



## INITIAL IMPRESSIONS SURVEY RESULTS – Preliminary Results

Survey Taken: 9/25/01

- This document contains the **preliminary results** an ANONYMOUS, NON-BINDING survey designed to get the initial reactions of the I-5 Partnership Task Force to the specific design elements in the option packages. The results will be used to focus subsequent discussions, present the evaluation factors in a concise manner, and track the Task Force's progress toward consensus. Surveys will also be taken after the presentation of evaluation data.
- Directions for filling out the survey were: For each Decision Tree question, you have 10 points to allocate between the choices. EXAMPLES: If your initial impression is that "YES" is the clear answer - no doubt about it - you might note your impression as "YES: 10 and NO: 0." If you are uncertain, you might note "YES: 5 NO: 5." If you favor YES, but it's a close call, you might note "YES 6 and NO 4."
- The numerical results are presented as averages.
- Areas highlighted in blue indicate a need for more information by the Task Force to determine the merits of the element in question. These elements will be the focus of evaluation data in October.

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
1A.	Will a <b>West Arterial Road</b> , by itself, satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement? <i>Pages 13-15</i>	.36	9.64	1.82	8.18	1.09	8.91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of trucks that would use and cost impact</li> <li>• will divert some traffic over I-5 and have limited benefit</li> <li>• Adding new road capacity is not a long-term solution. Massive environmental impacts.</li> <li>• No. Will help freight movement.</li> <li>• Does little to nothing to deal with bottlenecks on the corridor.</li> <li>• Clearly not enough by itself, too expensive.</li> <li>• Does not address commuter and through north / south traffic</li> <li>• This is a not the best alignment for this idea. A lot of expense for a smaller purpose road</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
1B.	If NO, should the west arterial road be considered <b>in combination</b> with other improvements?	4.64	5.36	4.45	5.55	4.55	5.45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will generate excessive traffic on Mill Plain/4<sup>th</sup> Plain with no mitigation – 4<sup>th</sup> Plain not adequate to support this option</li> <li>• Only if not going to Hwy #30</li> <li>• I have not seen, and do not expect to see, data that indicates this would significantly improve traffic in the corridor.</li> <li>• To the extent that port to port freight mobility produces traffic through Downtown Vancouver – this is safer and improves I-5 mobility</li> <li>• This arterial has the possibility of relieving neighborhood traffic impacts without requiring widening of I-5 (assuming we can answer environmental questions).</li> <li>• If freight data warrants, it might help</li> <li>• There is some merit to the concept for the purpose of freight mobility. Cost may be a primary factor and shortening span may be necessary.</li> <li>• Add LRT from Expo to Vancouver</li> <li>• This idea is more interesting if mixed with new railroad bridges</li> </ul>
2A.	Will <b>Commuter Rail</b> , by itself, satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement? <i>Page 16</i>	.82	9.18	1.09	8.91	.95	9.05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This solution would encourage interstate commuting and may further exacerbate current problems</li> <li>• LRT in Clark Co would better achieve transportation and land use goals.</li> <li>• Is duplicative of Interstate LRT</li> <li>• No—however could help</li> <li>• Very unlikely to solve freight or commuter congestion in corridor – detracts from LRT investment and success</li> <li>• Not clear why we should pursue</li> <li>• Will attract limited riders. Competes with (freight) rail congestion</li> <li>• Location of commuter rail proves to be disincentive for use by a large number of people</li> <li>• This idea could work if major investment into rail network. But it helps commuters only and not freight.</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
2B.	If NO, should commuter rail be considered in combination with other improvements?	2.18	7.82	5.09	4.91	3.64	6.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This solution would not divert significant traffic and would not benefit other options</li> <li>• I don't see how commuter rail would greatly help traffic, given geography, location of existing rail lines, and location of population in area. Feeder buses from Park and Ride to rail is a barrier to riders – too many stops</li> <li>• Don't believe commuter rail is an option for this corridor, however it could help.</li> <li>• Detracts from focus of better options</li> <li>• Transit options (LRT and Express Bus) address issues. This seems to encourage urban sprawl.</li> <li>• Expensive but fits with high-speed rail.</li> <li>• Not as intracity service; possibly rural to city</li> <li>• Any plan must incorporate commuter rail – especially for future development. Light Rail/Commuter</li> <li>• Would be nice to combine commuter rail and high speed rail alignment. Better investment and other freight improvements</li> </ul>

3.	Question	Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
	What type of overall transit improvements best satisfies the Problem, Vision and Values Statement? Pages 17-19							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Express Bus</li> </ul>	4.27	5.73	3.91	6.09	4.09	5.91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will help move people while reducing traffic. But there's a better solution – LRT.</li> <li>In the interim this might help, but not in the long term.</li> <li>I do not see these two options [Express Bus and Light Rail] as exclusive. Express bus is a preliminary to light rail. Infrastructure, economic development, feeder bus, etc. Express bus should support future light rail.</li> <li>Shorter term option</li> <li>(Doesn't favor), except for (the option) connecting to LRT Terminus)</li> <li>Without having numbers on the plan I just can't decide.</li> <li>Express bus to rail head not desirable due to transfers. Express feeder service will be needed to meet demand from outlying areas and will be needed as interim solution while LRT is planned and developed. Express via HOV to downtown Portland would be only application in lieu of LRT</li> <li>Would like to see direct Express Bus service all the way to downtown Portland and points along I-205</li> <li>Could be used as a prelude to expanding LRT</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
3.	What type of overall <b>transit improvements</b> best satisfies the Problem, Vision and Values Statement? <i>Pages 17-19</i>							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Light Rail</li> </ul>	7.82	2.18	9.45	.55	8.64	1.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important element but must be accompanied by traffic accommodation</li> <li>LRT provides more advantages than express bus, due to land use opportunities (TOD, mixed use, etc) which don't occur with express bus (LRT is more permanent)</li> <li>In the long term this would be the best option, but will need good feeder service.</li> <li>I do not see these two options [Express Bus and Light Rail] as exclusive. Express bus is a preliminary to light rail. Infrastructure, economic development, feeder bus, etc. Express bus should support future light rail.</li> <li>Best option for long range plan. Builds on successful Portland system.</li> <li>(Favor the segment) to Clark College terminus with later expansion</li> <li>I think this best overall fits the vision and values statement.</li> <li>Provides connectivity to MAX and provides most seamless transportation system</li> <li>Building a light rail network is essential to a balanced system and land use choices</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
4.	What type of overall road improvements best satisfies the Problem, Vision and Values Statement? Pages 20-26	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 Lanes</li> </ul>	7.82	2.18	8.2	1.8	8	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needed</li> <li>Assuming this includes a 4<sup>th</sup> lane for entry /exit similar to I-84 and 217</li> <li>Unsure – some places still have only 2 lanes. I’m not sure making those places 3 lanes won’t compromise too many things – quality of life and environment</li> <li>Yes. Would help to improve and correct queuing issues and could provide carpools/vanpools.</li> <li>Adding this road capacity and eliminating bottlenecks is key to improve mobility</li> <li>(Favor 3 lanes) except Delta Slough bridge and Rose Quarter – keep at 2 lanes</li> <li>I’m not sure there shouldn’t be (an option that is) “as is” minus (projects at) Rose Quarter and Delta Park.</li> <li>Three lanes plus dedicated LRT lanes; added capacity and additional SOV lanes will not solve traffic congestion</li> <li>w/ 4<sup>th</sup> lane add/drop where needed</li> <li>Three lanes for now but don’t forget 40 year aspect</li> <li>Make the system 3 lanes each way</li> </ul>

Question	Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
4. What type of overall road improvements best satisfies the Problem, Vision and Values Statement? Pages 20-26							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a 4<sup>th</sup> Lane</li> </ul>	3.91	6.09	2.64	7.36	3.27	6.73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expensive bandaid on a massive wound</li> <li>Compromises quality of life and environment. This is too important. Must find other ways to support mobility and economy.</li> <li>Would create too many issues with neighborhoods, however help some of the freight issues.</li> <li>Only at key interchanges</li> <li>Long term road capacity is important, but impacts may be unacceptable</li> <li>Suggest 4 lanes south to Columbia, then 3 lanes south (into Portland)</li> <li>Too significant impact environmentally, to community and cost. Expanded highway generates expanded auto congestion. Will need to address egress and ingress</li> <li>Reversible lanes – YES – hybrid option 4/3 lanes has same appeal – No HOV</li> <li>Maybe a 4<sup>th</sup> auxiliary lane in a few places</li> <li>If a 4<sup>th</sup> could be considered way into the future, if needed, but right of way reserved for now</li> <li>Prefer adding 4<sup>th</sup> lane from Columbia Blvd. north only</li> <li>Make it 4 lanes from Columbia Blvd. to SR 500</li> </ul>
5A. Will we need a new river crossing to satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?	9.3	.7	9.09	.91	9.19	.81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Absolutely – critical need</li> <li>For light rail and possibly arterial traffic</li> <li>Don't know yet</li> <li>Given horizon is 40+ years—a new bridge is essential</li> <li>Replacement, NOT additional/supplemental. Supplemental is ok only if best way to accommodate LRT</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
5B.	If yes, what type(s) of river crossing best satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?							
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New 4-lane supplemental bridge for express bus, HOV, and Hayden Island Access Page 27</li> </ul>	3.73	6.27	3.73	6.27	3.73	6.27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not without LRT</li> <li>Would address issues – not the best solution</li> <li>Don't like Hayden Island access change – too much new road. Don't like new general purpose lanes. New road capacity is not likely needed. Through traffic could use even if signed otherwise</li> <li>Could improve freight movement.</li> <li>Accommodating express (bus) only not best option</li> <li>Whichever pencils out as best in capacity help and low cost</li> <li>Confusing to mix HOV through travel with local access</li> <li>Only feasible if decision is to retain existing bridge as primary access across the river</li> <li>"Reversible – Yes" – "HOV – No"</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New 4-lane supplemental bridge for LRT, HOV, and Hayden Island Access Page 28</li> </ul>	5.91	4.09	7.55	2.45	6.73	3.27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would address issues – not the best solution</li> <li>Don't like Hayden Island access change – too much new road. Don't like new general purpose lanes. New road capacity is not likely needed. Through traffic could use even if signed otherwise.</li> <li>Could improve freight movement.</li> <li>Include express bus</li> <li>Like LRT capacity, but doesn't increase road capacity for 40 years!</li> <li>(Favor a bridge) with 2 lanes, bike and pedestrian facilities with arterial connections (not HOV on this bridge)</li> <li>Consider moving SB freeway lanes to new structure and old SB bridge for HOV, like cross section 2 p.33</li> <li>Whichever pencils out as best in capacity help and low cost</li> <li>Would like it better if just local and LRT</li> <li>3 travel lanes plus LRT or 2 travel lanes +LRT w/access is issue</li> </ul>



Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
5B.	If yes, what type(s) of river crossing best satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New supplemental bridge for LRT only <i>Page 29</i></li> </ul>	3.09	6.91	5.09	4.91	4.09	5.91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By itself a partial solution at best</li> <li>Okay, if this is the best way to accommodate LRT</li> <li>Does not increase freeway capacity for freight. Not a good 40 yr option.</li> <li>If no agreement on a road bridge</li> <li>Yes, only if the data comes out that capacity is truly improved by <u>only</u> LRT</li> <li>(This is the) minimum new bridge required</li> <li>If constructing a new bridge need to address mobility of corridor 40 years out— ingress/egress travel lanes and LRT.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supplemental 6-lane bridge <i>Page 30</i></li> </ul>	1.73	8.27	1.55	8.45	1.64	8.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost effective, will address most issues</li> <li>If current I-5 bridge intended for use for LRT, then construction of new bridge, the retrofit current I-5 bridge with LRT will take way too long</li> <li>Large impact to Hayden Island</li> <li>Doesn't handle the light rail option</li> <li>(I) do like the concept of upriver crossing and leaving Hayden Island access alone, but it seems like huge cost</li> <li>No LRT (on this bridge is a drawback)</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New supplemental 6-lane bridge with separate LRT bridge <i>Page 32</i></li> </ul>	1.91	8.09	2.36	7.64	2.14	7.86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too expensive – one bridge better</li> <li>Too much capacity left on current I-5 bridges</li> <li>Why 3 bridges? Excess! Too many lanes – wow!</li> <li>Accommodates LRT and adds capacity – better 40 yr option</li> <li>Very costly to do bridge with 6 travel lanes and separated LRT bridge.</li> <li>(I) do like the concept of upriver crossing and leaving Hayden Island access alone, but it seems like huge cost. But if in 40 years the current I-5 bridge needs to be replaced, this idea could be the best.</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
5B. cont.	If yes, what type(s) of river crossing best satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New supplemental 6-lane bridge with joint-use LRT Page 33</li> </ul>	3.73	6.27	4.55	5.45	4.14	5.86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many variables to make choice</li> <li>Issues is how many lanes – if keep 6 on current Interstate and add 6 lanes=too many lanes. If shrink existing bridges to 4 lanes, and have 4 here and LRT makes more sense.</li> <li>Difficult/costly/time intensive to retrofit existing bridge</li> <li>Need to understand seismic issue.</li> <li>Consolidating on to one structure seems to be better than two</li> <li>May have some merit if one lane is LRT and one lane addresses ramp needs</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New 10-lane replacement bridge Page 34</li> </ul>	.91	9.09	1.09	8.91	1	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to do more to encourage LRT and HOV options</li> <li>Seems 2<sup>nd</sup> most efficient bridge configuration – one bridge, but need to add LRT. Fixed span is less disruptive to traffic</li> <li>Need to understand seismic issue.</li> <li>Too much structure with no LRT</li> <li>If in the 40 year picture (the) I-5 bridge needs to be replaced, then this may be the way to go especially with LRT.</li> <li>Too serious (of an) impact environmentally. Capacity expansion will not necessarily address congestion being experienced in the corridor</li> <li>2 lanes GP throughout, 1 lane HOV through, 1 add/drop (SR 14 to Hayden Island.), 1 LRT each direction (not 4 through lanes)</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
5B. cont.	If yes, what type(s) of <b>river crossing</b> best satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?							
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New 10-lane replacement bridge with separate LRT bridge <i>Page 36</i></li> </ul>	1.09	8.91	2.45	7.55	1.77	8.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too expensive – why not incorporate LRT into new bridge</li> <li>Too many lanes</li> <li>If building a new bridge why build 2 instead of combining into 1 bridge</li> <li>Need to understand seismic issue.</li> <li>Too much structure</li> <li>If in the 40 year picture, the I-5 bridge needs to be replaced, then this idea may be the way to go, especially w/ LRT</li> <li>Too serious (of an) impact environmentally. Capacity expansion will not necessarily address congestion being experienced in the corridor.</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New 10-lane replacement bridge with joint-use LRT <i>Page 37</i></li> </ul>	4.09	5.91	2.36	7.64	3.23	6.77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be fantastic, but I think infeasible</li> <li>10 lanes too much with LRT ability to relieve peak traffic</li> <li>Least impact to Hayden Island and Vancouver waterfront of all bridge options. Probably cheaper than building 2 new bridges?</li> <li>Need to understand seismic issue.</li> <li>Consolidating on to one structure seems more efficient.</li> <li>2 lanes GP throughout, 1 lane HOV through, 1 add/drop (SR 14 to Hayden Island.), 1 LRT each direction (not 4 through lanes)</li> <li>If in the 40 year picture, the I-5 bridge needs to be replaced, then this idea may be the way to go, especially w/ LRT</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
5B. cont.	If yes, what type(s) of <b>river crossing</b> best satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?							
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New supplemental tunnel concept <i>Page 38</i></li> </ul>	4.27	5.73	2.73	7.27	3.5	6.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too expensive, though it would be very attractive</li> <li>I don't know that this is really necessary. What is advantage to a tunnel vs a bridge, if existing bridge will still be in use?</li> <li>(I) do not support.</li> <li>Need to understand seismic issue.</li> <li>Remain uncertain as to feasibility</li> <li>If this costs equal to bridges and is safe and if better environmentally, then this may be good supplementary crossing</li> <li>Need to know cost in comparison to bridge. Also would raise issues about seismic activity</li> </ul>
6A.	Will <b>policy actions such as land use, taxation and TDM</b> , alone, satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?	2.09	7.91	2.55	7.45	2.32	7.68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We can use land use to significantly mitigate, but not resolve all issues</li> <li>But would do more than anything else alone</li> <li>These can play a big part of solution. We don't have enough data to say yet how much a part of the solution this should be.</li> <li>A combination of actions will be needed.</li> <li>Simply does not solve the primary infrastructure issues</li> <li>If TDM was a priority, I believe the possibility that we could change the world for the better if we change our transportation behavior</li> <li>Each of these are important concepts but by itself, will not move adequate volume.</li> <li>Important to do the land use incentives to make sure people have options to live conveniently to work</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
6B.	If NO, should policy actions be considered in <b>combination</b> with other improvements?	8.3	1.7	8.91	1.09	8.62	1.38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we do not consider land use, our decision will drive land use</li> <li>• This is best combined with LRT or express bus</li> <li>• Yes—will need to be included with other improvements.</li> <li>• Several tools will enhance success of other options, e.g. tolls pay for bridges</li> <li>• TDM strategies and policies supporting the use of alternative transportation modes is an essential component of the I-5 solution</li> <li>• Important to do the land use incentives to make sure people have options to live conveniently to work</li> </ul>
7A.	Which of the <b>problem spot improvements</b> do we need to satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widen I-5 to 3 lanes between the Fremont Bridge and I-84 (Rose Quarter Area) <i>Page 12</i></li> </ul> (This question was re-worded to say “Should we address the problems in the Rose Quarter Area)	8.64	1.36	8.27	1.73	8.45	1.55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems needed, but not sure will clear backup north of this point</li> <li>• Yes, if it can be coordinated with rest of decisions on removing/reuse of Eastside I-5</li> <li>• Major bottleneck – solving the rest of corridor without this only makes this area worse</li> <li>• Need to coordinate impact of proposal with existing land use in area and I-84</li> <li>• This section should be studied as part of the decision whether to move East Bank freeway</li> <li>• (I) don’t like freeway expansion – are there other ways to address the problem?</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widen I-5 to 3 lanes between Delta Park and Lombard <i>Page 11</i></li> </ul>	9.18	.82	8.09	1.91	8.64	1.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absolutely necessary under any condition – this stretch meters traffic</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> before south at Rose Quarter</li> <li>• Just moves the bottleneck; doesn’t address <u>root</u> of the problem.</li> <li>• One of the most important bottlenecks that must be solved</li> <li>• Bottleneck at Delta Park contributes significantly to I-5 congestion.</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
7A.	Which of the <b>problem spot improvements</b> do we need to satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?							
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add on and off ramps at Columbia Blvd. <i>Page 23</i></li> </ul>	6.73	3.27	8.36	1.64	7.55	2.45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seems complicated. I don't understand what net benefit this creates.</li> <li>Seems an important freight mobility option</li> <li>Ideal if I-5 improvement minimizes impact to neighbors—this helps existing problem.</li> <li>Yes, but look for a more modest design</li> <li>Costs may be much higher than benefit to neighborhood</li> <li>Couldn't there be a simpler way to do these ramps?</li> <li>Needs to be less costly – a direct connection from Columbia to Denver?</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relocate Hayden Island Interchange to Marine Dr. Interchange (valid only if no new river crossing is selected) <i>Page 24</i></li> </ul>	4.91	5.09	4.2	5.8	4.57	5.43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But only as an alternate</li> <li>Don't have enough information. Seems awfully complicated. Is positive impact greater than negative impact?</li> <li>Looks like an expensive approach.</li> <li>Doesn't seem critical to solution.</li> <li>Separate the heavy truck/freight traffic attempting to access I-5 when new bridge built.</li> <li>New bridge</li> <li>This ramp design seems awkward. Expensive way to solve a small part of the problem</li> </ul>

Question		Washington		Oregon		Bi-State		Comments
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
7A.	Which of the <b>problem spot improvements</b> do we need to satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement?							
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify I-5 interchanges in Vancouver between SR 14 and SR 500 <i>Page 25</i></li> </ul>	7	3	5.82	4.18	6.41	3.59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But I am concerned about taking home sites</li> <li>Ramp lanes are scary. Neighborhood impacts, more pavement, etc.</li> <li>Helps reduce congestion toward bridges and supports downtown Vancouver revitalization</li> <li>Looks like a lot of detrimental community impact</li> <li>Improvements offer safety enhancements and increased access to downtown Vancouver</li> <li>A few key locations, not throughout</li> <li>With new bridge</li> <li>Yes, if safety data shows this is highly needed</li> <li>Concerned about loss of homes in the 4<sup>th</sup> Plain area</li> <li>Is the desire to not have weaves so important that we would impact neighborhoods?</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northbound HOV in Clark County <i>Page 26</i></li> </ul>	6.45	3.55	6.3	3.7	6.38	3.62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HOV works!</li> <li>Bridge (new) would be rather prohibitive.</li> <li>I need to understand why HOV will not work across existing I-5 bridges.</li> <li>Remain unconvinced regarding effectiveness of HOV</li> <li>Don't know</li> <li>Traffic counts would drive this decision, but seems logical on interim</li> <li>Not needed in planning horizon</li> <li>Yes, only when the future shows there is a true need into Clark County</li> </ul>
8.	Will <b>doing nothing more than baseline</b> satisfy the Problem, Vision and Values Statement? <i>Pages 8-12</i>	.82	9.18	1.36	8.64	1.09	8.91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The statement concludes that we have a problem, so doing nothing is insufficient.</li> <li>No, although will help</li> <li>40 year framework necessitates moving well beyond what is in baseline</li> <li>The baseline includes projects that have negative impacts on freight, transit and freeway operation in N/NE Portland.</li> <li>If our horizon is 40 years+ baseline will not begin to meet the corridor needs.</li> </ul>

9. Assuming the Final Strategic Plan will include some or all of the following, allocate 100 points between the listed strategies to indicate your initial impression as to the **general composition of the overall approach, and the relative contribution of individual elements to the whole.** (Examples – If you believe all will contribute equally give each 10 points. If you believe one or more elements will not be part of the solution, assign “0” points. If you believe the plan should include 5 elements contributing a different value, you might score “40, 25, 20, 10, 5” with “0” for the rest.):

<u>9%</u>	Land use policy changes	<u>11%</u>	Three lanes
<u>4%</u>	West Arterial	<u>5%</u>	Four lanes
<u>2%</u>	Commuter Rail	<u>18%</u>	River crossing
<u>7%</u>	Express bus	<u>12%</u>	Spot improvements
<u>23%</u>	Light rail	<u>10%</u>	Transportation demand management

10. Additional comments on your impressions and this process:

- A lot of work has gone into tonight’s effort. Good job. There was some good discussion by the Committee which reflects the effort put into the evening.
- What can be done to improve accident response? What specifically, must be done to bring current bridge up to current seismic requirements? We must have some evaluation of expected damage during a “significant” seismic event.
- I would very much like to see reversible lanes used for peak periods on the river crossing.
- I thought Vera’s question about a discussion about Vancouver’s 3 lane plan and how it impacts Portland was interesting. Its like a husband deciding to take Viagra without discussing it with his wife.
- Thanks, very helpful.
- This worked better than expected.