

# Meeting Evaluation

Columbia River Crossing  
&  
Mill Plain to SR 500 Interchange Improvements  
July 24, 2001, Water Resources Center

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
This session was useful	X				
My comments were heard	X				
I know more now than when I arrived	X				

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Meeting Evaluation

Columbia River Crossing  
&  
Mill Plain to SR 500 Interchange Improvements  
July 24, 2001, Water Resources Center

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
This session was useful	X				
My comments were heard	X				
I know more now than when I arrived	X				

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Meeting Evaluation

Columbia River Crossing  
&  
Mill Plain to SR 500 Interchange Improvements  
July 24, 2001, Water Resources Center

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
This session was useful		✓			
My comments were heard	✓				
I know more now than when I arrived	✓				

Comments:

*These sessions are very helpful in fostering public understanding of the complex issues*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Meeting Evaluation

Columbia River Crossing  
&  
Mill Plain to SR 500 Interchange Improvements  
July 24, 2001, Water Resources Center

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
This session was useful	✓				
My comments were heard	✓				
I know more now than when I arrived	✓				

Comments:

Appreciate the ample staff present.

Goal point for discussion - before getting narrowed too far

Your attention is directed to the report (96-55)  
on a hearing in Vancouver on February 2, 1980  
before the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation  
of the U S House of Representatives Committee  
on Public Works and Transportation.

That hearing dealt with a proposal  
for an additional highway bridge across the Columbia River.

Please review the delivered testimony  
on page 66 and pages 68 through 71 of the report.  
The cited testimony is pertinent to your current concerns  
for addressing needs of traffic between Vancouver and Portland.

If finding a copy of the report is difficult for you,  
mine will be made available for photocopying and return  
if you call 503 235 7032,  
or write to 7417 S E 20th Av, Portland 97202.

PROPOSED THIRD BRIDGE CROSSING ON THE COLUMBIA  
RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON, AND  
PORTLAND, OREGON

A0000108040254

Y 4.P 96/11  
96-55  
c.2

OREGON

(96-55)

FEB 23 1981

STATE LIBRARY

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON  
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

FEBRUARY 2, 1980

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON: 1980

88-036 O

Now it is imperative that the potential river crossing locations be thoroughly evaluated, which is pointed out to you in the legislative studies that should be done. At the same time, the social, environmental, economic, and land use impacts of each alternative must be identified. However, it is our concern that the issue before us, and the need for a solution is far too urgent to founder on a continuing public debate without the necessary information to arrive at a practical and cost effective solution. The Port of Vancouver would urge the officials of both States, with whatever assistance and direction can be provided by the Federal Government to get on with the tasks noted above.

To depart somewhat from my text, we know what the problem is, we know what the solution is, and let's get on with it.

I thank you very much, and I can't help but say that I hope you enjoyed an unhurried trip across the I-5 bridge. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROE. Thank you, Mr. Gorini.

Mr. McCormack?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no questions. I thank you, Mr. Gorini.

Do you have any information for the record on what you think the impact on the port itself would be with or without a third bridge?

Mr. GORINI. Well, I'll try to pull some of that out this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Subsequent to submission?

Mr. GORINI. Yes. We get 50 to 150 trucks a day, now when there is a jam on the bridge, crews have to be kept on that means overtime pay so that they can be unloaded, but we have never really sat down and tabulated direct dollar costs to it, but I am sure that the data exists. It is a question of getting somebody to dig it out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I don't want you to put a lot of extra work on it, but anything you have for subsequent submission, I think would be valuable to the committee.

Mr. ROE. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. ROE. The next witness we have listed is Leroy Morley, M-o-r-l-e-y, Ironworkers Local No. 29.

Mr. Morley do you have testimony for us?

Mr. WORLEY. Worley, Mr. Chairman. W-o-r-l-e-y.

Mr. ROE. OK, the Chair recognizes Mr. Worley, Ironworkers Local No. 29. My people here renamed you. We will make that correction for the record, Worley.

#### TESTIMONY OF LEROY WORLEY, IRONWORKERS LOCAL NO. 29

Mr. WORLEY. Well, first of all I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and Congressman Duncan, and Congressman McCormack, for inviting me to attend this hearing.

My primary concern, and if I twitch a little, I think, or stutter, it comes from spending too many hours in that traffic jam, coming from Portland to Vancouver and back.

I try to schedule my trips to the Longview area, Vancouver area, in such times that I do not have to be involved in the congestion of traffic, but it does not always work that way.

I would like to state that members of the various unions that are absent that you called out earlier; namely, the Teamsters and the Carpenters, are probably not here in attendance because they had

meetings last night in Portland and probably couldn't get back here in time, but I am concerned over the jobs and the available added stimulus for economic growth in Vancouver and in the Portland area, and in the Rivergate area, and also the mental relief and well being of citizens of both States, and I am glad that you did bring up the subject of the savings of energy and the price per gallon cost of gasoline in terms of saving of energy. The projected cost of gasoline, I think, by July 1 is supposed to go to about \$1.50 per gallon. Sitting in that line out there I am sure uses up quite a few gallons, but my primary concern for my members that I represent is jobs, and many, many jobs that are being done now on the I-205 bridge and potential of jobs and growth for all members of the community and a living for that.

I am quite concerned with the fact that Mr. Carroll mentioned it would be approximately 14 years before we could "cut the ribbon," on the bridge. I would be hopeful that we would be able to have it completed much, much sooner. Aside from that fact, I am here primarily just to express concern for jobs, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for allowing me to speak.

Mr. ROE. We appreciate your testimony, Mr. Worley.

Any questions, Mr. McCormack?

Mr. McCORMACK. No questions. Thank you very much, Mr. Worley.

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, permit me to say that I am glad that you are putting the emphasis where you are, I think it is important that we consider energy problems as we consider the Northwest power bill, and realize that without more energy and without the means of moving people as a result of their jobs, we are going to run into social problems that are at least equal to the environmental problems we see today, and I suspect you are going to see. So I am glad that you are putting the emphasis that you are on jobs.

Thank you very much.

Mr. ROE. Thank you.

Our next witness is Mr. John Matthews, M-a-t-t-h-e-w-s, owner of the O.K. Delivery. Is Mr. Matthews here?

[No response.]

Mr. ROE. Is the next witness here?

Mr. DUNCAN. Before you leave Mr. Matthews, I don't know whether his absence is inadvertent or intentional this morning. Mr. Matthews happens to be the father of my daughter-in-law, and I was kind of looking forward to him being here this morning so I could get him on the witness stand, but I guess that's why he didn't show.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Ken McFarling, M-c-F-a-r-l-i-n-g. Mr. McFarling is listed here as the advocate for rail lines, would that be a fair listing?

#### TESTIMONY OF KENNETH McFARLING, ADVOCATE FOR RAIL LINES

Mr. McFARLING. My name is Kenneth McFarling, of Portland. This hearing was brought to my attention by the executive director of the National Association of Railway Passengers in Washington, however he had no opportunity to suggest the testimony which I am about to give, and to deliver.

Mr. ROE. You may give your testimony, Mr. McFarling, and we appreciate it.

Mr. MCFARLING. Dr. Lawrence Griffith intended and also expected to be here this morning to testify, but because of illness he could not do so, however, a copy of his testimony has been delivered to the committee.

Mr. ROE. It will be included in the record.

[The following was received for the record:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. LAWRENCE GRIFFITH, TRANSIT RESEARCH OF OREGON

The very real transportation problems between Vancouver and Portland are not ones which have no solution, nor even the lack of resources, but which are severely compounded by the existence of a "political curtain" hanging between the jurisdictions, made up of fabric from both sides of the river.

It is this "curtain" which we must rise over and transcend, not the river.

The position of some elements from the Washington side, and perhaps from both sides, see the advantage of having a third bridge constructed across the river. This, of course, would be a return to a plan which has been universally rejected by all political elements comprising the three county region, of which Clark county did have an associate relationship with, until formation of the Metropolitan Service District of Oregon, which supplanted The Columbia Region Association of Governments.

In June 1975, CRAG adopted a regional transportation plan based upon two key findings

1. The region cannot afford the monetary and environmental costs of a continued expansion of automobile capacity to accommodate growing regional travel.

2. The highway system as it is likely to exist by 1990 will have unacceptable levels of congestion without a major increase in public transit use.

Thus, it will be understood, that regional travel demands must be compensated by improved public transportation facilities. Comprehensive land use decisions must support heavier mass transit use.

The Portland area political jurisdictions is giving short shrift to the idea of continually converting homes, neighborhoods, fully paid for urban services, into automobile pathways, ramps, and parking lots.

Transit must absorb sufficient travel demand to relieve constraints on both the environment and energy, which is caused by the using of petroleum resources.

A city (Vancouver), attacked by such an invasion, ultimately finds it's air shed overwhelmed, it's livability destroyed, and it's tax base eroded. The center dies, while suburbia thrives.

Indeed, we are finding ourselves facing incredible petroleum problems on a national scale, with constantly rising costs, and the potential of a third world war to support our petroleum habit.

Indeed, petroleum serves as a staple resource in our entire economy. We should use it wisely, and not exploit it's use. According to the petroleum industry, we have used approximately 1/3 of our domestic resources, constituting that recovered by primary technology, and most of this has been used in the past 25 years.

It's waste, and economic exploitation must end. In fact it has ended. National survival calls for wise and propitious use of all energy resources, especially petroleum.

We must maximize energy efficiency in the actual design of transportation facilities.

Calls for a third bridge are premature, when the I 205 bridge and free way are nearing completion, and we have not experienced it's effects upon travel problems. Indeed, this facility is the only remaining constituent of the original 1969 \$683.6 million transportation plan, which as mentioned has been formally withdrawn.

Transportation planning must be part and parcel of land use decisions. They must be evaluated upon their effects upon agricultural lands, woodlands, open space and air pollution potentials. Transportation design fostering urban sprawl development is to be avoided.

More consideration must be given to the placing of commercial and industrial job sites, so that housing can be more easily served by transit.

Efforts are being addressed to better serve the needs of Vancouver, in this respect, and they need support and a sense of direction. A large share of those now commuting between the two cities, could be easily converted to transit, given the proper facilities.

One well provided transit way of intermediate capacity, could carry as many persons per hour as 7 lanes of a freeway, with considerable less stress on the community, and less cost.

The state of Washington has the same obligation as does Oregon, to promote energy conservation, but it cannot happen with business as usual methods. We must, however, keep our economy going, and supported.

The Rivergate freeway proposed in 1969 consisted of 2 bridges, one tunnel, and 20.6 miles of freeway, at an estimated cost of 235.6 million dollars in 1969 dollars. Today that cost would be over 1/2 billion dollars.

One serious problem which is already taking form, is the deteriorating condition of present State and federal highways, including the Interstate system. A report issued by the Comptroller General, to the Congress in July, 1979, stated that in 1977, States would need \$18 billion dollars to offset highway deterioration on the Interstate system through 1996, and for the next 20 years, they will need \$67 billion for similar needs on non-interstate roads. As deterioration, and inflation continues, these needs will increase. In case of reconstruction it could become exponential.

It is pretty clear, that States have been opting to use matching or reserve funds to match Federal money for new projects. The result is that we are accumulating a huge repair bill for freeways and highways already built.

It appears to me, that on one side of the river, the options are clear, because we have been working at developing alternatives. Yet, if the city of Vancouver had been a full partner in the political jurisdictional family, it would without doubt, had top priority on developing alternative transportation proposals. Its growth and tremendous need would have been better addressed.

The ecological factors in good transportation planning are high on the list of important decisions for the city of Vancouver. The fact of its close proximity to a large urban center such as Portland, bring it into the same air shed, and significantly affected by the same impacts as to it's livability, and future growth. We both pride ourselves on our beautiful land, this great river, and I am certain, the desire to let this land remain the beautiful place that it is. An assault on either side of the river, is an assault to both.

There is no competition here. Let's just keep this, the best place to live.

Mr. MCFARLING. Members of the House Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, my intention is to broaden the scope of your deliberations concerning an additional interstate bridge in the vicinity of Vancouver.

Three bridges presently carry traffic across the Columbia between Vancouver and Portland, two more are under construction. Two vehicular bridges exist side by side, each with the assignment of three lanes in one direction. Until the second vehicular bridge is opened to travel the traffic pattern on the older of those bridges accommodated four roadway lanes in each direction. For its first 20 years, each of the two central lanes also included a track for cars of the electric railway company, which formerly provided frequent service, passenger service linking the two cities. That company paid a substantial portion of the cost of constructing the bridge.

Highway administrators subsequently reduced the number of lanes so that truck and bus companies can operate vehicles wider than ordinary automobiles. Let it be noted that commercial haulers using roads obtain the lucrative prerogatives of ownership without bearing the responsibilities of ownership.

The bridges currently under construction are for highway I-205. Each is designed to accommodate excessively wide commercial vehicles on four lanes. To carry railway movements, a solitary double track bridge connects the two cities. It was built before any of the highway bridges, and it was built by private enterprise. Instead of imposing a burden on taxpayers, it and its owners are levied upon to support the treasuries of the States it connects.

Surface transportation is one of the activities vital to the fabric of society, but the proportion of material, energy and space devoted to roads and the vehicles which use them, long ago passed out of



range within which expenditures of resources can make a net contribution to the well-being of America.

Any self-reliant business organization must devote part of its income to recompensing investors for funds advanced to establish the company. The cost to provide infrastructure for practitioners of any transport technology is immense, but commercial carriers on roads invest virtually nothing in the infrastructure. The carriers pay only user charges, deliberately set low enough to foster commercial usage. Instead of having sizable fractions of their income earmarked to defray capital costs, commercial carriers by rote can use that money to influence public opinion and office holder's decisions. The manufacturers of vehicles for whom lavish expenditures from the public treasury have created a market employ similar tactics to perpetuate their dominance of land transport.

People who genuinely support energy conservation and reduced oil imports sought provision for an electric passenger railway in the design of I-205 bridges. Such a railway could easily have been included and a branch from the projected Gresham-Portland line. The highway lobby stifled that proposal. The lobby did consent to allowance for bicycle traffic, which it doubtless perceives to be no threat to automotive dominance of land transport.

The next Columbia River crossing should provide the most useful transport capacity in relation to resources consumed in construction and in operation thereafter. Now it should lessen the subjugation of America by petroleum exporting countries. It should achieve those objectives by design and location to facilitate travel and shipment on America's nationwide railway network, and travel on an electric passenger railway system serving the Vancouver-Portland metropolitan area.

The time is long overdue for Government officialdom to give as much attention to making available the capabilities of railway technology as it has to promoting roadbuilding and vehicular traffic. There have been individuals in public office who have directed attention to the value of railway technology and have urged that public policies support the the development of railways to the same degree as any of the technologies which traditionally are proteges of public works programs. Unfortunately for America, actions by public bodies up to now in regard to intercity transport merely have abated somewhat the rate of destruction facilities and services. In regard to vehicular transport, their action has been to scale down the expenditures for additional roads and for elaborate remodeling of existing roads.

America's policymakers traditionally have left the provision of railway facilities to voluntary investment of private funds. That circumstance should not hereafter be allowed to foreclose the advantages which Americans will enjoy if railway technology is utilized for an increasing share of transport requirements. If the Public Works Committee, of which you are a part, cannot by itself alter that tradition, let it join forces, perhaps with the Committee on Commerce, to accomplish that result.

Your subcommittee may regard Government ownership and fostering of transport infrastructure as wrong or as right, but whichever is your judgment, equity requires that it be the same for all technologies. The distorting effects upon America of having singled

out railway technology to depend upon voluntary investment of private wealth to underwrite capital expenditures should be evident.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify before your committee. You will truly deserve gratitude if you undertake to redress the unequal treatment of technologies, as exemplified by Columbia River bridges.

Mr. ROE. Thank you, very much, Mr. McFarling, for your testimony. Those of us on the east coast happen to support the idea of the balanced transportation system because it is industrially needed. Regrettably, we just don't have the support as of yet in the Congress, which we need.

Mr. McCormack?

Mr. McCORMACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your testimony, Mr. McFarling.

As you may know, I come from an old railroad family. As a matter of fact all of us, my brother, my father, and I were railroaders and I have very strong, positive, supportive feelings for rail transit, and we have just been struggling to keep the Milwaukee Road open and the Amtrak lines across the country and North and South as for instance between Seattle and Portland.

Mr. MCFARLING. I am somewhat familiar with that, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I am sure you are, and I think you know of that report. My mind is open on this, as on this question, but any proposed rail service simply has to be demonstrated as practical and economically competitive and available to provide service.

I must say, quite frankly, that I am quite skeptical of the ability of the rail service to serve this area competitively, but my mind is open and I am willing to be convinced.

Mr. MCFARLING. Well, of course, railroad service to generate any public support is 50 years behind in getting comparable support to the highway, more than 50 years, of public expenditures and large amounts made for highways, and naturally within the first 2 or 3 years you would not be able to make a railway system which is comparable in extent to the highway network; however, as Chairman Roe should be familiar with, and between Philadelphia and his own State, the Port Authority Railway, which is only 15 miles long, carries an immense amount of traffic on that route, compared to the road network in New Jersey, which is tributary to the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Duncan?

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, I want to thank Mr. McFarling for calling our attention, as I have tried to do in my comments, to the role that rail transportation can and should play in a balanced transportation system. If you will forgive me, I think you have overstated the case a little bit, but that is the privilege of an advocate, and I have done that on occasion myself, when I have represented clients.

I just want to suggest, it is true that the trucking companies and the automobile users have not directly had to factor into their balance sheets an item for capital investors, but it is also true that this great interstate system of transportation and the support which the Federal Government has given to the primary and the secondary systems has all been paid for out of a trust fund that

**FELTON Joyce A**

**From:** Paul Edgar [pedgar@ces-sys.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 25, 2001 4:55 PM  
**To:** FELTON Joyce A  
**Cc:** Bob Hart; Dean Lookingbill; Jeanne E. Harrison; Steve Gerber  
**Subject:** Design Review Comments, 7/24/01 meeting, I-5 Partnership effort

1. Four-Lane Arterial Bridge, (immediately to the West) it appears to be very expensive but if it includes Light Rail plus the two HOV and two GP lanes it might have benefit. The completion date of this type of bridge must be as soon as five years but no more than eight years. It must have Light Rail included, to be justified. The cost of maintaining the old bridges with the new bridge and including the required upgrades to the old bridges is the downer. Ranking # 3
2. Six-Lane 1-5 Bridge, (immediately to the East) appears to have the greatest cost with major negative impacts to existing system on both sides of the river. Again it still maintains the costs that need to be included as part of our river traffic and long term maintenance and required upgrade the old bridges. Ranking # 4
3. Ten-Lane 1-5 Bridge, (immediately to the East) appears to be the best of the I-5 bridge proposal. It would require a separate Light Rail bridge that could be built at an earlier time frame. This proposal must eliminate the two old bridges and should eliminate most of the problems with the river traffic. Ranking # 2
4. Tunneling under the Columbia River has too many contingencies. Ranking # 5
5. Not included but Ranked # 1 is the Port to Port connection/expressway and bridges. This must start at US Highway 30 and parallel the rail tracks through the gully in St Johns, parallel with Portland Street across to Hayden Island and over the Columbia River on to the new Mill Plain Extension. This could get 80% of the trucks off I-5 and eliminate a great deal of the congestion up and down the I-5 corridor. This would buy us the time to design, permit, finance and build the Ten-Lane Bridge and get the first car across in twenty years. This Port to Port Expressway should be at least eight-lanes. It should have consideration for commercial heavy rail where it could eliminate the current old rail bridge and its problems to river traffic. This must be completed in five years, thereby through it we would eliminate a lot of the expense to upgrade the I-5 corridor. Funding could come from the most sources and could include tolls on SOV's and allowing HOV's to cross free. This is the necessary backup for problems on I-5, at and on the bridges and for construction when I-5 is disrupted to build the Ten-Lane bridge. The I-5 corridor from the Columbia River to the Fremont Bridge, could work when upgraded to three lanes minimum in each direction with this Port to Port Expressway and bridges.

This Port to Port Expressway proposal saves the historic St Johns Bridge, is great for NW Portland neighborhoods, Industrial NW Portland, Ports of Portland and Vancouver, Rivergate, Columbia Blvd., Marine Drive, Fremont Bridge, Working jobs on both sides of the river, Truckers, River Shipping Interests and the tax payers in both Oregon and Washington. This does not eliminate the need for a new Light Rail bridge across the Columbia River.

The Mill Plain to SR 500 Interchange improvements outlined should include a ramp to I-5 north bound. Most of the problems are a result of the proposed HOV lane changes to I-5. I would not spend these dollars and effort and would look at how I could integrate traffic and commuters to the proposed Port to Port Expressway and bridges as a better investment. Very low priority as shown.

Paul Edgar  
 Transportation Activist