

MEETING TITLE: Task Force Meeting
DATE: February 27, 2007, 4:00 – 8:00 p.m.
LOCATION: ODOT Region 1
 123 NW Flanders Street, Portland

Note: Please turn off all cell phones, handheld devices, and pagers during the meeting as they can disrupt the audio and recording equipment. Thank you.

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
4:00 – 4:15	Welcome & Announcements	
4:15 – 4:20	January 23 Meeting Summary	Approval
4:20 - 4:35	Response to Questions	Discussion
4:35 – 5:35	Public Comment	Receive Public Comment
5:35 –5:45	Report from the Community and Environmental Justice Group	Discussion
5:45 – 6:00	Report on Public Comment and Open Houses	Discussion
6:00 – 7:50	Recommendation on Transit and River Crossing Alternatives for DEIS	Discussion / Action
7:50 – 7:55	Meeting schedule and topics for 2007	Discussion
7:55 – 8:00	Wrap Up and Next Steps	
	<p>Next Meetings: March 27, 4:00-6:30 p.m. WSDOT, Southwest Region Office, 11018 NE 51st Circle, Vancouver, WA</p> <p>April 24, 4 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. Oregon Department of Transportation 123 NW Flanders St., Portland, OR</p>	

DIRECTIONS BY TRANSIT

FROM PORTLAND:

\$0 – Fareless Square from downtown Portland • No transfers
 Accessible by **TriMet bus #10, 33, 35, 44** or **MAX** light rail (Old Town / Chinatown stop). For route information contact TriMet at 503-238-RIDE or www.trimet.org.

FROM VANCOUVER:

\$2.00 • Approx. 50 minutes total • One transfer
 From Downtown Vancouver (7th Street Transit Center) take TriMet bus #6 (Martin Luther King Blvd route) toward Portland. Get off at Martin Luther King Blvd and Convention Center. Transfer to MAX Red or Blue Line to City Center. Exit at Old Town/Chinatown, walk one block north to NW 1st and Flanders. For route information contact TriMet at 503-238-RIDE or www.trimet.org.

We, the members of the Community Environmental Justice Group (CEJG), have been meeting since August of 2006. We are a collection of neighborhood and community representatives within the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) influence area and represent the communities which will be most significantly impacted by this project. Many of our communities contain low income and minority individuals who historically have been overly impacted and excluded from the development and decision making process.

On January 9, 2007 we reviewed the CRC Staff Recommendation of alternatives for advancement into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

It is the consensus of this group that we cannot accept or decline the Staff Recommendation. We believe there are too many unanswered questions regarding the impacts facing the communities we represent.

While we acknowledge improvement to the transportation facilities in the corridor significantly benefit the region, the following issues have yet to be addressed to our satisfaction:

- I. I. Health and Environmental Impacts (include, but are not limited to Air Quality and Noise)
- II. Displacement of Homes, Businesses, Resources, Neighborhoods and Impacts on Quality of Life
- III. Study of Alternatives for Corridor Placement and the Impact Area

I. Health and Environmental Impacts

The CEJG members are concerned about current and future air quality and noise issues, particularly within 1500 feet of the I-5 corridor.

We would like to know the current level of emissions (including diesel emissions) and noise levels to establish a base line for data collection.

We would like to know what air quality and noise standards will be negotiated for construction equipment and related project vehicles.

We would like to know how the air quality and noise standards will be monitored and how they will be mitigated during and after the project is complete, to insure no air quality degradation for ten years within the Bridge Impact Area (BIA).

II. Displacement of Homes, Businesses, Resources, Neighborhoods and Impacts on Quality of Life.

After completing a bus tour of the BIA, the CEJG members calculate the possibility of approximately 100 homes and more than 20 businesses along both sides of the bridge being removed, destroyed or heavily impacted.

We would like to know what compensations and mitigation measures will be made for those home owners, renters and business owners.

Hayden Island could potentially lose virtually all of the neighborhood shopping resources (grocery, pharmacy, restaurants, fuel stations and other retailers).

III. Alternatives and Corridor

Many believe the current corridor is already extended to its maximum and should not be expanded further. Members in Vancouver, Hayden Island and Portland have expressed strong concerns about the significant deterioration of their quality of life both during construction and after the project is completed.

Conclusion

Although the CEJG believes that many, if not most of these issues can be mitigated as specific plans unfold, it is unwilling to offer endorsement of the "Build" option until more specific and detailed planning and solutions are offered to deal with the issues described above.

Therefore, after all of these considerations, the CEJG cannot accept or decline the Staff Recommendation.

We must have more information.

Agreed upon this Fifteenth Day of February, 2007, by unanimous consensus of the following members:

Dave Frei,
CRC Task Force Member
Arnada Neighborhood Association Member
Vancouver, WA

Anne McEnery-Ogle, Chair
Shumway Neighborhood Association
Vancouver, WA

Edward G. Garren,
Hayden Island Neighborhood Network (HiNoon)
Portland, OR

Nicole Williams,
Environmental Justice Action Group,
Boise Neighborhood, Local 36
Portland, OR

Marcia Ward,
Salmon Creek
Vancouver (Hazel Dell), WA

Dave Skagen,
Rose Village Neighborhood, K Street
Vancouver, WA

Kris Long,
Vancouver, WA

John Benson,
Piedmont Neighborhood Association
Portland, OR

Jonath Colón-Montesi,
N/NE Neighborhood Coalition,
Portland, OR

Matt Whitney, President
Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Portland, OR

The following members participated in drafting the response letter, but did not attend the meeting on February 15, 2007: Michelle Tworoger and Connie Sherrard

Environmental Justice Program

Environmental Justice

Environmental Justice is defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or EPA as the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, culture, education, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal environmental programs and policies.

Meaningful involvement means that: (1) potentially affected community residents have an appropriate opportunity to participate in decisions about a proposed activity that will affect their environment and/or health; (2) the public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision; (3) the concerns of all participants involved will be considered in the decision-making process; and (4) the decision-makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected.

Community and Environmental Justice Group

To achieve the goal of meaningful public involvement in the project development process, Columbia River Crossing (CRC) formed the Community and Environmental Justice Group (CEJG). The fifteen members of the CEJG come from neighborhoods in the project area and include environmental justice communities (low-income, African American, Latino, Vietnamese and Russian speaking), two liaisons from the CRC Task Force, and five at-large members. They represent the diverse interests and perspectives of Vancouver, Portland and Hayden Island neighborhoods potentially affected by the project.

The Community and Environmental Justice Group provides input to CRC project staff in these areas:

- identifying community concerns early in the process
- presenting recommendations at key milestones
- raising relevant issues of interest (or potential impact) such as air quality, noise, highway interchange alignments and design features to help inform the project's efforts to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate potential community impacts
- assisting CRC staff in effectively engaging the public in the project

The Community and Environmental Justice Group meets monthly at the Kenton Firehouse in North Portland (2209 N. Schofield). The meetings are open to the public. Materials and meeting schedules are posted to the project web site.

Environmental Justice Training

On September 30, CRC hosted an environmental justice training for members of the Community and Environmental Justice Group, the Columbia River Crossing Task Force and the public. Nationally recognized environmental justice expert Running Grass led the workshop. The participants learned the basic concepts of environmental justice, identified specific environmental justice issues facing the project, and learned about resources and strategies for dealing with environmental justice concerns. Additional training sessions led by Running Grass are available to CRC project participants.

Environmental Justice Methods and Data Report

The purpose of this report is to determine if uneven impacts to low income and minority residents exist within the project area. The report is part of the material collected in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or DEIS. The DEIS is required for major projects that may affect the environment. A tool for decision making, it describes the positive and negative effects of a proposed project and identifies alternative actions.

Outreach Efforts

Since the fall of 2005, we have talked with over 3,000 people about the project at fairs, festivals, open houses, neighborhood meetings and leadership breakfasts. With the help of the Community and Environmental Justice Group, we will continue to engage in diverse outreach efforts to provide relevant and timely information about the project to communities in the project area.

Project Information

To learn more about the Columbia River Crossing project, please call us or visit our web site.

Web: <http://www.ColumbiaRiverCrossing.org>
Phone: 360-737-2726 or 503-256-2726

November 1, 2006



Washington State
Department of Transportation



Oregon
Department
of Transportation

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information: Individuals requiring reasonable accommodations may request written materials in alternative formats or sign language interpreters by calling the project office (360-737-2726 and 503-256-2726) or calling Washington State's TTY service (800-833-6388) or Oregon State's TTY service (800-735-2900). For individual needs in Oregon, please contact ODOT at 503-731-8281.

Title VI: The project 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. For questions regarding the Title VI Program, you may contact WSDOT's Title VI Coordinator at 360-705-7098.

February 20, 2007

TO: Columbia River Crossing Task Force
FROM: Doug Ficco and John Osborn
SUBJECT: Next steps – Task Force Activities in 2007-2008

As we draw the preliminary analyses to a close and move to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) analyses of alternatives, so also will we be changing the frequency of Task Force meetings. The work completed by the Task Force over the past two years has required very frequent meetings, and we are very grateful for your continued involvement and active participation. As we move forward, we don't expect to need to meet as frequently. The engineering, environmental, urban design, and other activities needed to complete the DEIS will require time to complete between meetings.

Therefore, we are proposing the following schedule of meetings:

Date	Topics
March 27, 2007	<i>If needed</i>
April 24, 2007	Progress report/discussion. Transit, and highway design concepts. TDM/TSM measures.
June 26, 2007	Progress report/discussion. Reports on urban design, freight and bike/ped work group activities.
September 25, 2007	Progress report/discussion. Capital and O&M costs, initial results of environmental studies.
December 11, 2007	Review completed results of environmental studies, discuss preliminary Draft Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
March/April 2008 (date TBD)	Review DEIS
June 2008 (date TBD)	Review public comments on DEIS and LPA. Task Force Recommendation on LPA

Note that topics and dates may change depending on the progress of the analyses. Previously, we distributed a schedule of monthly meetings throughout 2007. Please hold those dates for possible changes in the above schedule. In addition, dates not used for a formal meeting will be used for workshops with Task Force members and other interested stakeholders.

Once again, thank you very much for all your hard work over the past two years. We look forward to seeing you in April!



proud past. promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

February 22, 2007

Columbia River Crossing
Project Task Force
700 Washington Street
Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

Dear Fellow Task Force Members:

With this letter we wish to enter once again into all relevant forums and records the unanimous policy statement of the Board of Clark County Commissioners regarding the Columbia River Crossing project, as follows:

The outcome of this project will have a long lasting impact on our communities, for our progeny will bear the burden of its price and the social habits it will promote. Therefore, we believe we have an opportunity to be visionary yet practical while being ever vigilant with our public coffers.

From the first ferry boats to the original Interstate Bridge, some 167 years have been dedicated to shuttling people across the river. Now, more than 120,000 vehicles cross the river throughout each day, which results in intense congestion that frustrates commuters and slows down delivery of goods throughout the region. We need to address those issues. However, it is our firm belief that we cannot end rush-hour congestion on the I-5 corridor by simply building a new bridge over the Columbia River, no matter how much we spend on it.

If we were to build a new bridge, complete the Delta Park widening project, and eventually widen both the I-5/I-405 split and Rose Garden, we will still only have three freeway lanes from here to downtown Portland. Each one of those lanes can handle about 2,000 vehicles per hour, so 3 lanes can handle a maximum of 6,000 vehicles per hour. As of 2005, there were already about 5,000 vehicles per hour traveling along the I-5 corridor during the peak travel hours. By 2030 that number will jump to at least 7,500 – more than I-5 can handle under the best circumstances. Put another way, Columbia River Crossing staff estimates that congestion during the commute southbound every morning will increase from 2 hours in 2005 to 4.75 hours in 2030. That is with a new 12-lane replacement bridge, high capacity transit, and a toll to pay the multi-billion dollar price tag.

The bottom line is: build a new 12-lane bridge, and shortly thereafter, congestion will return.

Let us be clear, we know doing nothing is not an alternative that should be considered. If we do nothing, people and goods will be stuck in a “rush hour” that extends through most of the day. That is not acceptable for our commuters or the neighborhoods that will suffer greater health risks caused by the increased car exhaust from stalled traffic. What we are saying is that because our carrying capacity is limited, we need to look at how to move traffic at different times, different directions, and using a variety of modes to clear that capacity for freight and commuters who have to drive.

This means an alternative that is a complete departure from the business as usual approach of just building a big, new, expensive I-5 bridge. So let us start looking at doing something different, with an eye toward a more positive result. Together, we could:

- Increase transit ridership with more efficient service that works for people's busy schedules, which means pairing bus service with a new bridge structure for either bus rapid transit or light rail and lanes to clear on- and off-ramp traffic.
- Prioritize signals, ramp meters, and lanes for vehicles with more than one person.
- Fix the interchange system around the I-5 bridge to clear the congestion that happens when people try to weave on and off at Hayden Island, SR-14, and downtown Vancouver.
- Move the swing arm on the rail bridge to the center channel and make it a lift span. This \$40 million fix would eliminate the need to use the I-5 Bridge lift for barge traffic.
- Work with employers to provide incentives for flexible schedules that allow workers to commute south during non-peak hours when there is no congestion.
- Aggressively bring jobs to Clark County so people can live and work closer together and avoid the hours of commuting that keep them away from family and community.


Only by changing how, when, and where we travel will there ever be hope for true congestion relief on the I-5 corridor. We have an opportunity right now to show true vision and leadership that addresses the root of our congestion instead of just putting a band-aid on it.

Please understand that we are not giving you an answer to what the preferred alternative should be for the Columbia River Crossing project. We are simply asking that an alternative is included in the study that shows vision, creativity, and lower costs to move more people. We believe that together we can achieve this goal.

Sincerely,



Steve Stuart
Chair



Betty Sue Morris
Commissioner



Marc Boldt
Commissioner

We, the members of the Community Environmental Justice Group (CEJG), have been meeting since August of 2006. We are a collection of neighborhood and community representatives within the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) influence area and represent the communities which will be most significantly impacted by this project. Many of our communities contain low income and minority individuals who historically have been overly impacted and excluded from the development and decision making process.

On January 9, 2007 we reviewed the CRC Staff Recommendation of alternatives for advancement into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

It is the consensus of this group that we cannot accept or decline the Staff Recommendation. We believe there are too many unanswered questions regarding the impacts facing the communities we represent.

While we acknowledge improvement to the transportation facilities in the corridor significantly benefit the region, the following issues have yet to be addressed to our satisfaction:

- I. I. Health and Environmental Impacts (include, but are not limited to Air Quality and Noise)
- II. Displacement of Homes, Businesses, Resources, Neighborhoods and Impacts on Quality of Life
- III. Study of Alternatives for Corridor Placement and the Impact Area

I. Health and Environmental Impacts

The CEJG members are concerned about current and future air quality and noise issues, particularly within 1500 feet of the I-5 corridor.

We would like to know the current level of emissions (including diesel emissions) and noise levels to establish a base line for data collection.

We would like to know what air quality and noise standards will be negotiated for construction equipment and related project vehicles.

We would like to know how the air quality and noise standards will be monitored and how they will be mitigated during and after the project is complete, to insure no air quality degradation for ten years within the Bridge Impact Area (BIA).

II. Displacement of Homes, Businesses, Resources, Neighborhoods and Impacts on Quality of Life.

After completing a bus tour of the BIA, the CEJG members calculate the possibility of approximately 100 homes and more than 20 businesses along both sides of the bridge being removed, destroyed or heavily impacted.

We would like to know what compensations and mitigation measures will be made for those home owners, renters and business owners.

Hayden Island could potentially lose virtually all of the neighborhood shopping resources (grocery, pharmacy, restaurants, fuel stations and other retailers).

III. Alternatives and Corridor

Many believe the current corridor is already extended to its maximum and should not be expanded further. Members in Vancouver, Hayden Island and Portland have expressed strong concerns about the significant deterioration of their quality of life both during construction and after the project is completed.

Conclusion

Although the CEJG believes that many, if not most of these issues can be mitigated as specific plans unfold, it is unwilling to offer endorsement of the “Build” option until more specific and detailed planning and solutions are offered to deal with the issues described above.

Therefore, after all of these considerations, the CEJG cannot accept or decline the Staff Recommendation.

We must have more information.

Agreed upon this Fifteenth Day of February, 2007, by unanimous consensus of the following members:

Dave Frei,
CRC Task Force Member
Arnada Neighborhood Association Member
Vancouver, WA

Anne McEnery-Ogle, Chair
Shumway Neighborhood Association
Vancouver, WA

Edward G. Garren,
Hayden Island Neighborhood Network (HiNoon)
Portland, OR

Nicole Williams,
Environmental Justice Action Group,
Boise Neighborhood, Local 36
Portland, OR

Marcia Ward,
Salmon Creek
Vancouver (Hazel Dell), WA

Dave Skagen,
Rose Village Neighborhood, K Street
Vancouver, WA

Kris Long,
Vancouver, WA

John Benson,
Piedmont Neighborhood Association
Portland, OR

Jonath Colón-Montesi,
N/NE Neighborhood Coalition,
Portland, OR

Matt Whitney, President
Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Portland, OR

The following members participated in drafting the response letter, but did not attend the meeting on February 15, 2007: Michelle Tworoger and Connie Sherrard

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1540 | FAX 503 797 1793



METRO

To: Columbia River Task Force members
From: Rex Burkholder
Date: February 27, 2007
Re: For Consideration by the CRC Task Force

On February 22, 2007, the Metro Council adopted the attached resolution regarding the alternatives to be considered by the CRC Task Force for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The resolution supports:

1. Including the staff recommendation in the DEIS.
2. Adding an additional alternative that would analyze a supplemental bridge for use by autos, trucks, high capacity transit, bicycles and pedestrians and retain the existing bridges for a variety of objectives.
3. Analyzing in the DEIS a variety of issues relating to land-use, tolling, environmental justice, access issues on Hayden Island, and TDM/TSM measures.

I am, therefore, recommending to the Task Force that a subcommittee of the Task Force be formed with the charge to return at our next meeting with the more defined alternative that would be analyzed in the DEIS. I would expect that the subcommittee would work closely with CRC staff to develop an alternative that would offer the most practical alternative for reuse of the existing bridges and meet the Metro Council's objectives.

Thank you for consideration of this request.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING) RESOLUTION NO. 07- 3782B
METRO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS)
CONCERNING THE RANGE OF) Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
ALTERNATIVES TO BE ADVANCED TO A)
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT)
STATEMENT FOR THE COLUMBIA RIVER)
CROSSING PROJECT)

WHEREAS, the Interstate 5 freeway (I-5) is the only continuous north/south interstate freeway on the West Coast, providing a critical national and international transportation link for motor vehicles and truck-hauled freight in the western-most United States, between the Canadian and Mexican borders; and,

WHEREAS, in 1917 a bridge across the Columbia River was completed and in 1958 a second bridge was built adjacent to the first bridge, the two becoming today's I-5 north and south bound bridges. These bridges have had no significant modifications since their completion; and,

WHEREAS, for the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan region, I-5 is one of two major freeways that connect the two states and their shared metropolitan economy; and,

WHEREAS, the estimated cost of truck delay by the year 2020 is an increase of 140 percent to nearly \$34 million dollars; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 bridge crossing the Columbia River and adjacent bridge influence area segments, known as the Columbia River Crossing (CRC), has extended peak-hour travel demand that exceeds current capacity; and,

WHEREAS, the Interstate 205 Bridge is also reaching its peak-hour period carrying capacity; and,

WHEREAS, current transit service in the I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver is also constrained by the limited capacity and congestion in the bridge influence area, greatly limiting transit reliability and operations; and,

WHEREAS, there are significant safety issues relating to the existing bridges with the bridge crossing area and its approach sections experiencing crash rates more than two times higher than statewide averages for comparable urban highways in Washington and Oregon. This is largely due to congestion and outdated designs including interchanges too closely spaced, weave and merge sections which are too short causing sideswiping accidents, vertical grade changes in the bridge span which restrict sight distance, and very narrow shoulders that prevent avoidance maneuvers or safe temporary storage of disabled vehicles; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 bridges across the Columbia River do not meet current seismic standards, leaving travelers in the I-5 corridor vulnerable to bridge failure in the event of an earthquake; and,

WHEREAS, the configuration of the existing I-5 bridges relative to the downstream Burlington

Northern-Santa Fe rail bridge contributes to hazardous navigation conditions for commercial and recreational boat traffic; and,

WHEREAS, bicycle and pedestrian facilities for crossing the Columbia River along I-5 do not meet current standards; and,

WHEREAS, in 2002, the Metro Council approved Resolution 02-3237A, For the Purpose of Endorsing the I-5 Transportation and Trade Study Recommendations, including recommendations for light rail transit connecting the Portland area with southwest Washington and adding a new supplemental or replacement bridge; and,

WHEREAS, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan endorsed by the Metro Council in 2002 included light rail transit as the recommended transit mode and a maximum of ten lanes as the roadway improvement; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council approved the Interstate MAX line to Expo center as the locally preferred alternative for high capacity transit in the I-5 north corridor; and,

WHEREAS, Interstate MAX light rail transit was built to Expo Center and has been in operation since May 2004; and,

WHEREAS, in February 2005, the Task Force began its study of the CRC problems and possible solutions; and,

WHEREAS, the Task Force adopted in October 2005 a CRC Project *Vision and Values Statement*; and

WHEREAS, after holding public open houses to gather public comment, in November 2005, the CRC Task Force adopted a CRC Project *Problem Definition*; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force approved a Purpose and Need statement in January 2006, which defined a discrete set of objectives; and,

WHEREAS, in February 2006, the Task Force approved project evaluation criteria against which alternatives would be evaluated; and

WHEREAS, thirty-seven transportation modes or design options were identified, analyzed and combined into alternative project packages; and,

WHEREAS, twelve alternative project packages, consisting of a No Build and eleven other transportation packages that included auto, truck freight, transit, bicycle and pedestrian investments in the CRC Project area were developed in summer 2006; and

WHEREAS, the twelve alternative project packages were screened using the approved evaluation criteria; those that met the evaluation criteria were recommended to advance; and those that did not meet the evaluation criteria were recommended to not advance; and,

WHEREAS CRC staff have recommended, consistent with the evaluation criteria, that the No Build and a Replacement Bridge and either light rail transit or bus rapid transit be advanced to a draft environmental impact statement; and

WHEREAS, any of the build alternatives would require a change to the Regional Transportation Plan and this would require Metro Council approval; and,

WHEREAS, any transportation investment decision about the Columbia River Crossing Project will have a substantial impact on the economy and livability of the Metro region; and,

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

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has had CRC Project briefings or discussions on October 3 and 17, and December 5, 2006; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has, through both existing policy and through public discussion by the Council, established policy concerns and objectives that should be advanced with regard to the CRC Project; and,

WHEREAS, the Metro Council desires to establish policy guidance for its representative on the Task Force concerning those alternatives to be advanced for study in a draft environmental impact statement; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED,

that the Metro Council recommends the following policy guidance to its CRC Task Force representative:

1. The Metro Council supports the following CRC staff recommendations for alternatives to be advanced to a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS): a) a No Build option, b) a Replacement Bridge with Light Rail Transit (LRT) and express bus option and c) a Replacement Bridge with Bus Rapid Transit and express bus option.
2. In addition to the CRC staff recommended alternatives, the Metro Council supports including in the DEIS for additional analysis an alternative that includes a supplemental bridge built to current seismic standards to carry cars, trucks, high capacity transit, bicycles and pedestrians. This alternative retains the existing I-5 bridges for freeway travel with incremental improvements to those bridges and the key access ramps, to improve flow and increase safety on I-5. Additionally, this alternative could include replacing the swing span of the downstream railroad bridge with a movable span located in a mid-river location.
3. The Metro Council recognizes that a range of transit alternatives between the Expo Center and Vancouver, Washington in the I-5 corridor must be considered in the Columbia River Crossing DEIS and that substantial data and analysis about ridership, costs, etc. have yet to be completed. However, based on A) investments already made in this corridor by both the Metro region and the Federal Transit Administration to construct Interstate MAX; and, B) existing data that has been developed during the

Alternatives Analysis over the past two years, the Metro Council notes that light rail transit has shown to date to have more promise to cost-effectively meet the transit demand in the corridor.

4. The alternatives advanced to the DEIS must be responsive to financial considerations. Tolling or another user pay financing source should be considered with all of the alternatives advanced to the DEIS.

5. Given the impact of the existing transportation facility and the potential impact of any future facility, the following should be part of any DEIS analysis: a) land use changes that reduce the amount of 2035 peak-hour commuting across the Columbia River; b) mitigation programs that address existing and potential future health impacts caused by motor vehicle emissions; c) creating motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian links across I-5 to the two halves of Hayden Island; and d) investigation of capping I-5 in downtown Vancouver as a mitigation measure that re-connects historic elements in the City of Vancouver, e) transportation demand management (TDM)/ transportation system management (TSM) policies augmenting build options, and f) other issues related to environmental justice.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this day of , 2007.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney



A Catalyst for a
Healthy, Livable
Clark County

1101
Broadway
Suite 110
Vancouver
Washington
98660



Phone
(360) 567-1087
Fax
(360) 693-8279

RECEIVED

FEB 06 2007

Columbia River Crossing

February 1, 2007

Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington Street
Vancouver, WA 98660

Re: Public Statement

Attn: Columbia River Crossing Task Force:

The Columbia River Crossing Task Force decisions will have long-term impacts on the health and quality of life for Clark County and Portland metropolitan communities. The *Steps to a Healthier Clark County Leadership Team*, a group promoting policy that supports physically active communities, encourages the Task Force to implement a *sustainable* solution that addresses multiple transportation options, including state-of-the-art pedestrian and bikeway systems. It is vital that this legacy transportation project take every opportunity to contribute to physical activity, reduce single occupant car trips, and provide proven alternative transportation options.

As we review the numerous public documents, meeting minutes, and publications available from the Task Force, we *are very concerned by the lack of equitable attention being given to pedestrian and bikeway systems in creating a sustainable Crossing alternative*. It is absolutely critical that these vital details not be overlooked.

National research proves that there is a **direct and critical relationship** between the built environment, transportation systems, community walkability, and the individual health of community residents. According to recent data in the *Community Choices 2010 Report Card*, levels of obesity and overweight among adults and youth in Clark County have reached epidemic levels (62% of adults in Clark County are overweight or obese and 28% of 8th graders are overweight or at risk of becoming overweight). Therefore, pedestrian systems and bikeways are extremely important and deserve equal attention in plan development.



A Catalyst for a
Healthy, Livable
Clark County

In an effort to ensure that equitable consideration and planning time is granted to this vital area, the *Steps to a Healthier Clark County Leadership Team* urges the Task Force to take the following immediate actions:

1. Convene a formal *Pedestrian System and Bikeway Task Force* to develop a state-of-the-art pedestrian system and bikeway plan to be included in the Crossing plan. This Task Force would incorporate public comment, national research, and consideration of best-practices balanced with financial integrity into a formal set of recommendations to the Columbia River Crossing Task Force.
2. The *Steps to a Healthier Clark County Leadership Team* encourages you to include one or more of our members to serve on this Task Force. The Steps Team will bring a wealth of experience and resources to the table regarding the components of a state-of-the-art pedestrian and bikeway system.

Barbe West, Executive Director of Community Choices 2010, will contact your offices in the next week to follow-up on this letter. In the meantime, if you have questions, you may contact Barbe at 360-567-1087.

Sincerely,

Steps to a Healthier Clark County Leadership Team

1101
Broadway
Suite 110
Vancouver
Washington
98660



Phone
(360) 567-1087
Fax
(360) 693-8279



This publication is supported by the Steps to a Healthier US Cooperative Agreement Program of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Its contents do not necessarily represent the official views of HHS.




Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates

AORTA • P. O. Box 2772 • Portland, Oregon 97208-2772

Also known as OreARP • Oregon Association of Railway Passengers

Phone & Fax: 503-241-7185 • OregonRail@netscape.com • www.aortarail.org



Feb. 5, 2007

To: The CRC Task Force
From: Jim Howell
Re: Public transit in the CRC Corridor

Why is a \$2 billion mega-bridge the only recommended option to come out of the CRC process? Because of a belief that 20 years from now, 50,000 more vehicles a day will need to cross the Columbia River.

This belief is based on forecast modeling that predicts, in 20 years, 80% of all peak-hour, prime-direction commuter travel will still be in single occupancy vehicles.

Sophisticated forecast models are only as good as the assumptions programmed into them. How and why are the assumptions regarding public transportation wrong?

The year 2020 origins and destinations in the PM Peak shown on Figures 3-1 and 3-6 in the "Draft Components Step A Screening Report" for both "All Trips" and "Transit Only Trips" suggest that inadequate transit networks may have been fed into the forecast model.

These maps clearly show a high concentration of jobs on Hayden Island and in north, northeast and northwest Portland, as well as in downtown Portland and the Lloyd district, yet show few of these jobs being accessed by public transportation. They also show a poor distribution of home-base destinations in Clark County. Most of the trips end at the high capacity transit park and ride lots, instead of being distributed from the stations by good local transit service.

These O & D transit patterns strongly indicate that inferior transit networks were assumed in the forecast. Well-designed bus networks on both sides of the river, interfaced with light rail, would produce a distribution of dots on the "transit only" map similar to the distribution on the "all trip" map. Experience shows that transit systems heavily dependent on park and ride access are inferior in attracting

ridership. Once people are in their cars, it is too easy for them to stay in it for the remainder of their trip.

Availability, frequency and reliability are more important than speed in attracting people to public transit, especially if driving becomes less reliable due to traffic congestion and incidents. Over time, the growing cost of driving will also attract commuters to switch to using the transit system.

Light rail is just one component of a well-designed transit system. It is the logical mode for crossing the river. It is not affected by traffic, is already built from Portland City Center to Expo Center, has convenient station locations for connecting bus service if it is provided, and has the high capacity (the equivalent of a 10-lane freeway) for future ridership growth. It also would be cheaper to operate than buses.

The basic foundation for the perceived need to replace the current bridges with a new mega-bridge is the outrageous assumption that 180,000 vehicles must cross it every day and only 20% of peak-hour prime direction commuters will use public transportation.

Is a higher transit travel share a far-fetched notion for 20 years into the future? Remember that twenty years ago there was great skepticism among some otherwise forward thinking people that MAX would have any significant impact on travel patterns.

Attachments:

- Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-6 from the Draft Components Step A Screening Report

Contact:

- Jim Howell 503-284-7182 jimhowell89@hotmail.com

Figure 3-1. OR Origins and WA Destinations in PM Peak Period (2020)





Figure 3-6. Year 2020: OR Origins and WA Destinations in PM Peak Period – Transit Only





805 Broadway, Suite 412
Vancouver, Washington 98660-3237
360-694-5006
FAX 360-694-9927
www.credc.org

COLUMBIA RIVER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

February 9, 2007

Chair Hal Dengerink
Chair Henry Hewitt
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Street Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660-3177

CREDC Position on Range of Alternatives to Advance for Further Analysis in the DEIS

Dear Chairmen Dengerink and Hewitt,

The Columbia River Economic Development Council supports the CRC staff recommendation on the range of alternatives to be advanced for further analysis in the Columbia River Crossing Draft Environmental Impact Statement. A mid-level replacement bridge with two transit options are the most rational solutions to the issues raised with the currently inadequate Columbia River Span and CRC Process.

I will be unable to attend the Tuesday, February 13, 2007 meeting where the Crossing Task Force is to decide on the alternatives to advance. Clearly count me as supportive of the staff's proposal.

Recently, there have been a growing number of individuals criticizing the narrowness of the options being proposed for further analysis. I am perplexed by the critique that there has been inadequate study of other alternatives. I feel that has been the focus of the task force process since its inception. The proposed alternatives survived our rigorous screening process and therefore are worthy for advancement. Spending more public resources to study failed alternatives will not have any other result other than to waste taxpayer resources.

I apologize for my absence, but hope that my position is clear and can be represented in the decision process.


Sincerely,

Bart Phillips, President

Corporate Officers
Ron Frederiksen, Chair
RSV Construction Services, Inc.
Kelly McDonald, Secretary
Clark County Title Company
John McDonagh, Treasurer
Vancouver Business Journal
Tim McMahan, Vice-Chair
Stoel Rives
Paul Winters, Past-Chair
Winters & Associates
Bart Phillips, President
CREDC

Board of Directors
Gary Adkins
City of Ridgefield
Doug Anderson
Underwriters Laboratories
Jonathan Avery
Legacy Salmon Creek Hospital
Michelle Baker
Kaiser Permanente
Sid Boles
Moss Adams
Barbara Bushell
Columbia Tech Center
Parker Cann
Columbia Credit Union
Curt Christianson
Georgia Pacific
Justin Cleary
City of Ridgefield
Carol Curtis
Clark Public Utilities
John Deeder
Evergreen School District
Dr. Hal Dengerink
WSU - Vancouver
Paul Dennis
City of Camas
Bill Dudley
Landerholm Law Firm
Bob Durgan
Andersen Construction
Eric Fuller
Eric Fuller & Associates
Brent Grening
Port of Ridgefield
Jeffrey Hamm
CTRAN
Alan Hargrave
Port of Camas/Washougal
John Idsinga
City of Battle Ground
Robert Knight
Clark College
Joseph Kortum
SW Washington Medical Center
Lisa Lowe
Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt
Betty Sue Morris
Clark County
Doug Ness
The Columbian
Lisa Nisenfeld
SW WA Workforce Dev. Council
Andy Nygard
Edward Jones
Casey O'Dell
Sharp Microelectronics
Kathleen Sego
Sego's Herb Farm
Jim Short
Wafer Tech
Monte Silliman
First Independent
Larry Smith
City of Vancouver
Jeanne Stewart
City of Vancouver
Brian Wells
Team Construction
Larry Wilson
Wilson & Associates, AIA
Brian Wolfe
Port of Vancouver

Directors Emeritus
Steve Horenstein
Miller Nash LLP



COALITION FOR A LIVABLE FUTURE

310 SW FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 612 • PORTLAND, OR 97204
PHONE: 503.294.2889 • FAX: 503.225.0333 • WWW.CLFUTURE.ORG

February 16, 2007

Hal Dengerink and Henry Hewitt
Co-Chairs
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington St.
Vancouver, WA 98660

Dear Mr. Dengerink and Mr. Hewitt,

We appreciate the contributions of time and resources made by staff, task force members, and citizens of our two states to help shape this project and work toward the best possible outcome for the long-term health and vitality of our region. We respectfully submit these comments for consideration by the Columbia River Crossing task force members.

The Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF) is a partnership of 80 diverse organizations working together for healthy and sustainable communities. By connecting issues, people, and organizations, CLF empowers communities to take action together to shape the decisions affecting the Portland-Vancouver region's future.

It is our understanding that one reason CLF was invited to serve on the Task Force is that we were expected to represent the public interests represented by our diverse membership – environmentalists, public health interests, social justice advocates, and more. We agreed to serve on the CRC Task Force because we care deeply about growth and development in the region and believe that this project has the potential to reshape our region. We came to the table in good faith to participate in what we anticipated would be a fair and open process.

Through our experience of having served on the task force for nearly two years, we have come to realize that the limited and very prescribed approach of an environmental impact statement process, and the lack of a clear vision for our bi-state region's future, are serious and potentially fatal flaws to the process. The staff recommendation on the table demonstrates this, and we are deeply concerned that if we accept the staff recommendation as it stands, we will be failing to serve the public interests we represent.

The following describes our key concerns:

There are too few alternatives. In fact, there is really only one alternative being proposed: a colossal and costly replacement bridge. We believe that at this point in the process, it is imprudent to advance only one alternative. This is especially true given that no real cost assessments have been conducted. Thorough cost estimates using full cost accounting of social, economic, and environmental impacts for different options are critical to making intelligent decisions about narrowing alternatives.

Some ideas that have merit and should be studied fully include:

- a) A “light build”/demand management option that fixes safety issues with current bridges, makes key ramp improvements, and focuses on managing the demand in the corridor using the most aggressive strategies. There may be “a thousand tiny things” that taken together could perform very well, cost much less, and serve the long-term health of our communities much better. We should be holistic in our approach to this alternative, and not limit the scope of where these actions must be taken to the bridge influence area.
- b) Fixing the railroad bridge swing span to improve marine navigation conditions, rather than only using road strategies to address these problems.
- c) An option that reuses the current bridges for some functions. We are not convinced by the limited analysis conducted thus far that there is not some configuration that could reuse some or all of the current bridges for transportation and/or other purposes.
- d) An arterial concept should be carried forward. We should make good on the promise of the Bi-state Trade Partnership and fully analyze how to address local travel needs with some sort of arterial connection.
- e) An alternative that emphasizes substantial investment in transit in the bridge influence area and beyond, including strong local transit on both sides of the river, as well as heavy rail for longer thru trips.

The no build alternative needs to be modified. It should meet the purpose and need, and include cutting-edge, far-reaching strategies for managing travel demand in the corridor. The staff component findings document indicates that the no-build alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project. While the no build alternative is a National Environmental Policy Act requirement, it is not in the public interest to advance an alternative that has already been demonstrated to fail. This alternative must be re-crafted to meet the purpose and need, so that its performance can be evaluated fairly against build options.

This alternative is supposed to include “aggressive” transportation demand management (TDM), a goal that was approved by the task force last year. However, as it is defined currently, the TDM approach includes strategies contained in existing Clark County and Portland Metro regional plans, with the exception of tolling. This is not “aggressive TDM.” We believe that this alternative should include the best practices and new approaches from communities throughout the world that go far above and beyond what is contained in today's adopted policies. For example, if we invested \$1 billion dollars in TDM, what would it look like?

In addition to our specific concerns about the staff proposal, we'd like to reiterate two broader concerns:

Public health must be a top priority. It has been marginalized historically in transportation planning and the costs far surpass any other economic costs associated with the project.

We have heard a lot about the economic costs of congestion in this project, yet, we have heard nothing about the economic costs related to health. Car crash injuries and fatalities are the biggest health threat to individuals under 45 in the Pacific Northwest. The economic costs of this are astounding. Data from the National Safety Council for the three metro area counties in Oregon shows that car crashes cost our region \$577 million in 2005. Add to this the staggering

costs of our obesity epidemic (for example, 1.5% of EVERY dollar spent in America goes to type II diabetes treatment), which is propelled in part by our auto dependence and poorly planned development, and we quickly surpass projected congestion costs.

The health impacts on the communities most directly affected by this project must also be prioritized. These communities already have the highest asthma rates in the region, caused by very high levels of air pollutants and other toxic exposures. A bigger bridge would induce more motor vehicles in this already over-polluted corridor, especially when considering the projected peak period travel timesavings—5 minutes southbound and 20 minutes northbound. For N/NE Portland, one of the most racially diverse areas of our region, in particular, added lanes means that more vehicles will be stuck idling in traffic, increasing air pollution in their communities. And while we have been assured that future technology and cleaner fuels will reduce air pollutants, research has shown that any increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) negates air quality improvements they generate. Furthermore, forecasts project that VMT will continue to outpace these improvements. Added lanes will undoubtedly contribute to an increase in regionwide VMT.

Land use and transportation are inextricably linked. Land use must be an integral part of the strategy for addressing future travel needs and behavior on I-5.

Despite a stated intent in the task force adopted vision and values to support smart land use and growth management, no alternatives are being considered that look hard at a land use approach to the challenges in the corridor. This is shortsighted, and we should be considering appropriate land use strategies to address some of the issues.

At the same time, it is critical that we evaluate land use impacts by specifically measuring the difference in the development pattern with the current lane configuration as well as any additional lanes added in the analysis.

Taken altogether, these concerns have led us to conclude that we cannot support the staff recommendation. It is too limited, and it is not in the public interest to limit the study of alternatives so severely at this point in the project's process. While we may in the end decide to support a replacement bridge option if enough community and environmental benefits are guaranteed, we cannot in good conscience say that we can support a \$2-6 billion 12-lane replacement bridge now. In our view, this is what the staff is asking us to do, and unfortunately, too much critical information is missing to make an informed decision. We urge the task force to join us in asking the project staff to broaden the set of alternatives to advance for full analysis and address fully the issues we raise in this letter.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment and for your continued work together to create the best possible outcome for the health and vitality of our region from this project.

Sincerely,



Jill Fuglister & Ron Carley
Co-Directors



February 19, 2007

Hal Dengerink and Henry Hewitt
Co-Chairs
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington St.
Vancouver, WA 98660

President

Peter Paquet

Vice President

Scott Lukens

Secretary

Jane Hartline

Treasurer

Ron Spencer

Past President

Linda Craig

Nancy Jane Cushing

Martha Gannett

Peg Goldie

John Hammerstad

Jill Inskip

Terry Kem

Kristina Gifford

Claire Puchy

Adrienne Wolf-Lockett

Board Member

Emeritus

Dave Marshall

Dear Mr. Dengerink and Mr. Hewitt,

We are writing to comment on the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) staff recommendation to be considered by the CRC task force on February 27th.

We have general concerns regarding the staff recommendation and the lack of a wider range of alternatives to be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) analysis. Specifically we are concerned that the staff recommendation is not considering options- such as adding a multi-modal arterial bridge- that could potentially address transportation needs more cost-effectively and result in less cumulative impact to the region's air and water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, and overall watershed and community health.

It is clear that any solution involving a new bridge or retrofitting the existing bridges will have direct environmental impacts associated with stormwater run-off and fish habitat in the immediate Columbia River channel.¹ However these impacts must be kept in perspective. Adding new freeway lanes to Interstate 5 will also have cumulative environmental impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods and region. These landscape-scale impacts to natural resources and environmental quality are likely to be of far greater magnitude than those posed by the actual construction or retrofitting of bridges.

Research and experience indicate that type and number of transportation options available in a metropolitan region help shape where and how development is likely to occur. Therefore investments in transportation infrastructure also exert direct and indirect impacts on regional water resources and biodiversity. Where there are few transportation alternatives to single occupant vehicles, evidence suggests there is little compulsion to depart from conventional, low-density development that has higher impacts on local and regional ecosystems as well as public health.²

We are concerned that a new 10 or 12-lane freeway bridge could encourage more low-density real estate development in Clark County's urbanizing watersheds while providing only temporary relief from traffic congestion. This would very likely result in greater environmental impact from the increased urban stormwater run-off and habitat loss and fragmentation than solutions less focused on freeway expansion. Air

¹ November 21, 2006 CRC Memoranda, *Considerations of Replacing Versus Reusing the Existing Interstate 5 Bridges*, pg. 1-13; Impacts to state and federally listed peregrine falcons that have nested on the existing I-5 bridges since 2001 must also be addressed in selecting and designing final options.

² Protecting Water Resources with High Density Development. 2006. EPA publication 231-R-06-001. pg. 38; Protecting Water Resources with Smart Growth. 2004. EPA publication 231-R-04-002. pg. 116; Endangered By Sprawl: How Runaway Development Threatens America's Wildlife, 2005 by Reid Ewing and John Kostyack with Don Chen, Bruce Stein, and Michelle Ernst, National Wildlife Federation, NatureServe and Smart Growth America, pg. 68.

quality in North Portland and future development on West Hayden Island- a regionally identified Habitat of Concern- could also be negatively impacted by additional freeway lanes. We question whether these types of cumulative environmental and community impacts will be adequately assessed and ultimately avoided or minimized if there is not an option in the EIS that envisions a significantly different land-use and transportation strategy for meeting the existing or a revised CRC purpose and need.

It is our impression that the existing CRC purpose and need may preclude incorporating alternatives in the DEIS that could have significantly lower environmental impact than the proposed freeway bridge options. Hence we support revising the purpose and need statement and associated criteria- as necessary- to include a slightly wider scope of options in the DEIS.

The CRC presents a unique and unparalleled opportunity to positively impact the way the region grows and addresses critical environmental challenges. Thank you for considering our comments.

Sincerely,



Bob Sallinger
Urban Conservation
Director



Jim Labbe
Urban Conservationist

CC: Metro Council, Portland City Council, Meryl Redisch, Executive Director Audubon Society of Portland



February 20, 2007

Metro Council
600 NE Grand
Portland, OR 97232

Dear President Bragdon and Councilors,

I am writing to comment on the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) staff recommendation to be considered by Metro Council on Thursday, February 22nd. My understanding is that Council will be considering two resolutions regarding the Columbia River Taskforce staff recommendations. The Urban Greenspaces Institute is greatly concerned at the lack of lower cost alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) analysis. For example, the current recommendations do not include a multi-modal arterial bridge that would provide for a less costly, alternative transportation oriented solution. I am writing to urge Metro Council as the region's transportation planning organization to insist such an alternative remain on the table for consideration.

We are particularly concerned about the significant negative impacts that a ten to twelve lane bridge and the attendant additional lanes on Interstate 5 would have on the surrounding neighborhoods. With a projected cost of somewhere between \$2 and \$6 billion we are also concerned about the overall impact of such a costly project on the region's ability to address other transportation needs, both traditional road projects and alternative transit projects.

From the information we have received, it appears that the current Columbia River Crossing purpose and need statements preclude consideration of alternatives that would undoubtedly have significantly lower environmental impact and cost than the proposed freeway bridge options. Therefore, we urge Metro Council to adopt a resolution that recommends adoption of a revised purpose and need statement that allow for a more diverse array of options in the DEIS.

Sincerely,

Mike Houck, Executive Director

cc Hal Dengerink and Henry Hewitt Co-Chairs, Columbia River Crossing Task Force

Directors

Goody Cable, Chair
M. J. Cody, Vice Chair
Bob Wilson, Secretary/Treasurer

Staff

Mike Houck, Executive Director

Advisory Board

Bill Bakke
Native Fish Society
Portland, Oregon

Janet Santos Cobb
California Oak Foundation
Oakland, California

Patrick M. Condon
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC

John Fregonese
Fregonese Calthorpe & Associates
Portland, Oregon

Charles Jordan
The Conservation Fund
Portland, Oregon

Jon Kusler
International Institute of Wetland
Science and Public Policy
Berne, New York

Robert Liberty
Senior Counsel for
Congressman Earl Blumenauer
Portland, Oregon

Peg Malloy
Portland Housing Center
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Rutherford Platt
Ecological Cities Project
Amherst, Massachusetts

Dr. Joe Poracsky
Geography Department
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

Rodolpho H. Ramina, PhD.
Ecodesign Coordinator
Industrial Federation of
Paraná State, Curitiba, Brazil

Ann Riley
Waterways Restoration Institute
Berkeley, California

Ralph Thomas Rogers
Urban Ecologist
Seattle, Washington

Jennifer Thompson
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Portland, Oregon

Paddy Tillett
Architect and Urban Designer
Portland, Oregon

Mike Uhtoff
Northwest Nature Shop
Ashland, Oregon

Dr. Alan Yeakley
Environmental Sciences and
Resources
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon



PORTLAND FREIGHT COMMITTEE

February 20, 2007

RECEIVED

FEB 21 2007

Columbia River Crossing

Hal Dengerink, Co-Chair
Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington St., Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

Dear Co-Chair Dengerink and Hewitt:

The purpose of this letter is to support the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) staff recommendation. This recommendation is to advance three alternatives for further study in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. These alternatives include: 1) No Action, 2) Replacement Bridge with Bus Rapid Transit, and 3) Replacement Bridge with Light Rail Transit.

The Portland Freight Committee (PFC) is advisory to Portland's City Council. Its membership includes 30 private sector representatives of freight service providers, shippers, trade associations and businesses directly related to multi-modal freight activities. Our roster is attached.

The PFC views the CRC as the most important transportation project presently under consideration in this region. I-5 is the only continuous north/south interstate highway on the West Coast, providing a commerce link for the United States, Canada and Mexico.

The two-bridge crossing, which served 30,000 vehicles per day in the 1960's, now carries more than 125,000 automobiles, buses and trucks each weekday. While many of these trips are regionally oriented, it is estimated that 70 to 80 percent of the trips using the I-5 crossing actually enter and/or exit I-5 within the 5-mile long I-5 Bridge Influence Area.

The increased demand mentioned above, combined with short merge lanes, lack of safety shoulders, and frequent bridge lifts has resulted in stop-and-go traffic conditions for hours on end. This is unacceptable for an essential trade corridor and it is unacceptable for local businesses and resident who rely on this road for their daily living.

Members of the PFC have participated in other I-5 decisions over the last decade, and we are fully supportive of the investments made to date that will improve safety and relieve congestion both north and south of the I-5 crossing. It is now time to make a decision about the crossing. We urge the CRC adopt the staff recommendations and proceed with the DEIS.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ann L. Gardner". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the left of the typed name.

Ann L. Gardner
Chair

Cc: Mayor Tom Potter and Portland City Council
Chair Tom Wheeler and Multnomah County Commissioners
President David Bragdon and Metro Councilors

From: [Levin Nock](#)
To: [Columbia River Crossing;](#)
CC: [rep.bencannon@state.or.us;](mailto:rep.bencannon@state.or.us)
Subject: Building a bridge to a better future
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 9:13:17 AM
Attachments:

Dear Hal Dengerink and Henry Hewitt,

Please evaluate at least one low-cost, green, light-build alternative for the I-5 Columbia River crossing. This should include dedicated public transit, a truck lane, bike lanes sheltered from the noisy and polluted main deck, and perhaps a lane or two of tollroad or congested freeway. (The designers should personally cycle across the I-205 Columbia bridge before finalizing the design.) Please retool the assumptions underlying how this and other alternatives are designed and measured, taking into account current understanding of global warming and peak oil. The goal should be to provide access and mobility for people living on both sides of the river, and for freight that needs to cross the river, for the next 100 years or more, without damaging the river or the air. The goal should NOT be to move cars and trucks. There are many sustainability experts in Portland who would be delighted to help evaluate the project's design in terms that are meaningful to your constituents' happiness.

All primary roads eventually become congested, unless access is restricted by tolls, HOV/Bus only lanes, or other mechanisms. Transportation engineers can choose what shape the transportation network takes, but they cannot choose whether freeways become congested. As long as it costs nothing to travel on a road, more and more vehicles will travel on that road. Americans waiting in interstate traffic jams are just like Russians waiting in Soviet breadlines—when the state provides something for free, everybody wants it, so people spend their time (instead of their money) to get it. If you bake more bread, more people will come to stand in line.

“Trying to cure traffic congestion with more capacity is like trying to cure obesity by loosening your belt” Glen Heimstra..

Please do not spend billions of our tax dollars creating ‘excess’ capacity that will fill up in a few years anyway. I appreciate many of the wonderful projects that Metro is engaged in, such as affordable housing, that make a huge difference in the lives of many residents. According to CRC task force modeling, the current proposals with 10-to-12 lane freeways will only reduce peak rush-hour travel time by 5 minutes.

Do your constituents really want to spend \$2B to save 5 minutes? I don't. Please use our money wisely.

Thanks!!!
Levin Nock

www.GreenwayNeighborhoods.net

Lnock@comcast.net

503-706-2101

1173 NE 71st Ave

Portland OR 97213



City of Gresham

Mayor Shane T. Bemis

1333 N.W. Eastman Parkway
Gresham, Oregon 97030-3813
(503) 618-2306
Fax (503) 665-7692

February 20, 2007

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2007

Columbia River Crossing

Dr. Harold A. Dengerink, Co-Chair
Mr. Henry H. Hewitt, Co-Chair
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington Street, Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660-3177

Re: CRC Staff Recommendation for DEIS Alternatives

Dear Dr. Dengerink and Mr. Hewitt:

The City of Gresham has been participating in discussions about the Interstate Bridge and I-5 corridor since the beginnings of the Bi-State Coordination Committee. There is no doubt that an improved transportation facility in this corridor is necessary to the long-term economic vitality of the Portland-Vancouver region and the states of Washington and Oregon.

The City of Gresham appreciates the opportunity to continue to participate in this important process and look forward to helping the region address this important transportation need. We support the Columbia River Crossing Staff recommendation for alternatives to proceed to further analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

One of the outstanding issues that we are particularly concerned about is tolling. We understand that there is much work ahead before any final decisions are made. While analysis to date has suggested that tolling the new facility will be required to fund a new crossing, we believe that any tolling decision must account for impacts on the rest of the regional transportation system.

We are very concerned about the impacts of tolling a new I-5 bridge will have on the I-205 corridor and the interchange of I-205 and I-84. This area already suffers significant peak hour delays and any diversion from the I-5 corridor due to tolls will surely exacerbate the situation, reducing the overall benefits of an improved Columbia River Crossing, and simply shifting some of the problems to other areas of the region.

The City of Gresham respectfully requests that the Task Force's action on the staff recommendation include a commitment to assess how tolling will affect other regional highway corridors.

This means an alternative that is a complete departure from the business as usual approach of just building a big, new, expensive I-5 bridge. So let us start looking at doing something different, with an eye toward a more positive result. Together, we could:

- Increase transit ridership with more efficient service that works for people's busy schedules, which means pairing bus service with a new bridge structure for either bus rapid transit or light rail and lanes to clear on- and off-ramp traffic.
- Prioritize signals, ramp meters, and lanes for vehicles with more than one person.
- Fix the interchange system around the I-5 bridge to clear the congestion that happens when people try to weave on and off at Hayden Island, SR-14, and downtown Vancouver.
- Move the swing arm on the rail bridge to the center channel and make it a lift span. This \$40 million fix would eliminate the need to use the I-5 Bridge lift for barge traffic.
- Work with employers to provide incentives for flexible schedules that allow workers to commute south during non-peak hours when there is no congestion.
- Aggressively bring jobs to Clark County so people can live and work closer together and avoid the hours of commuting that keep them away from family and community.


Only by changing how, when, and where we travel will there ever be hope for true congestion relief on the I-5 corridor. We have an opportunity right now to show true vision and leadership that addresses the root of our congestion instead of just putting a band-aid on it.

Please understand that we are not giving you an answer to what the preferred alternative should be for the Columbia River Crossing project. We are simply asking that an alternative is included in the study that shows vision, creativity, and lower costs to move more people. We believe that together we can achieve this goal.

Sincerely,



Steve Stuart
Chair



Betty Sue Morris
Commissioner



Marc Boldt
Commissioner

Edward Lynch
Company

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2007

Columbia River Crossing

Dr. Hal Dengerink, Co-Chair
Mr. Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington Street
Vancouver, WA 98660

Re: Columbia River Crossing Task Force Vote on February 27, 2007

Dear Hal and Henry:

A long-planned trip will find me in India when the Columbia River Crossing Task Force meets on February 27, 2007. Arrangements with Barbara Hart for my phone call to the Task Force to cast my vote during that meeting may or may not work so as a back up to that call I am casting my vote for the crossing alternatives as follows:

1. We members of the Task Force voted to take the three alternatives proposed by staff out to the public for comment with the understanding that there would be a follow-up vote. The full array of alternatives has been discussed at Task Force meetings; thus, I have a full understanding to vote as I see the options.
2. We collectively agreed that "alternates" were not eligible to vote in the absence of a Task Force member. I recall no discussion regarding absentee votes such as I am doing here and therefore, if correct, would expect the following vote to be valid.

My vote on the issue at hand, alternatives for the proposed Columbia River Crossing, is that we move forward on the three alternatives as proposed by staff and make the appropriate studies toward a final design.

The process has been open, extensive and fair. We should proceed on.

Sincerely,



Edward C. Lynch

February 21, 2007

RECEIVED

FEB 23 2007

Columbia River Crossing

Hal Dengerink, Co-Chair
Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington, Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

Regarding: Columbia River Crossing

Dear Columbia River Crossing Task Force:

At its February 21, 2007 meeting, the Merchants Exchange of Portland Board of Directors voted unanimously to support the Columbia River Crossing staff recommendation. This recommendation is to advance three alternatives for further study in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. These alternatives include 1) No Action, 2) Replacement Bridge and Bus and 3) Replacement Bridge and Light Rail Transit.

The Merchants Exchange is a unique regional member-based association founded in 1879 to encourage, extend and promote the common business interest of those parties in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States who are involved in marine transportation, the distribution of Pacific Northwest agricultural products, and related areas of domestic and foreign commerce. The Merchants Exchange has over 100 members, including but not limited to the public ports and private terminals, steamship operators & agents, admiralty attorneys, customs brokers, tug and barge companies, freight forwarders, stevedores, and ship repair services with offices located along the Lower Columbia and Willamette Rivers. Our members are reliant on internationally trade.

Merchants Exchange members are vitally dependent on the Columbia River to transport freight. River navigation would be improved under the Replacement Bridge Options because the marine channel alignment would be enhanced with fewer piers and the need for bridge lifts would be removed. As was stated in the Columbia River Staff Recommendation Executive Summary, the U. S Coast Guard recognizes this stretch of the Columbia River as one of the more difficult areas to navigate because of currents and the challenges associated with transiting under both the Interstate Bridge and the Railroad Bridge one mile downstream. The Supplemental Bridge Option would worsen navigation.

The I-5 system provides for the flow of freight goods as well as people – both of which are key factors to the on-going success of our businesses and the region we serve. I-5 provides a connection to four public ports and over 30 private facilities on the lower Columbia and Willamette Rivers, up-river barging, two transcontinental rail lines and much of the region’s industrial land. The Replacement Bridge Option requiring fewer lifts, will enhance transit.

Merchants Exchange members have known for decades that the I-5 system is near failure. Shipments take longer than they should. Commute times have reached an unacceptable level, and accidents occur twice as often along this stretch of the freeway due to the bridge lifts, the narrow lanes and the stop-and-go traffic. The cost to business is staggering.

In the late 1990’s, in recognition of this growing problem, the Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation initiated the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Study. Study findings, published in 1999, concluded that:

- Interstate 5 is the primary economic lifeline on the West Coast.
- Interstate 5 is currently the most congested segment of the regional freeway system.
- This region needs a strategic plan for managing demand in the I-5 corridor and making a balanced set of improvements.
- Improvements will be costly and most cannot be funded with existing revenue.

The work now underway by the Columbia River Crossing Task Force is the continuation of the 2002 Strategic Plan and builds upon the endorsement of every municipality in the region.

Many Merchants Exchange members are concerned that it is almost a decade since planning for the I-5 crossing first began, but we understand that the project is difficult and constrained by the proximate air, rail and river traffic, as well as existing and proposed public and private investments on both sides of the river. We appreciate the careful attention that has been given to these issues.

We therefore enthusiastically support the staff recommendation which proposes one river mid-level replacement bridge crossing and two transit components for further study.

Sincerely,



Gary Haines
President
Merchants Exchange of Portland
Board of Directors



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Highway
Administration**

WESTERN FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY DIVISION
610 EAST FIFTH STREET
VANCOUVER, WA 98661-3801
(360) 619-7700 FAX: (360) 619-7846

File: 311

February 26, 2007

Dr. Hal Dengerink, Co-Chair
Mr. Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington Street, Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

Dear Co-Chairs Dengerink and Hewitt:

I am writing on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration, Western Federal Lands Highway Division (WFLHD) solely as an owner and occupant of the WFLHD facility located at 610 E Fifth Street, Vancouver WA.

After reviewing the Columbia River Crossing Task Force (CRC) recommended alternatives and considering potential impacts to our facility, I would like to provide you and the task force with information and share initial concerns of the proposed alternatives.

Our office employs an on-site staff of approximately 250 people. Any changes to our west parking lot will have a negative impact on our office. On any given workday our west parking lot and the access road above the parking lot are fully utilized. This is in addition to a full utilization of the on-street parking on Fifth Street. The elimination of any existing parking spaces would require alternate parking options to be discussed and reviewed.

At present the only vehicular access we have to our interior compound is via Anderson Road which parallels I-5. We store and maintain our trailers in this compound. Our loading dock also is located within this interior compound which is used to receive supplies and materials for our office and our laboratories. The proposed corridor-widening would eliminate or severely change Anderson Road. This would adversely affect our ability to use our interior compound to store and maintain our trailers and would prevent any 52' delivery truck access to our loading dock. Any changes to Anderson Road will need to address ingress and egress options for deliveries to our facility.



We also have a concern about the air and noise impacts the proposed project will have on our facility and on our employees and visitors. With the potential of having an enlarged and elevated freeway virtually adjacent to our main building, we believe that there is the potential for increased air pollution and noise affecting our office. We also request that some consideration be given to the aesthetics of the project, due to the potential impacts to the historic character of the area and to our office.

From a cultural resources perspective, there are structures or archaeological remains representing three periods of history known within WFLHD's property that are potentially susceptible to impacts from the CRC Project. These cultural resources, as well as the Fort Vancouver National Historic Reserve, must certainly be considered under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act during the development of the CRC Project.

First is the St. James Catholic Mission Site, which dates to 1845 – 1888 and at one time included at least 28 separate structures. Only one previous archaeology study has been conducted within the WFLHD property and during this study, intact significant historic deposits relating to the St. James Catholic Mission Site were identified just north of WFLHD's main building.

Second is the U.S. Army period dating to 1846 – 1948. A Medical Storehouse and Quartermaster's Depot Blacksmith's Shop are noted on an 1854 historic map just south of the WFLHD property in the center of what is now East Fifth Street. The Old Mule Barn located on the east end of the WFLHD property was constructed in 1910 as an artillery stable and has since been upgraded to suit WFLHD functions. A long shed associated with the Army's Spruce Production Division is shown within the WFLHD property on historic maps from 1918 and 1928. Also, a pair of large temporary barracks located at the western edge of the WFLHD property is present on subsequent maps.

Third is the WFLHD period dating to 1930's – present. In addition to the Old Mule Barn, the WFLHD property contains its Main Building, which was constructed in the 1930's as a garage for a building that was removed during the original construction of I-5. During this time, the garage was upgraded to serve as offices for the WFLHD. While this building's significance has not been determined, a formal determination of its eligibility for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is scheduled for spring/summer 2007. Any questions concerning cultural resources, historic and aesthetics about the WFLHD property or the National Historic Reserve should be addressed to the National Park Service.

February 26, 2007
Page Three

We ask that the CRC Task Force give these concerns and information serious consideration.

Sincerely,



Clara H. Conner
Division Engineer

cc: Oregon Division Office, FHWA Salem, OR
Washington Division Office, FHWA Olympia, WA
National Park Service
Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust

February 22, 2007

Mr. David Bragdon, President
Metro Council
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland OR 97232

Subject: City of Vancouver's position of the Columbia River Crossing Recommendation

Dear President Bragdon:

Of all of the decisions that we as elected officials will make during our tenure, the future of the I-5 Crossing of the Columbia River will be one of the most important. Not only will this decision directly affect the cities of Vancouver and Portland, but its impacts will be experienced throughout the entire region as well as travel and commerce along the West Coast of the United States.

The staff of the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) and the Task Force dedicated months of time, at the onset of the project, to define a Purpose and Need that adequately addresses the deficiencies of the existing crossing within the Bridge Influence Area (BIA). These issues included the topics: congestion, transit, freight, safety, bicycles, pedestrians, and seismic stability. All alternatives must be tested against these criteria and only those that stand the challenge should be advanced into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Those alternatives recommended by the CRC staff meet these criteria.

During the course of the study the Task Force considered 23 different mobility and nine separate transit options. Not only were these options tested against the Purpose and Need, but were measured against other performance criteria.

The time has passed for second guessing the criteria established in the Purpose and Need. We should not be willing to accept anything less than a product that meets this criteria and will adequately serve our region for the next 100 years. The existing bridges will not and cannot meet those expectations.

Royce E. Pollard • Mayor
Dan Tonkovich • Councilmember
Pat Jollota • Councilmember
Jeanne Harris • Councilmember



Tim Leavitt • Councilmember
Jeanne Stewart • Councilmember
Larry J. Smith • Councilmember
Pat McDonnell • City Manager

February 22, 2207

Page Two

During the design and construction of the I-5 corridor in the 1950's, the cultural and historic connections were severed from our downtown. Any option other than a new bridge will continue to drive a wedge between these vital elements of our community and consume large portions of economic and sensitive waterfront lands. The actual footprint of a new supplemental bridge along with the existing I-5 bridges is unacceptable to this city as it would significantly and adversely impact our community. Additionally, arterial travel between the two states, not on an Interstate Bridge, will consume needed capacity within our downtown, creating safety and congestion challenges. If transit was to use the existing bridges, reliability would be compromised due to unexpected bridge lifts. The Coast Guard has indicated that if an additional bridge was to be constructed, lift restrictions would be eliminated from the existing interstate lift span bridges. While these present significant impediments to interstate travel, maintenance and operation of the existing structures could conceivably be transferred from the two DOT's to the local jurisdictions. This, too, would be unacceptable to the City of Vancouver.

The environment we live in today is very different from that of 50 years ago and will be substantially different 50 years into the future. We must continue to keep our eye on the mission and select and build an alternative that considers all of these important elements.

The city understands the need to improve mobility through the corridor and embraces a solution that accomplishes that mission, however, not to the detriment of our community. The future of these efforts will result in a system of improvements through both the cities of Vancouver and Portland. Given the enormity of this decision and its expected life span, I urge you to support the recommendation of the CRC staff.

Sincerely,



Royce E. Pollard

Mayor

America's Vancouver



1020 SW Taylor, Suite 760
Portland, OR 97205
503.241.2423 (V) 503.241.2721 (F)

February 24, 2007

Hal Dengerink, Co-Chair
Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
700 Washington Street Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

Dear Co-Chairs Dengerink and Hewitt:

Founded in 1997, The Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition (CREEC) is a group of trade associations, professional organizations and companies involved in the development, sale and management of commercial, industrial and institutional properties; a list of our members is attached. CREEC monitors and evaluates land use and transportation issues at the local, regional and state levels and advocates positions supportive of the State of Oregon's economic growth.

The purpose of this letter is to support the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) staff recommendation to advance three alternatives for further study in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. These alternatives include: 1) No Action, 2) Replacement Bridge with Bus Rapid Transit, and 3) Replacement Bridge with Light Rail Transit. CREEC views the CRC as the most important transportation project presently under consideration in this region as I-5 is the only continuous north/south interstate highway on the West Coast, providing a commerce link for the United States, Canada and Mexico.

The two-bridge crossing, which served 30,000 vehicles per day in the 1960's, now carries more than 125,000 automobiles, buses and trucks each weekday. Although I-5 accommodates substantial "through" traffic, it is estimated that 70% to 80% of the trips using the I-5 crossing actually enter and/or exit I-5 within the five-mile long I-5 Bridge Influence Area. The increased demand described above coupled with short merge lanes, lack of safety shoulders, and frequent bridge lifts has resulted in serious congestion several hours of the day. This is unacceptable for an essential trade corridor that carries a major proportion of the region's travelers and freight.

Over the past several years, CREEC has supported the investments made to date to improve safety and relieve congestion both to the north and south of the I-5 Columbia River crossing, most recently the upgrade of the Columbia Boulevard interchange. But none of these investments will bear full fruit without addressing the need for a new bridge across the Columbia, as this is the worst "choke" point on the entire I-5 system. We urge the CRC adopt the staff recommendations and proceed with the DEIS.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Tharp".

Mike Tharp, Chair

ABOUT CREEC:

Membership. *Founded in 1997, The Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition (CREEC) is a group of trade associations, professional organizations and companies involved in the development, sale and management of commercial, industrial and institutional properties. Members include:*

- *Certified Commercial Investment Members of Commercial Investment Real Estate Institute (CCIM)*
- *Columbia Corridor Association (CCA)*
- *Commercial Association of Realtors® (CAR)/Oregon Association of Realtors® (OAR)*
- *International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC)*
- *National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP)*
- *Portland Metropolitan Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)*
- *Providence Health System (PHS)*
- *Schnitzer Steel Inc.*
- *Society of Industrial and Office Realtors® (SIOR)*
- *Westside Economic Alliance (WEA)*

Mission Statement. *“CREEC is a coalition of commercial and real estate development and business organizations that supports a thoughtful, common-sense approach to development that balances economic and environmental objectives.”*