Columbia River CROSSING

Meeting Agenda

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	
	Next Meetings: March 27, 4:00-6:30 p.m. WSDOT, Southwest Region Office, 11018 NE 51st Circle, Vancouver, WA April 24, 4 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. Oregon Department of Transportation 123 NW Flanders St., Portland, OR	

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.

Columbia River CROSSING

Meeting Summary

Meeting: Columbia River Crossing Task Force
Date: January 23, 2007
Location: WSDOT SW Region Headquarters
11018 NE 51st Circle, Vancouver, Washington

Members Present:

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Alternate Attending
Adams	Sam	City of Portland	
Brown	Rich	Bank of America	
Burkholder	Rex	Metro	
Byrd	Bob	Identity Clark County	Ginger Metcalf
Caine	Lora	Friends of Clark County	
Dengerink	Hal	Wash. State University- Vancouver	
Eki	Elliott	Oregon/Idaho AAA	
Frei	Dave	Arnada Neighborhood Association	
Fuglister	Jill	Coalition for a Livable Future	
Grossnickle	Jerry	Columbia River Towboat Association	
Halverson	Brad	Overlook Neighborhood Association	
Hamm	Jeff	C-TRAN	
Hansen	Fred	TriMet	
Hewitt	Henry	Stoel Rives, LLP	
Isbell	Monica	Starboard Alliance Company, LLC	
Knight	Bob	Clark College	
Malin	Dick	Central Park Neighborhood Assn.	
Osborn	Dennis	City of Battle Ground	
Paulson	Larry	Port of Vancouver	Katy Brooks
Phillips	Bart	Columbia River Economic Development Council	
Pollard	Royce	City of Vancouver	
Strahn	Elson	Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust	
Stuart	Steve	Clark County	
Sundvall-Williams	Jeri	Environmental Justice Action Group	
Valenta	Walter	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association	
Walstra	Scot	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce	
Zelenka	Tom	Schnitzer Group	

Members Absent:

Armbruster	Grant	Portland Business Alliance
Cruz Walsh	Serena	Multnomah County
Lookingbill	Dean	Regional Transportation Council
Lynch	Ed	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Pursley	Larry	Washington Trucking Association
Ray	Janet	Washington AAA
Russel	Bob	Oregon Trucking Association
Schlueter	Jonathan	Westside Economic Alliance
Schmidt	Karen	Washington Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
Tischer	Dave	Columbia Pacific Building Trades
Wyatt	Bill	Port of Portland

Number of guests present: 35

Project Staff Present:

Ron Anderson
Ray Barker
Danielle Cogan
Doug Ficco
Frank Green
Heather Gunderson
Barbara Hart
Bob Hart
Nanci Luna Jimenez
Jay Lyman
Tom Markgraf
John Osborn
Peter Ovington
David Parisi
Lynn Rust
Carolyn Sharp
Lynette Shaw
Gregg Snyder
Audri Streif
Rex Wong

NOTE:	*Task Force questions and comments are in italics,* Staff responses are in plain text

1. Welcome & Announcements

• Welcome to new members

- Jeff Hamm is the new CEO of C-TRAN and will now represent the agency on the Task Force.

• City of Vancouver Letter to Co-Chairs

--*Mayor Royce Pollard - The City wanted to give its views on four major areas. We support the staff recommendation and give our reasons in the letter. We are very concerned about more travel through downtown Vancouver and don't want anything to do with the supplemental options that bring that in. We also commented on bringing the light rail system across the river for the sake of planning for the next 50 to 100 years. When the I-5 went through, we weren't concerned about aesthetics or what we were doing – but it cut off from the Historic Reserve. We have an opportunity to bring the Reserve and downtown back together by adding a cap to that part of I-5.*

--Walter Valenta – Could you expand on the letter's reference to eliminating consideration of high ramps connecting SR-14 to I-5?

--Mayor Royce Pollard – Preliminary documents had high ramps coming along the Reserve right by the military hospital with a similar one on the other side. That is not acceptable for us.

--Hal Dengerink – We have not yet received the information on where we'll enter and exit on the freeway. Another concern I'd like to address is the one that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will not be done before we select our locally preferred alternative. I want to assure everybody that though it won't be published before we select, we will have all the data and the analysis before we make the decision.

2. Meeting Summary Approval

• **Action:** Approved – Draft summary of November 29, 2006 Task Force meeting

3. Public Comment

- **Terry Parker** - Resident from Oregon. Observed that it was the Hayden Island, Marine Dr. and Delta Park interchanges that were creating the back up and that traffic is free-flowing in Washington. Concerned that there are preconceived notions driving the CRC process and that a final selection is not justified without the consideration and pricing out of middle ground options that retain the existing bridges. Requested that tolling take into account the cost break-out of different transportation modes and that all bridge users, regardless of mode, pay a toll. Also requested that there be accurate counts presented on the current use of bikes across the bridge in order to determine whether or not that mode is justified as being part of a new design. Stated that it is inappropriate to spend $2 billion and then attempt to control what kind of modes users use.
- **Carolyn Patterson -** Daughter of civil engineer. Asserted that the Interstate Bridge has been substandard since the beginning due to the bridge lift and that another location should likely be found for the crossing. Stated that the greatest source of congestion is Delta Park and that improvements are already coming. Claimed that HOV lanes and light rail would benefit Portland much more than Clark County. Reasons given against a downtown light rail include few people living in the I-5 corridor and an alignment that would not serve many of Clark County's top employers.
- **John Owens -** Stated that the congestion issue is more than a commuter issue because the I-5 corridor is a major arterial for multiple regions. Explained that with an average of 27,000 truckloads a year of product shipped by his company, that at the current rate of $70-100 for an hour of truck use, his business easily loses $100 on a given day between Portland and Vancouver. Emphasized the economic pressure put on freight because of current inability to afford either too much or too little inventory at a time. Talked about the numerous factors in the corridor that have a negative impact on supply chain and stated that everyone gains from a design that helps freight and daily efficiency.
- **Jim Howell** - Representing Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates (AORTA). Stated that the regional model traffic projections that the staff recommendation is based on are only as good as the initial assumptions programmed into it, and compared the current work to that done by energy planners whose actions based on large demand projections ultimately ended in bankruptcy. Stated that there were many factors that negate the staff's assumptions such as raised fuel prices and environmentally focused projects receiving more federal financing. Stated that a two track light rail line can carry more than highway, that building a local arterial would provide a local connection for Hayden Island and emergency access, and that replacing the BNSF railroad span would greatly limit need for freeway lifts. Stated that it would be extravagant and possibly against NEPA guidelines to not further evaluate a low-impact alternative in the DEIS process.
- **Debbie Larner** – Vancouver resident of thirteen years. Stated that in the past decades, cities which have grown have built necessary roads except for Portland and Seattle. Commented that though there have been elements of public process, nothing has been built and that light rail is a new stall tactic. Stated that inadequate road space will eventually choke off economic vitality and that building roads is a political priority. Questioned that light rail was the best use of transit dollars and asked how much bus or deluxe bus service could be provided for the same amount of money.
- **Randy Mueller** – Clark County resident, transit advocate, student at PSU in regional planning, with experience securing funding for C-TRAN. Stated opposition to CRC's combination of the replacement bridge option with the two transit options. Commented that he does not see it as a comprehensive solution but as a strong-arming of commuters into transit choices. Took issue with prices not being included in the explanations and comparisons of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT). Stated he'd like the concerns expressed in a letter sent by the C-TRAN board to CRC to be addressed. Proposed solutions that included slowing down to give people time to confer with their staff and stakeholders; updating Web site with current descriptions of LRT and BRT; separating transit components from the replacement bridge option and build a bridge with the capacity for high capacity transit; and holding an advisory vote in Clark County.

- **Sylvia Evans** - Resident who has lived 27 years along a Portland freeway. Voiced concern about statements in CRC's *Air Quality Methods and Data Report* claiming that there was no conclusive evidence of the affect of air quality on health and referred to several studies showing a link between health issues and air quality. Stated that there are already a high number of health problems in her area and that there should be no more lanes added. Stated that the community wants 1% of the total project budget to go into a community enhancement fund to build health care centers along the freeway, provide care in schools next to freeway, and to install air quality monitors. Also proposed 1% of the income from tolls on the bridge to pay for these programs, and stated that this could be modeled off of what other states are already doing. Also recommended updating Web site.
- **Jim Karlock** – Referred to handout about the phone survey conducted by CRC **(Appendix 1)**. Referred to the answers of question #2 on the survey which showed congestion as a top ranked concern for those polled and question #6 in which 62 percent responded that they wanted a road based solution to solve I-5 problems between Vancouver and Columbia Blvd. Asserted that these are the most important results from the poll. Argued against claims that light rail's capacity is equal to that of one lane of traffic and that a more accurate figure would be ¼ of a lane. Also disputed the claim of the operating costs being less for light rail than buses due to the inclusion of extensive bus lines which serve few people over many miles.
- **Sharon Nasset** – Passed out flyer for a community forum for a third bridge option **(Appendix 2)**. Claimed a wide base of support for a third bridge option. Stated that CRC was intending to make a fourth truck route through Vancouver on 39th Ave, and that the task force was inadequately informed about the actions of the Freight Working Group that the task force had signed off on. Stated that the current recommendation would add pollution and truck traffic and would not provide non-highway access on and off Hayden Island. Stated that I-5 partnership says it's imperative to do something for rail. Claimed that current recommendation would cause businesses to leave and that creating infrastructure to the ports would create jobs.

4. Progress Report on Open Houses and Outreach Activities

• Presentation by **Danielle Cogan**

--Brad Halverson – Could you send out a synopsis of the comments you've received before next meeting?

Danielle Cogan – We will send out the report beforehand with the typical materials that are sent.

--Steve Stuart – Will the raw comments themselves be available? Perhaps online?

Barbara Hart – We can make available the raw comments, probably through a link on the website.

5. Staff Recommendation Discussion – Questions and Clarifications

Jay Lyman – The goal is to use this time to answer your questions about the staff recommendation. In December the staff sent out a request for questions from Task Force members. There is a summary of the two questions we received and our responses to them in your packet **(Appendix 3)**. We'd like to start by going over those very briefly and then opening up the discussion to other questions.

• <u>Discussion of Question from member Dave Frei:</u>

Jay Lyman – Dave Frei asked why we have not so far considered air quality and noise and vibration impacts as part of our analyses of the alternatives. The short answer is that all of the build alternatives performed similarly in regards to these impacts, except for Alternative Package #3. Because there is little difference between the supplemental and replacement options in this respect, it is not a good discriminator here. Alternative Package #3, which has the existing bridges used for I-5 and builds a new bridge for local arterial traffic and light rail, would perform similarly as the no-build option.

--Jeri Sundvall-Williams – There is a statement in the Air Quality Methods and Data Report that it has not been proven that poor air quality has an adverse impact on health. It is something that has been proven in other states and has affected those transportation plans.

Jay Lyman – We'd be happy to spend more time talking about the report.

--Dave Frei – The concern is that we are going to lean on no-build as the differentiator. An intermediate option would involve working with what we have and finding an option that provides relief for air quality and meets the purpose and need. The no-build will always look worse. I'd like an intermediate alternative that we could work with to balance capacity and air quality.

Jay Lyman – What our experts are saying is that even if we do nothing, there will be improvement in emissions. Investing in the I-5 corridor will also change it by reducing congestion, but our experts are saying about 90% of the improvement will come from changes in vehicle types and fuel quality.

--Jeri Sundvall-Williams – Historically the community has been part of deciding how air quality issues will be modeled. We are still willing to contribute what we'd like to see in an air quality document. I think it can be flip to say that cleaner diesel will make a change. There are many engines out there that will run another 30 years and lower income populations who don't turn over their cars very frequently.

--Jill Fuglister – I'd like to echo Dave's discomfort about having what we see as just one alternative in the DEIS process. A real no-build with Transportation Demand Management (TDM) needs to be vetted as well as another lighter build option that works with what we have, perhaps with some aspects of what Jim Howell has proposed.

Jay Lyman – The no-build includes a very aggressive TDM.

--Walter Valenta - I'm nervous about similarities between this and the Mt. Hood Freeway, which also only compared one alternative to a no-build. I've heard that a lawsuit based on this consideration of just one alternative is what undid that project. Are we vulnerable because of this?

Jay Lyman – I don't think there is anyone here who can speak to the history of the Mt. Hood Freeway. With regard to vulnerability, we are working closely with the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, and national experts. They say we have followed an acceptable and appropriate process for this project and are managing risks appropriately.

--Hal Dengerink – There is a difference between following the process and what we are applying it to. Do we need additional alternatives as we proceed?

Jay Lyman – You have to consider all reasonable alternatives, but in the process of getting to the DEIS you can screen out options that are less reasonable or optimal. In the DEIS, we will have to explain why we did not consider other alternatives.

--Jill Fuglister – Is there going to an opportunity to hear more about the TDM?

Jay Lyman – We have some working assumptions presented before in the component lists. We will need to get a group to look at fleshing those out.

• <u>Discussion of Question from member Elliott Eki:</u>

Jay Lyman – The second question was from Elliot and concerned the effects of the Delta Park project on CRC. The project is scheduled to go to construction in 2008 and finish in 2010. It will add another southbound lane and safer shoulders, and we are assuming that CRC will match that change. The project left an unanswered question about HOV lanes. They have asked CRC to consider the viability of an HOV lane through the CRC project area and beyond ito determine whether they will include an HOV lane.

--Steve Stuart – To confirm what we have understood, the staff is running a model with an HOV lane on the Washington side up to 134th.

Jay Lyman – To make that idea work we would have to re-stripe the shoulders to add a lane. We would not take away from general purpose lanes to create an HOV.

--Steve Stuart – I don't think that Washington residents know that it is being modeled or that it is included in the travel times and throughput being shown. It is good information for them to know. What has been included for TDM in the no-build? You call it aggressive, but isn't it the TDM that has already been adopted by RTC and Metro?

Gregg Snyder – You are correct. It is extremely aggressive in Oregon and is more modest in Washington. In the build options, we would probably include additional TDM options that are suggested in a number of components.

--Steve Stuart – Can we get a copy of the TDM policies?

Gregg Snyder – Yes.

--Brad Halverson – Is the 2008 to 2010 date just for the first part of the Delta Park construction?

Jay Lyman – Yes

--Brad Halverson – I was disappointed that the three through lanes were not presented as a done deal in the Hibbetts poll. It is not what we are talking about, but it is what the public was talking about. How were the questions developed?

Jay Lyman – Hibbetts was directed by the project team and participating agencies.

--Brad Halverson – Hopefully future polls will have more specific questions or guided responses.

--Steve Stuart – I'd like to request more information on the HOV lane extending past the project area. I would like to see information on other impacts that go beyond the BIA in your modeling.

--Walter Valenta – When we used the term "aggressive" TDM, I thought we were going outside of what we are already doing into something other regions have not done. Metro may be "aspirational," but it doesn't sound like that on the other side. How aggressive are Metro's policies?

--Rex Burkholder – Metro has been doing a lot of individualized and mass marketing efforts. There is also an intelligent traffic system network like ramp meters and we are in the process of tying those to the ones across the river. Beyond what we are already doing, there is also more individualized marketing, tolling, and a good transit alternative that can be considered. There is more you can do such as pricing. We can be more aggressive, but I am not sure that this project alone is the right place. It has to be systemic.

Jay Lyman – The alternatives moving forward will include variations of tolling as a variable. It is one of the strongest management tools we have and a funding mechanism as well.

--Walter Valenta – Going person to person and business to business to ask what could make transportation better is what has made TDM work on Swan Island. There is also TDM as a land-use equation. Is that in our modeling?

--Rex Burkholder –The models consider the "cost" of travel by translating everything into dollars. The work we do in tolling will tell us how behavior changes based on cost of travel. Modeling will tell us if you can actually change behavior by raising "costs." From there you can modify them in ways other than tolling.

--Lora Caine – What is the timeline on figures for cost and tolling?

Jay Lyman – The cost information will be a result of refining the recommendations. By mid-summer we are likely to have estimates. We are on a similar timeline for detailed tolling results, though we will have some preliminary information from it coming out in the next few months.

--Lora Caine – Is there any way to get a ballpark on costs? That could impact how I vote on this.

John Osborn – The initial costs we have with respect to replacement and supplemental based on what little engineering there has been done show that both options are pretty much the same cost. Because that is the same, other factors such as impacts to local traffic, marine navigation, and right-of-way become more important. The environmental impacts and transit reliability also become bigger issues. When you add things up, what decision do you come to? We are working on putting these factors into a matrix to give you in the next week or so.

--Jill Fuglister – What is included in costs for this level of analysis?

John Osborn – Construction of the river crossing and the changes needed to the interchanges. Operating costs are included as well.

--Dick Malin – I would like to share Lora's concern. Cost is coming at us from everywhere. I am concerned about a neglect to look at conventional cost effective methodology and analyses. You can look at costs as pieces or comparisons, but the toughest is finding the value of avoiding our bridge coming down.

Doug Ficco – We have engineers looking at different types of structures and we'll analyze them to see what is the best fit and most cost-effective. For cost, we assume the same type of bridge in either option.

--Hal Dengerink – We need to make sure that everybody has their questions answered. Please feel free to contact the staff and they will answer your questions both personally and as a group.

--Brad Halverson – If several of us have similar questions, it would be good if we could get something like the memo we got today emailed out to everyone before the next meeting.

6. Economic Importance of the I-5 Corridor

• Presentation by Chris Wornum of Cambridge Systematics

Discussion

--Steve Stuart – What does the Seattle area look like with regard to rates of growth and decline?

Chris Wornum – Seattle is about 10 years ahead of you as far as the congestion's cost on their economy. They have an advantage with their major academic centers that will foster growth in new economy sectors and may see less damage from neglecting their transportation.

--Rex Burkholder– Could you go into more about labor as an input into the economy and how that relates to transportation?

Chris Wornum – It doesn't matter how they get to work if employers can recruit from a larger and more diverse labor pool. As a benchmark that I've seen, if you double the size of the labor pool, productivity increases by a half of a percent, which is a major advantage for any region.

--Lora Caine – Do you see an increase in freight for rail, and is its capacity limited by what is there?

Chris Wornum – Yes. I understand that the rail bottlenecks are severe in this region, perhaps more than trucks. It's as important an investment as highway in this area.

--Jeff Hamm – What regions are stagnating and how are they responding in terms of transportation?

Chris Wornum – Any economic region that slows down does so for multiple reasons, not just transportation. L.A. and Atlanta are examples of places where congestion has negatively affected growth. There are places that have solved their transportation problems such as downtown San Francisco and New York with public transit.

--Walter Valenta – Are you saying that the areas that avoided stagnation did so with intense mass transit?

Chris Wornum - No. Silicon Valley has invested a lot in its transit but still has low ridership and though not stagnating, has slowed down.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Next Meeting:
February 27, 2007, 4:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Oregon Department of Transportation
123 NW Flanders St., Portland

Appendices
to Task Force Meeting Summary

Handouts to Task Force Members

Appendix 1 Copy of results from CRC's phone survey and flyer on light rail and congestion distributed by Jim Karlock

Appendix 2 Flyer for community forum on third crossing options distributed by Sharon Nassett

Appendix 3 Memo on staff responses to December questions from task force members.

Poll shows that People Want Roads, Not transit

Columbia crossing survey questions #2:

Q2. What is the most important issue that you would like to see your local and regional government officials do something about? (Open, probe for one issue only)

Traffic Congestion/Control ----------17%
Education Quality ----------11%

Notice that Congestion scored well above education.

Columbia crossing survey questions #6:

Q6. What do you think should be done, if anything, to minimize the problems on I-5 between Vancouver and Columbia Boulevard in Portland, including the Interstate Bridge across the Columbia River? (Open)

Lanes Added/Wider Roads/Eliminate Bottlenecks ----------27%
Another Bridge Added ----------24%
Mass Transit (General)/Development/Improvements ------10%
Current Bridge Replaced/Widened ---------- 7%
Light Rail Development/Expansion Across Bridge---------- 6%
Highways/Roads Added/New Route Choices---------- 4%

Here 62% of the respondents wanted road based solutions, 16% mass transit

CRC (Hibbits) Poll: http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/getInvolved/MarketResearch.aspx

Portland Light Rail is Ineffective at reducing Congestion

Oregonian October 29, 1998: Trimet said Ridership went from 3,642 to 5,415 an increase of 1773.
Conclusions: Trimet found that, over a three hour period, 1773 people were removed from the freeway for a total of 591 people per hour.

- A freeway lane has a capacity of around 1800 cars per hour.
- 591 people would occupy 492 cars at 1.2 people per car.
- 492 / 1800 = 0.27, or about 1/4 of one lane of freeway capacity.

MAX removed ONE-QUARTER OF ONE LANE worth of traffic from the Sunset during rush hour.

Also: Of the 5.415 total transit users, 3,642 **(67%) were previous transit users** and 1773 (33%) were not.

Trimet' own FactSheet claims that: "MAX carries 26% of afternoon rush-hour commuters traveling from downtown on the Sunset Hwy. and Banfield Fwy. corridors."

1. The Sunset Hwy. is 3 lanes in each direction, so there are 4 "lanes", counting MAX as one lane. Of 4 lanes, MAX carries 26%, which is just a little more that the 25% it would carry if all 4 "lanes" carried the same number of people.
2. Conclusion: MAX carries about the same number of rush-hour commuters as one lane of freeway. 2/3 of MAX riders would be on a bus if MAX had not been built (as shown above)
3. Therefore MAX carries a number of people equal to 1/3 of the number of people on one lane of the freeway. But the number of cars removed is 1/3 divided by 1.2 people per car = 28%

MAX only reduces traffic by 28% of one lane of freeway, according to Trimet's own data.

Operating Cost of Rail vs Bus

From Trimet's BusmasStat.pdf:
Rail delivered 169,553,280 passenger miles for $73,537,962, a **cost per passenger-mile of $0.434**
Bus delivered 236,736,000 passenger miles for $197,597,326 a **cost per passenger-mile of $0.835**
From Trimet corespondance:
However, Trimet's lowest cost line is Line 33-McLoughlin it has a **cost per passenger-mile of $0.34**

Construction Cost of Vancouver LRT Loop

Express Bus-Short

3 lane/LRT loop	cost: $1,222 million	for 13,000 riders
3 lane/Express Bus-**Short**	cost: $14 million	for 9,000 riders
Increase due to rail	cost: $1,208 million	for 4,000 more riders (subtracting)

Cost per increased rider: $1,208,000,000 ÷ 4000 = **$302,000 per increased rider**

Express Bus-Long

3 lane/LRT loop	cost: $1,222 million	for 13,000 riders
3 lane/Express Bus-**Long**	cost: $32 million	for 10,600 riders
Increase due to rail	cost: $1,190 million	for 2,400 more riders (subtracting)

Cost per increased rider: $1,190,000,000 ÷ 2400 = **$495,000 per increased rider**

It would literally be cheaper to buy a Pearl district condo for each of those ridders that would not ride the bus. (Of course it would hard to identify those individuals)

No Cost Estimates Presented

The lack of costs associated with each proposal prevents comparison of cost-efficiencies and may lead to a high cost "Rolls-Royce" solution when a Ford would work as well.

Now that the project cost seems to be 6 BILLION, perhaps a better solution would be combination of increased I205 and I5 capacity plus a third bridge location.

We don't know because we don't know the costs.

Most Data Was Filtered Through One Source

Most of the data that the task force got came from one source and there was no opposing viewpoints, except public comment. If the task force was to truly be an advisory group, they should have received data from opposing viewpoints. You should have heard from light rail opponents like:

Randal O'Toole, John Charles or Wendell Cox. John Charles is a Portland resident and Randal O'Toole is an Oregon resident.

More information at **www.DebunkingPortland.com**

Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.
Columbia Crossing Survey, November 2006
Two 15-minute surveys, Tri-County Area and Clark County
Each survey n=400 likely voters (2 of last 4 elections)

WARM-UP

Q1. All in all, would you say that things in the Portland/Vancouver area are headed in the right direction, or are things pretty much off on the wrong track?

	Combined	TC	Clark Co
Right direction	55%	56%	54%
Off on the wrong track	32%	32%	33%
[DON'T READ] DK	13%	13%	13%

MESSAGING – REASONS WHY CRITICAL/SERIOUS PROBLEM - UNPROMPTED

Q2. What is the most important issue that you would like to see your local and regional government officials do something about? (Open, probe for one issue only)

Combined	Traffic Congestion/Control	17%
	Education Quality	11%
	Education Funding	11%
	Tax Control	8%
	Road/Freeway Development/Maintenance	5%
	Growth/Development Control/Land Use	4%
	Healthcare/Insurance	4%
	Crime/Public Safety	4%
	All other responses	3% or less
	[DON'T READ] DK	6%
Tri-County	Traffic Congestion/Control	16%
	Education Funding	13%
	Education Quality	12%
	Tax Control	8%
	Road/Freeway Development/Maintenance	4%
	Healthcare/Insurance	4%
	Crime/Public Safety	4%
	Growth/Development Control/Land Use	4%
	All other responses	3% or less
	[DON'T READ] DK	6%
Clark County	Traffic Congestion/Control	22%
	Education Quality	10%
	Road/Freeway Development/Maintenance	7%
	Growth/Development Control/Land Use	7%
	Tax Control	7%
	Columbia River Bridge	6%
	Transportation/Public Mass Transit	5%
	Healthcare/Insurance	4%
	All other responses	3% or less
	[DON'T READ] DK	6%

Clark County Another Bridge Added ---------- 38%
Lanes Added/Wider Roads/Eliminate Bottlenecks ---------- 36%
Current Bridge Replace/Widened ---------- 8%
Light Rail Development/Expansion Across Bridge ---------- 8%
Mass Transit (General) Development/Improvements -------- 5%
New highways/Route choices ---------- 5%
All other responses ---------- 3% or less
[DON'T READ] DK ---------- 9%

MESSAGING – RATING REASONS WHY TO DO SOMETHING - PROMPTED

Q7. I would like to read some reasons people have given us as to why something should be done to reduce traffic problems along the section of I-5 between state route 500 in Vancouver and Columbia Boulevard in Portland, including the interstate bridge across the Columbia River. Regardless of how you feel about this stretch of I-5, please tell me if you think that particular reason is a very good, good, poor, or very poor reason to do something to reduce problems along that section of freeway.

(ROTATE)	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	NA/ DK
a. The longer we wait to deal with this problem the more it is going to cost us.	46%	43%	8%	2%	2%
Tri-County	44%	44%	9%	2%	2%
Clark County	54%	38%	4%	3%	1%
b. Movement of products and freight will be slowed if we don't reduce congestion along that section of the freeway.	33%	48%	11%	3%	4%
Tri-County	33%	48%	12%	3%	5%
Clark County	36%	49%	10%	3%	3%
c. That section of freeway, including off ramps and the way the lanes are designed are just unsafe and need to be improved.	34%	39%	13%	3%	11%
Tri-County	34%	39%	13%	3%	12%
Clark County	38%	39%	13%	4%	7%
d. Local businesses will be hurt if we don't reduce traffic congestion along that stretch of I-5.	19%	41%	23%	7%	10%
Tri-County	17%	41%	24%	7%	11%
Clark County	24%	42%	21%	7%	7%
e. Including improved public transit as part of the improvement of that section of freeway would help reduce air pollution	34%	43%	13%	5%	5%
Tri-County	34%	44%	13%	4%	6%
Clark County	34%	41%	13%	9%	4%

Does Rail Reduce Congestion-1?

From the Oregonian october 29, 1998 (just after the Westside line opened):
The debate about ridership on westside light rail and its effect on traffic continued Wednesday, with Tri-Met saying it has attracted 1,773 new bus and rail riders in the westside corridor

Tri-Met based its number on a count of bus riders between 6 and 9 a.m. on an average of five mornings in October 1997 compared with a similar count of bus and rail riders this month in the same corridor. The agencys transportation consultants counted 3,642 riders both directions in October 1997 and 5,415 this month.

Analysis: This is a real count, not a projection and is from the transit agency itself!
Ridership went from 3,642 to 5,415 an increase of 1773. Of the 5.415 total transit users, 3,642 **(67%) were previous transit users** and 1773 (33%) were not. Typically light rail lines have more riders in the first month due to the hoopla surrounding their opening and before some riders realize that, for them, the rail is actually worse than the bus that it replaced, so this number of new riders is probably an ABSOLUTE MAXIMUM.
Conclusions:

1. Trimet found that, over a three hour period, 1773 people were removed from the freeway for a total of 591 people per hour.
2. A freeway lane has a capacity of around 1800 cars per hour.
3. 591 people would occupy 492 cars at 1.2 people per car.
4. 492 / 1800 = 0.27, or about 1/4 of one lane of freeway capacity.
5. **MAX removed ONE-QUARTER OF ONE LANE worth of traffic from the Sunset during rush hour.**

Does Rail Reduce Congestion-2 ?

A Trimet FactSheet (year 2006, 8 years after the Westside line opened) claims that:

- "MAX carries 26% of afternoon rush-hour commuters traveling from downtown on the Sunset Hwy. and Banfield Fwy. corridors."
- "Westside MAX provides the transportation capacity equivalent to another 1.2 lanes in each direction on the Sunset Hwy."

Analysis of "MAX carries 26% of afternoon rush-hour commuters traveling from downtown on the Sunset Hwy":
The Sunset Hwy. is 3 lanes in each direction, so there are 4 "lanes", counting MAX as one lane. Of 4 lanes, MAX carries 26%, which is just a little more that the 25% it would carry if all 4 "lanes" carried the same number of people.
Conclusion:

1. MAX carries about the same number of rush-hour commuters as one lane of freeway.
2. 2/3 of MAX riders would be on a bus if MAX had not been built (as shown above: "Of the 5.415 total transit users, 3,642 **(67%) were previous transit users...**")
3. Therefore MAX carries a number of people equal to 1/3 of the number of people on one lane of the freeway. But the number of cars removed is 1/3 divided by 1.2 people per car = 28%
4. **MAX only reduces traffic by 28% of one lane of freeway, according to Trimet's own data.**

Comment:

1. Those other 3 lanes of the Sunset, also carry trucks and buses along with a share of commuters equal to MAX.
2. 18 miles of MAX cost $963 million, or $53.5 million per route mile of double track ($26.75 million per track-mile).
3. Freeways typically cost $5-10 million per lane-mile.
4. The cost was 267% -535% that of a freeway lane for removing 28% of one freeway lane of traffic - **a cost of 950% - 1900% above that of a freeway**.

Does Rail Reduce Congestion-3?

The Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership used 18% and 31% as the percentage of rail riders that would be in cars. See here for the method used.

Conclusion: The above two methods produce answers consistent with the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership and we can be fairly confidnet that Portland's MAX only removes about 1/4 of one lane worth of traffic from a three lane freeway. LRT costs about 10-19 as much as freways for the same capacity.

Final Conclusion: LIGHT RAIL COSTS TOO MUCH AND DOES TOO LITTLE

Stop Traffic Congestion

It is time for a Third Bridge Now

- Congestion is the region's number ONE issue
- Congestion costs us hundreds of millions of dollars a year (Metro area)
- We have fewer bridges than most river cities of similar size in the US

This section of the I-5 Corridor has been under continuous study since 1977 - it is time for a Third Bridge Now.

A recent survey of regional residents shows that:

- 27% want Lanes added / wider roads / eliminate bottlenecks
- An additional 24% want another bridge added.
- Only 7% want the current bridge replaced or widened
- Only 6% want light rail. (Columbia Crossing Survey, Nov 2006, Davis, Hibbits & Midghall, Inc)

Clearly people want a third bridge, instead of replacing the current bridge.

Help save the current Historic Columbia River Crossing, downtown Vancouver, Jantzen Beach, and stop the encroachment on Historic Fort Vancouver.

Citizen Transportation Summit

organized by Concerned Neighbors
Speak up and direct the future transportation of our region.
Bring your ideas and share your thoughts.

Feb 5 Open House 2-8pm * Presentation 6:30 * 7PM Town Hall Open Mike
Jantzen Beach Yacht Club 12050 n. Jantzen Beach Dr.

Feb. 10 Open House at 11am –7pm* 1st Presentation noon *Open Mike 1-2pm
2nd Presentation is at 4pm with Open Mike 5- 6:30pm
Location TBA

Build a Long-term Solution, Now.

www.newinterstatebridge.com*thirdbridgenow@aol.com*503.283.9585

Columbia River CROSSING

Memorandum

January 23, 2007

TO: Columbia River Crossing Task Force

FROM: Doug Ficco and John Osborn

SUBJECT: Task Force Questions

Below are comments and questions received from Task Force members about the Staff Recommendations for River Crossing and Transit DEIS Alternatives and CRC responses.

From Dave Frei:

At this point, the staff recommendation does not address either Criteria 1.1 (Noise) or 1.3 (Air Quality). The long-term (multi-generational) effects upon the neighborhoods along the corridor due to air quality, noise, light pollution, etc. will be huge. I don't understand why staff has not addressed these criteria and why they are willing to narrow the option list without adequately accounting for the possibility that supplemental bridges might reduce these noise and air quality impacts. I have no preconceptions, but just want to ensure we don't eliminate the consideration of any option which could provide relief to the neighborhoods along the corridor.

Response:

All environmental criteria (both those defined by NEPA, as well as those identified in our Evaluation Criteria, which largely are included in the NEPA requirements, must be considered when evaluating alternatives. However, timing is everything. Analyses are costly and time-consuming, so we want to conduct them when they will be the most beneficial. We consider specific environmental criteria such as air quality and noise when 1) we have the alternatives defined to a high enough level that we have adequate data to assess potential impacts, and 2) there is a reasonable probability that the results of an analysis might influence a decision.

For example, it would have been irresponsible and impractical to consider air quality and noise impacts in early 2006, when we were screening the initial list of components down to 12 alternatives. We simply didn't have the components defined well enough to conduct meaningful analyses.

So, did we develop the 12 alternatives to a high enough level to assess air quality and noise? The answer is yes, for the most part. Given the assumptions that were made about highway and transit alternatives, we could have conducted air quality and noise studies, even though we know that the alternatives will be further refined in the DEIS. Thus, the question becomes "Is there a reasonable probability that the results of air quality and noise analyses will influence the decision at this point?" Our answer to that is no. Here's why:

1) We have two decisions under consideration: a) How do we cross the Columbia River?, and b) What types of high-capacity transit best meet the needs of the region? Dave's question focuses on the river crossing decision. With the exception of Alternative 3 (arterial only), all of the supplemental and replacement options would carry I-5 traffic on a new bridge, and would thus perform similarly in terms of traffic operations. Since traffic volumes, vehicle types, and speeds are the primary factors affecting both air quality and noise analyses, we can reasonably infer that there would not be significant differences for those two factors between any of the supplemental or replacement bridge options that provide for a new I-5 crossing.

360/737-2726 503/256-2726 WWW.COLUMBIARIVERCROSSING.ORG 700 WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 300, VANCOUVER, WA 98660

2) The exception to that is Alternative 3—the arterial bridge. It does not provide for additional capacity for I-5, but instead provides for an arterial connection between downtown Vancouver and Hayden Island. Our forecasts indicate that Alternative 3 will perform very similarly to the "No Build" alternative, meaning that hours of congestion, vehicle throughput, travel speeds, and other measures will not differ substantially from doing nothing. Air quality, noise, and all other factors will be evaluated for the No Build alternative, and from that we can reasonably infer how Alternative 3 might perform relative to I-5 traffic. Since Alternative 3 would increase traffic and congestion in downtown Vancouver and Hayden Island, we can also infer that air quality and noise would be at least marginally worse in those areas under Alternative 3.

   Thus, for the alternatives that improve I-5 capacity across the river (whether supplemental or replacement) we can reasonably assume that they would perform similarly in terms of changes to ambient air quality and noise (either positive or negative impacts). For Alternative 3, it's reasonable to assume that air quality and noise impacts would be similar to, or worse, than the No Build alternative.

   Furthermore, we can expect (based on experience in forecasting air quality impacts for other major projects in the Portland-Vancouver metro area) that changes in the vehicle mix and increasingly stringent regulations regarding fuel quality and emissions standards will result in lower corridor emissions in the future, even with projected increases in traffic volumes. In addition, alternatives that improve travel flow and reduce congestion will result in lower emissions and typically perform better than no-build alternatives.

To summarize, in terms of air quality we can reasonably expect that the future No Build conditions will be better than today, and that our river crossing recommendations (replacement bridge) will perform better than the No Build alternative or an arterial-only crossing. For other major transportation projects in the Portland area, the difference between alternatives in future years has been relatively small compared to the reductions in emissions resulting from changes in vehicle mix and regulations pertaining to fuel quality and emissions standards.

From Elliot Eki:

I'd like to hear more about how ODOT's decision to widen I-5 at Lombard will affect the CRC project...if at all.

Response:

ODOT has recently completed an Environmental Assessment for a project to add a third southbound lane to I-5 from Delta Park to Lombard, to improve street connections to the freeway access points at Columbia and Victory boulevards, and to improve safety shoulders in both northbound and southbound directions. Construction is planned for 2008-2010. Additional details of the project proposal can be found at http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION1/I-5DeltaPark/index.shtml.

Any improvements to I-5 resulting from the CRC project will match to the proposed lanes at Delta Park as defined by the Delta-Lombard project. In other words, the three through lanes proposed for the CRC project will match to the three lanes proposed in each direction at Delta Park.

The Delta-Lombard project identified the need to resolve whether one of the three southbound lanes should be designated as an HOV lane. Since decisions by the CRC project about improvements to the river crossing and transit through the corridor will directly affect the potential use of a southbound HOV lane, the Delta-Lombard project recommendations include utilizing analyses to be conducted as part of the CRC project to reach a recommendation for a southbound HOV lane. Thus, as part of our DEIS analyses of project alternatives, we will be considering the potential viability of a southbound HOV lane through the Delta Park area in conjunction with a larger southbound and northbound HOV system extending north through downtown Vancouver.

Columbia River CROSSING

Memorandum

February 20, 2007

TO: Columbia River Crossing Task Force

FROM: Doug Ficco and John Osborn

SUBJECT: Response to additional questions

Following our January meeting, Task Force member Jill Fuglister forwarded several questions to CRC staff. Her questions and the staff responses follow.

1. How do you define "transportation equity" and how is it measured for performance evaluation?

Transportation equity can be described as the "fairness" with which both positive and negative impacts resulting from implementing a transportation project or service are distributed among various population groups. Population groups are generally defined by location (neighborhood), race, ethnic background, income, or other distinguishing characteristics. Transportation equity is evaluated in 3 basic steps:

1. Identify the adverse effects and benefits from the alternatives
2. Evaluate how those benefits and effects are distributed among various population groups
3. Determine if the distribution of effects and benefits are proportionate or disproportionate.

There are a number of ways to do this analysis, including both quantitative and be qualitative methods. We will employ both approaches for the CRC project. While we consider equity issues at each step of the evaluation process, the methods will depend on the extent to which the findings would be useful for the decisions to be made at that step. Specific methods and data reports (MDR) for the project further describe how transportation equity will be addressed.

2. If the railroad swing span was fixed, how many lifts annually would there be? How much would this reduce the cost of maintaining current bridges?

Background: The BNSF railroad bridge, located about one mile west of the I-5 bridges, has a swing-span opening near the north (Vancouver) shoreline. Tug and barge operators crossing under the I-5 bridges will typically use the I-5 spans at the "hump", which are located in the middle of the river channel. That means that a typical maneuver involves an S-curve path between the I-5 bridges and the BNSF bridge. However, during periods of high water, the river currents make the S-curve maneuver hazardous, and the pilots will choose to call for a bridge lift on the I-5 bridges, since the I-5 lift spans line up for a relatively straight path to the BNSF bridge.

We have consulted with representatives of many of the tug and barge firms. Their assessment generally is that relocating the rail span would significantly reduce their need to call for bridge lifts. Other users (such as construction barges and high-mast recreational vessels) would still need to call for lifts due to height restrictions. Therefore:

a. If no new bridge is built, the number of I-5 bridge lifts could be reduced if the rail span is relocated closer to the center of the river.

360/737-2726 503/256-2726 WWW.COLUMBIARIVERCROSSING.ORG 700 WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 300, VANCOUVER, WA 98660

b. If a supplemental bridge is built, the benefits of relocating the railroad span would be affected by the pier locations for the new bridge. There are two barge channels associated with the spans at the I-5 "hump", and it is likely that one of them would be impaired by the piers supporting the new supplemental bridge. That may or may not affect the number of pilots that would choose to call for a bridge lift.

c. If a new I-5 bridge is built and the existing bridges are removed, there would be no river navigation benefit provided by relocating the railroad span (other than perhaps resulting in a wider opening at the railroad). The pier spacing and vertical clearances for the new I-5 bridge would allow vessels to cross under the bridge in several locations, including lining up directly with the downstream railroad span.

We do not have the information to reliably estimate what effect moving the railroad span would have on the number of I-5 lifts. We can say that it would be reduced from the 200-1,000 lifts that occur over a typical year (lift requirements vary widely depending on river conditions). However, the effect on annual operating and maintenance costs would be minimal, assuming that bridge tenders would still be required 24/7, since labor costs are the largest component of annual operating expenses. Efforts to limit I-5 Bridge lifts would benefit I-5, but alone would not address the CRC project's Purpose and Need. The CRC project supports the Bi-State Committee's recommendation for the region to further study this issue.

3. I know that we were told this at one point, but what are "comparable urban freeways" when considering the crash rates?

I-5 within the Bridge Influence Area is experiencing crash rates that are about double compared to other similar urban freeways in Oregon and Washington (e.g., in the Portland-Vancouver area some examples would be I-5, I-84, I-205, Highway 217, Sunset Highway). When bridge lifts occur, accident rates are three to four times more frequent than without bridge lifts.

4. In the memos in various places it says that the no build/TDM/TSM alternative does not meet the purpose and need? Aren't you only supposed to advance alternatives that meet the purpose and need to the full DEIS? Can you clarify this?

First, it is important to clarify what the No Build alternative is for NEPA purposes. Under federal requirements, it must consist of existing transportation facilities and services, plus programmed projects and services that can reasonably expected to be funded. It also reflects policies for efficient use of the transportation system (transportation system management, or TSM) as well as policies that encourage alternatives to single occupant vehicle trips (transportation demand management, or TDM) that are adopted in both regional and local transportation plans. NEPA requirements mandate that project alternatives be considered in comparison to a No Build alternative, which means that the No Build must be considered even if it can not be expected to meet the Purpose and Need of the project. All other Alternatives that advance must meet the project Purpose and Need.

A separate TDM/TSM alternative was one of the 12 options considered over the past several months. Alternative 2 represented a TDM/TSM emphasis with minimum investment proposed for I-5, including increased transit (bus) service. Under this alternative, I-5 traffic would stay on the existing bridges and improvements would be targeted at reducing accidents. CRC staff recommended dropping Alternative 2 as a stand alone solution for the project because it did not meet the project's Purpose and Need.

5. What are bike counts for I-5 bridge v. I-205 bridge?

A bicycle count was performed on September 28, 2005. 160 daily bicycle trips were made on both I-5 bridges. Data from the City of Vancouver shows that about 60 people commute by bicycle over the

bridges during the summer months. This declines to about 20 people commuting by bicycle over the bridges during the winter months. Besides commuting, bicyclists use the bridges for recreational purposes and some bicyclists use the bridge merely to access the Oregon side to conduct bottle recycling.

Approximately 30 to 40 pedestrians cross the bridge daily during the summer months. This drops to less than 15 people during the winter months.

The CRC project does not have bicycle or pedestrian count data for the I-205 bridge.

6. How many bridges in the nation/of this region do not meet "basic collapse" criteria for safety? My understanding is that current bridges are seismically sound, just not up to current seismic standards. Is this still accurate to say? Can you resend me a copy of the memo from the seismic panel?

We have not looked for national data on how many bridges do not meet "no-collapse" criteria. We did review 12 bridges on the Columbia and Willamette Rivers located in close proximity. Eight had been assessed for seismic condition and all had elements that were considered vulnerable. The four that were not evaluated have probable vulnerable elements. You are correct that seismic design criteria have become more stringent since these bridges were originally designed, as scientists are getting better information on potential risks. It is unlikely that any of the area bridges meet current "serviceability" standards. It is unknown how many meet "no-collapse" criteria without doing additional studies.

A copy of the "Panel Assessment of Interstate Bridges Seismic Vulnerabilities" is available upon request. ***It is important to understand that the current I-5 Interstate Bridges are not seismically sound.*** In 1995 ODOT commissioned a study to look at the lift spans which are considered the most vulnerable sections of the bridges. Vulnerabilities were found in the bearings, piles, piers, and lift span tower truss members. Based on the current inspection results for the northbound and southbound bridges, the appraisal and condition ratings range from "intolerable" to "satisfactory". Both of the bridges have been identified as "deficient" bridges. This classification is a result of the bridges' functional obsolescence which means they no longer meet the geometric and/or load capacity criteria for the Interstate system.

7. What is the vehicle throughput in the replacement scenario? What is vehicle throughput in no build/TDM/TSM… and does this include tolling?

Vehicle throughput, measured at the I-5 bridge crossing in the peak travel directions during the four-hour morning and afternoon peak periods, is the following for year 2005 Existing Conditions and for year 2030 No Build and year 2030 Replacement Bridge scenarios:

Southbound I-5 4-Hour AM Period: Existing = 19,100 vehicles, No Build = 21,600 vehicles, Replacement Bridge = 26,800

Northbound I-5 4-Hour PM Period: Existing = 20,500, No Build = 20,800, Replacement Bridge = 32,100

The existing average daily traffic counts on the two I-5 Interstate Bridges are about 130,000 vehicles per day. During peak periods the hourly capacity is about 5,500 vehicles in one direction for each bridge. This limited throughput is the reason the peak periods of congestion are increasing as population and travel demand increases.

A replacement bridge would be able to carry about 8,500 to 9,500 vehicles per hour depending on the number of lanes and whether one of the lanes is managed (HOV). Therefore, a replacement bridge could carry about 50-70% more vehicles during peak periods compared to the existing bridges.

The No Build scenario does not include tolling. However, if the existing bridges remain in service for I-5 traffic, peak period vehicle throughput would not change significantly whether tolled or not. Because demand for crossing the river at peak periods exceeds the available capacity of the bridges, the hourly vehicle throughput is limited to the capacity of the existing bridges. Reasonable tolling rates and affordable TDM/TSM programs would help reduce peak hour demand, but given the very strong and growing demand for travel across the river, it is very unlikely that tolling and TDM measures alone would reduce future demand to such a level that it would reduce throughput at the bridge.

8. On pg. 2 of "component findings" under safety, it says that the replacement option would provide the greatest safety improvements because it would "increase vehicle capacity over I-5". How does this improve safety? Don't more cars equal more accidents ultimately?

Crash analyses have shown that congestion is the major contributor to the increased accident rates. Providing added capacity will reduce the total hours of congestion. Reducing the hours of congestion combined with providing a new roadway and interchange ramps that meet modern design standards should result in a reduction of crashes per million vehicle miles driven.

9. Have you measured car crash deaths v. incidents? If not, will this happen? When you measure "safety" how is it measured? By "incidents" or what?

We conducted a comprehensive analysis of reported crashes along I-5 and its ramps in the Bridge Influence Area. The analysis covered the five-year period of January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004. During this period, there were over 2,200 reported vehicle crashes. Thirty-seven percent of the crashes involved at least one injury. Five fatalities were reported. The crash analysis will be updated this spring as data becomes available to reflect the more recent 2002-06 five-year period.

Vehicular crash history is one means of measuring the safety aspects of a highway facility. The crash rate on I-5 is over twice that compared to similar urban freeways in the Portland-Vancouver area. The crash analysis determined that the frequency and location of crashes is related to the number and location of existing non-standard design and safety features, and, as noted above, is also directly related to periods of congestion.

Question from Task Force Member Brad Halverson with Staff Response

-----Original Message-----
From: halverbk@comcast.net [mailto:halverbk@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2007 6:24 PM
To: Hart, Barbara
Subject: Questions for the CRC team

Hi Barbara,

I would appreciate it if you would forward this to the CRC staff.

I will be out of town for the next three meetings (which smashes my perfect attendance record) on business trips and a church mission trip to the New Orleans area. I realize this means I will not be able to vote on what goes into the DEIS phase of the CRC project. There is not much point in having an alternate at this juncture either.

I do support the staff recommendation with the three proposed options for further study. However, I do believe we need to have more choices to take into the DEIS.

I think we should pursue funding at this time to add the lift span to the downstream railroad bridge immediately. It is my understanding that by doing this now, we will significantly decrease the number of I-5 bridge lifts that are required which is a huge factor in traffic congestion in the off-peak hours and improve the safety for the shipping community using the Columbia River in this area. The railroad bridge improvements were denied funding under the Truman-Hobbs Act because they were going to help the I-5 bridge users more than the railroads. Even if this improvement only helps for five years (assuming that the railroad bridge improvements were completed in 2010 and a new I-5 bridge in 2015), it will show the public and the elected officials that we are willing to do what is necessary to help improve the corridor.

With the addition of the railroad lift span, their will be a significant reduction in the number of vessels requiring bridge lifts. I believe the option of a new but lower profile bridge with a lift span is back on the table. I think I have heard that the high profile of the new bridge would significantly impact views from downtown Vancouver and the waterfront along both sides of the river. A lower bridge would also allow pedestrians and bicyclists to traverse the bridge more easily. With a minimal number of lifts, the Coast Guard should be able to continue and hopefully expand the hours when lifts are prohibited. Finally, this profile may allow a less severe entry to the difficult landings on Hayden Island and Vancouver.

Another option involves the existing northbound bridge. This structure is on the Historic Register. Has the point been proven that will allow its removal?

> **STAFF RESPONSE:**
> **The Columbia River Crossing provided the Federal Highway Administration with information in support of removing the existing 1917 Northbound Interstate Bridge that is currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. We have not had a formal ruling on whether the information submitted is sufficient for a FHWA recommendation. Staff believes there is compelling information to support removal of the bridges.**

I am very concerned that a new mid-level bridge will be very challenging to navigate for pedestrians and bicyclists due to its long grade. It also will not be a very pleasant place to be with cars and trucks whizzing by at high speeds and close proximity. There will be savings from the narrower construction on a new bridge which can help fund maintenance of the existing northbound bridge (although I do realize that capital and maintenance funds come from different sources). I can see this bridge being used by pedestrians and bicyclists with minimal landing space on each side of the river.

360/737-2726 503/256-2726 WWW.COLUMBIARIVERCROSSING.ORG 700 WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 300, VANCOUVER, WA 98660

If the I-5 bridge lifts are dramatically reduced by the addition of the railroad lift span, the cost of keeping a bridge tender on hand should almost be eliminated. The stated estimate is the old bridge would cost $3 million/year to maintain. What is the estimated maintenance cost for a new mid-level bridge?

> **STAFF RESPONSE:**
> **The annualized operations and maintenance life cycle costs averaged over 30 years in today's dollars are $3.9 million per year to keep both existing bridges and $0.6 million per year for a mid-level replacement bridge.**

If an existing bridge is kept for transportation purposes, can the DOT's abandon it without a new buyer? Please note: this is not the "we do not want to maintain the existing bridges" discussion that we have often heard in our meetings.

> **STAFF RESPONSE:**
> **It is unlikely that the Washington and Oregon Departments of Transportation could abandon the existing Interstate bridges without some type of arrangement for another agency to assume ownership because of the need to provide staff around the clock bridge lifts. However, if the bridges no longer serve a highway function and sit idle, the United States Coast Guard indicated they would require the bridges be removed for improved river navigation.**

I appreciated the staff's response to the questions posed by other Task Force members after the November meeting. I do realize that some of these questions have been answered already, but I think it is a good time to make sure everyone understands the tradeoffs. I would like the staff's answers that I would like to have answers disseminated to the Task Force as well as this message. I look forward to watching a replay of the meetings.

Sincerely,
Brad Halverson

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 loose 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 McEnerny-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

Columbia River CROSSING

November 2006

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.

Columbia River CROSSING

Memorandum

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	*If needed*
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!

360/737-2726 503/256-2726 WWW.COLUMBIARIVERCROSSING.ORG 700 WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 300, VANCOUVER, WA 98660