehicle breakdowns, or bridge-lifts occur.

Due to excess travel demand and congestion in the I-5 bridge corridor, many trips take the longer, alternative I-205 route across the river. Spillover traffic from I-5 onto parallel arterials such as Martin Luther King Boulevard and Interstate Avenue increases local congestion. The two crossings currently carry over 260,000 trips across the Columbia River daily. Daily traffic demand over the I-5 crossing is projected to increase by 40 percent during the next 20 years, with stop-and-go conditions increasing to at least 10 to 12 hours each day if no improvements are made.

- **Impaired Freight Movement:** I-5 is part of the National Truck Network, and the most important freight freeway on the West Coast linking international, national, and regional markets in Canada, Mexico, and the Pacific Rim with destinations throughout the western United States. In the center of the project area, I-5 intersects with the Columbia River's deep water shipping and barging as well as two river-level, transcontinental rail lines. The I-5 crossing provides direct and important highway connection to the Port of Vancouver and Port of Portland facilities located on the Columbia River, as well as the majority of the area's freight consolidation facilities and distribution terminals. Freight volumes moved by truck to and from the area are projected to more than double over the next 25 years. Vehicle-hours of delay on truck routes in the Portland-Vancouver area are projected to increase by more than 90 percent over the next 20 years. Growing demand and congestion will result in increasing delay, costs, and uncertainty for all businesses that rely on this corridor for freight movement.
- **Limited Public Transportation Operation, Connectivity, and Reliability:** Due to limited public transportation options, a number of transportation markets are not well served. The key transit markets include trips between the Portland Central City and the City of Vancouver and Clark County, trips between North/Northeast Portland and the City of Vancouver and Clark County, and trips connecting the City of Vancouver and Clark County with the regional transit system in Oregon. Current congestion in the corridor adversely impacts public transportation service reliability and travel speed. Southbound bus travel times across the bridge are currently up to three times longer during parts of the a.m. peak compared to off peak. Travel times for public transit using general purpose lanes on I-5 in the Bridge Influence Area are expected to increase substantially by 2030.
- **Safety and Vulnerability to Incidents:** The I-5 river crossing and its approach-sections experience crash rates nearly 2.5 times higher than statewide averages for comparable facilities. Incident evaluations generally attribute these crashes to traffic congestion and weaving movements associated with closely spaced interchanges. Without breakdown lanes or shoulders, even minor traffic accidents or stalls cause severe delay or more serious accidents.
- **Substandard Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities:** The bike/pedestrian lanes on the I-5 Columbia River bridges are 6 to 8 feet wide – narrower than the 10-foot standard – and are located extremely close to traffic lanes thus impacting safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Direct pedestrian and bicycle connectivity are poor in the Bridge Influence Area.

- **Seismic vulnerability:** The existing I-5 bridges are located in a seismically active zone. They do not meet current seismic standards and are vulnerable to failure in an earthquake.

EXHIBIT H



Environment

[FHWA](#) > [HEP](#) > [Environment](#) > [Toolkit Home](#)

Environmental Review Toolkit

- [Home](#)
- [Planning and Environment](#)
- [NEPA and Project Development](#)
- [Streamlining/Stewardship](#)
- [Historic Preservation](#)
- [Section 4\(f\)](#)
- [Water, Wetlands, and Wildlife](#)

[NEPA and Project Development](#)

[Program Overview](#)

[NEPA Implementation](#)

- ▶ [NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking](#)
- [Purpose and Need](#)
- [Alternatives](#)
- [Impacts](#)
- [Mitigation](#)
- [Interagency Coordination](#)
- [Public Involvement](#)

[NEPA Documentation](#)

[Environmental Justice](#)

[Integrating Road Safety into NEPA Analysis](#)

[Interim Guidance on the Application of Travel and Land Use Forecasting in NEPA](#)

[Bridge Case Study](#)

[Active & Inactive Environmental Impact Statements](#)

.....
[More Information](#)

[Website Feedback](#)

NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking

The Importance of Purpose and Need in Environmental Documents

September 18, 1990

Introduction

The purpose and need section is in many ways the most important chapter of an environmental impact statement (EIS). It establishes why the agency is proposing to spend large amounts of taxpayers' money while at the same time causing significant environmental impacts. A clear, well-justified purpose and need section explains to the public and decisionmakers that the expenditure of funds is necessary and worthwhile and that the priority the project is being given relative to other needed highway projects is warranted. In addition, although significant environmental impacts are expected to be caused by the project, the purpose and need section should justify why impacts are acceptable based on the project's importance.

As importantly, the project purpose and need drives the process for alternatives consideration, in-depth analysis, and ultimate selection. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations require that the EIS address the "no-action" alternative and "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives." Furthermore, a well-justified purpose and need is vital to meeting the requirements of Section 4(f) (49 U.S.C. 303) and the Executive Orders on Wetlands (E.O. 11990) and Floodplains (E.O. 11988) and the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Without a well-defined, well-established and well-justified purpose and need, it will be difficult to determine which alternatives are reasonable, prudent and practicable, and it may be impossible to dismiss the no-build alternative.

The transportation planning process, which includes regional, sub-area, and corridor planning, can serve as the primary source of information for establishing purpose and need as well as evaluating alternatives. Information and forecasts of vehicle miles of travel, travel demand, highway and travel speeds, traffic diversion, time of day characteristics, and traffic accident rates can be provided by the planning process. This information can be used to evaluate congestion, air quality, safety, and other environmental issues for various transportation alternatives including the no-build alternative. Planning can also estimate the benefits and costs associated with highway and transit projects that can be used in the development of project "purpose and need."

Consideration of Alternatives

In urbanized areas, the urban transportation planning process required by Section 134 of Title 23, should result in plans and programs that are consistent with the comprehensively planned development of an area and that integrate transportation, land use, and environmental considerations. Comprehensive planning, which includes transportation, should establish the basic purpose and need for specific projects and the system wide consequences of operational improvements and the no-build alternative. For example, the planning process should identify the need for a transportation improvement between points x and y at some future date. Further, in a high percentage of cases, a decision on the appropriate mode (highway or transit) and the basic project concept (freeway on new location, upgrade of existing facility, light rail transit, bus/high-occupancy vehicle lanes, approximate travel demand, etc.) can be determined. In other cases, it may not be possible to resolve these issues until the conclusion of the project development process. Scoping meetings early in the environmental process are an excellent means to reach agreement with the participants on the basic purpose and need for the project, the consequences of the no-build alternative, and operational improvements and, where possible, the mode and project concept.

After the basic purpose and need for the project are established, a number of lines can theoretically still be drawn to connect points x and y. If the project's purpose and need are so vague as to only stipulate that a transportation improvement between x and y is needed, then reasonable alternatives would cover a wide range and must be evaluated to comply with the CEQ regulations. As the project's purpose and need is refined, a number of alternatives will drop out, thereby permitting a more focused analysis of those alternatives which truly address the problem to be solved. As alternatives are dropped from consideration, it is recommended that the concurrence of those cooperating agencies with jurisdiction by law be sought in that decision.

In a similar manner, the type of improvement to be considered even after the planning process may be wide ranging: from upgrading an existing facility to multi-lane freeway on new location. The traffic demands, safety concerns, system continuity considerations, etc., all will help define reasonable alternatives and products from the transportation planning process should serve as a primary source for this information.

Beyond the CEQ regulations requirement of evaluating all, or a reasonable number representative of the full spectrum of reasonable alternatives, there are other more action-limiting requirements for alternatives under Section 4 (f), the Executive Orders on Wetlands and Floodplains, and the Section 404 (b)(1) guidelines. To address these requirements and conclusively demonstrate that some alternatives are not prudent or practicable, a well-justified purpose and need are vital.

The use of land from a Section 4(f) protected property (significant publicly owned public park, recreation area or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or any significant historic site) may not be approved unless a determination is made that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to such use. There are numerous factors which could render an alternative "not prudent" because of unique problems, including cost and environmental impacts. If an alternative does not meet the project's purpose or satisfy the needs then the alternative is not prudent provided the purpose and need section can substantiate that unique problems will be caused by not building the project.

If a proposed action is to be located in a wetland or it entails a floodplain encroachment with significant impacts, a finding must be made that there is no practicable alternative to the wetland take or floodplain encroachment. Any alternative which does not meet the need for the project is not