

# Bi-State Coordination Committee

The Bi-State Coordination Committee is chartered by member agencies to review, discuss and make recommendations about transportation and land use issues of bi-state significance.

Metro  
Councilor Rex Burkholder  
CHAIR

Clark County  
Commissioner Craig Pridemore  
Vice CHAIR

Multnomah County  
Commissioner Serena Cruz

City of Vancouver  
Mayor Royce Pollard

City of Portland  
Commissioner Jim Francesconi

City of Battle Ground  
Eric Holmes, City Manager

City of Gresham  
Councilor Larry Haverkamp

C-TRAN  
Lynne Griffith, Executive  
Director/CEO

Tri-Met  
Fred Hansen, General Manager

Port of Vancouver  
Larry Paulson, Executive Director

Port of Portland  
Bill Wyatt, Executive Director

WSDOT  
Don Wagner, SW Administrator

ODOT  
Matthew Garrett, Rea. 1 Manager



1300 Franklin Street Floor 4  
PO Box 1366  
Vancouver, Washington  
98666-1366

Tel 360-397-6067  
Fax 360-397-6132

[www.rtc.wa.gov](http://www.rtc.wa.gov)



**METRO**

600 NE Grand Avenue  
Portland, Oregon  
97232-2736

Tel 503-797-1700  
Fax 503-797-1797  
TDD 503-797-1804

[www.metro-region.org](http://www.metro-region.org)

## Bi-State Coordination Committee Meeting

### Please Note Special Meeting Date and Location

**Tuesday, August 10, 2004**

**7:30 AM - 9:00 AM**

Clark County Elections/Auto Licensing Building\*  
North Conference Room 226  
1408 Franklin Street, Vancouver, WA

### AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Approval of Meeting Report\* (5 min)**
  - May 27, 2004 Meeting MinutesRex Burkholder, Metro
- 2. I-5 Columbia River Crossing - Implementing the Transportation and Trade Partnership (35 min)**
  - Update on Study Progress
  - Discussion of Decision-Making ProcessRob DeGraff, ODOT, Dale Himes, WSDOT
- 3. ORULE (10 min)**
  - Oregon Rail Users League Briefing
  - Committee discussion of ORULE & Rail ForumPat Egan, Port of Portland
- 4. I-5 Delta Park/Lombard Update (15 min)**
  - Alternatives proposed for EIS analysis
  - Committee Discussion & RecommendationsKate Deane, ODOT
- 5. WSDOT Congestion Relief Findings (20 min)** Bob Hart, RTC
- 6. Public Comment (5 min)** All

**Next Bi-State Meeting - September 23, 2004 7:30 am at Metro**

\* Park in the parking structure on Franklin Street as usual, only go to the smaller building on the left, versus to the taller building to the right. Signs will also be posted.

**Bi-State Coordination Committee  
Meeting Report  
May 27, 2004**

**1. Welcome and Approval of April 22, 2004, Meeting Report**

The meeting of the Bi-State Coordination Committee was called to order by Chair Rex Burkholder, at 7:30 a.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin, Vancouver, Washington. Those in attendance follow:

Committee Members

Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor  
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County Commissioner  
Matthew Garrett, ODOT, Region 1 Manager  
Lynne Griffith, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO  
Larry Haverkamp, City of Gresham Councilor  
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground Manager  
Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver Mayor  
Craig Pridemore, Clark County Commissioner  
Phil Selinger, TriMet Alternate  
Don Wagner, WSDOT SW Regional Administrator  
Laurel Wentworth, City of Portland Alternate  
Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland Executive Director

Staff

Andy Cotugno, Metro  
Dean Lookingbill, RTC  
Mark Turpel, Metro  
Diane Workman, RTC

Interested Guests

Ed Barnes, Washington Transportation Commissioner  
Richard Brandman, Metro  
Mike Clark, WSDOT  
Tyler Deke, Parsons Brinckerhoff  
John Fratt, Port of Vancouver  
Mark Garrity, WSDOT  
Steve Gorcester, Washington State Transportation Improvement Board  
Lance R. Grenzeback, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.  
Bob Hart, RTC  
Bill Hidden, Private Industry  
Dale Himes, WSDOT  
Geoff Larkin, Larkin Group, Inc.  
Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland  
Mary Legry, WSDOT  
Kate Marx, Metro  
Robin McArthur, ODOT  
Ginger Metcalf, Identity Clark County  
Rod Monroe, Metro Councilor, Alternate  
Sharon Nasset, Citizen  
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN  
Thomas Picco, ODOT  
Matt Ransom, City of Vancouver



Dale Robins, RTC  
Dave Roewe, Building Industry Association  
Sharon Wylie, Clark County

Chair Burkholder welcomed everyone and had all present introduce themselves. He then asked for approval of the April 22, 2004, Meeting Report.

**CRAIG PRIDEMORE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING REPORT.**

Matt Garrett had one correction on page 7, fourth paragraph from the bottom. A statement was made by Mr. Garrett and it was listed as being said by Craig Pridemore. The statement should read *Matt Garrett* said that Fred Hansen has captured the essence of his conversation with Stuart Foster.

**THE APRIL 22, 2004, MEETING REPORT WAS APPROVED WITH THE NOTED CORRECTION.**

Mr. Burkholder noted that a revised agenda was distributed. Agenda item 5 was renamed to better clarify the topic of discussion.

**2. De-Brief on the Joint WSDOT/ODOT Joint Transportation Commission Working Group**

Rex Burkholder said that both he and Craig Pridemore attended the Joint Commission meeting on May 25 at the Heathman Lodge in Vancouver. He said they had discussions regarding the I-5 Columbia River Crossing project and all the pieces involved. There were presentations by both the Washington and Oregon DOT regional administrators, along with the Washington Secretary of Transportation and the Oregon Director of Transportation about how the process will move forward. Mr. Burkholder and Craig Pridemore presented a letter discussing the potential role of the Bi-State Coordination Committee in that process, adding that the Coordination Committee is part of the core group that needs to be included in the decision-making and recommendations process. The Commissions did not take action at that meeting. Mr. Burkholder asked Mr. Wagner and Mr. Garrett if they knew what the next steps would be.

Matt Garrett said the charge to John Conrad, Assistant Secretary, Engineering and Regional Operations division for WSDOT and John Rosenberger, Deputy Director, Highway Division for ODOT was to come back in September with a follow-up meeting. They are to look at the proposal from Mr. Burkholder and Mr. Pridemore and work out who should comprise the forum and look at the need to grow.

Don Wagner agreed with what Mr. Garrett said. He said he heard that whatever is done needs to be very inclusive. It needs to build on the foundation of the former years of work that has already been done. He said he understood that the intention of the Joint Commission Committee would be to meet quarterly, making the next meeting in September. Mr. Wagner also said that he heard the Transportation Commission taking on the charge that this would be more than that of the Transportation Strategic Plan for the Trade and Transportation Partnership. Saying yes, this is an important project, and yes, we want to make certain that it is discussed throughout all the communities of interest. Mr. Wagner said at the full Washington Transportation Committee meeting on Wednesday, some conversation came up with the legislators. The conversations from the Commission side were that it was a very important project. It is not just a local issue. They had heard information about freight movement from the Seattle area, Portland area, and southern Oregon, and California all moving through and across this bottleneck, including heavy rail and highway. They want to make



certain that all of these issues are addressed, including how heavy rail might fit into this. Mr. Wagner said he and Matt Garrett and their staffs have not had a chance to figure out just what that process will be, but hopeful by September to have a better definition of what that might be and who may be involved. Mr. Wagner said he heard that both Commissions want true ownership; that they need to be the ones that make the decisions and they need to make certain that they have all the information that is available to them in making those decisions.

Washington Transportation Commissioner Ed Barnes said that he felt it was a good meeting, and that Mr. Pridemore and Mr. Burkholder did a good job in presenting the Bi-State Committee's interest. He said there are a lot of people who want to have an input in this process. He said there are folks in the Kelso/Longview area that would also like to be a part of it. It is a matter of getting all the players together and headed in the right direction. He said this bottleneck needs to be fixed, and the bridge represents not just the Portland/Vancouver area; it represents the whole west coast. He said the legislators in Washington, D.C. need to be aware of our need for the money to fix this problem.

Rex Burkholder requested to Mr. Barnes to keep the Bi-State Committee informed of the Commission, and let them know that they would like to be a part of the staff of the Joint Working group given how it may be structured.

Matt Garrett said he thought that the two DOTs needed to get together and work at how they will work together. He said Mr. Conrad, WSDOT, Assistant Secretary, had said to put together both DOTs and the possibility of a co-location.

Don Wagner said in the co-location discussion that has been taking place, they have discussed of what that staff will be. He said it is a good opportunity for Bi-State to have someone who is staff that becomes a member of that project team co-located with the rest of that project team to make sure that is a work in progress for all involved. If Bi-State does not have a staff, then they would be looking for the communities, such as Metro or RTC or the counties to also put members on the team so it is not something that we react to, but rather a project that is a team of represented folks to help make those decisions. Mr. Wagner said this is being done on a couple projects in the Seattle area. He said they are finding that beyond good communication, it does lead to things that get vetted very early, that the project team members can go back to their own agencies and get the news out and solutions made. Mr. Wagner said at this time, the location has not been determined, as Mr. Garrett had said. There are still things to work out with two states, two constitutions, and two different taxing structures. These issues need to be resolved before moving forward.

### **3. Bi-State Coordination Committee – Discussion of Short- and Long-Term Goals for Committee Coordination with the I-5 Columbia River Crossing Project**

Rex Burkholder said he had asked Kate Marx, Metro, to address the Bi-State Coordination Committee. He said this is the first full meeting of the Coordination Committee and a good time to look at issues and items to be addressed through the year. Ms. Marx will take the Committee through a process to help guide actions and goals for setting the agenda for the next year.

Kate Marx said to start the discussion of the new charter to look at what members want for the Desired Future State. The discussion is related to transportation, land use, economic, and environmental issues as well. Ms. Marx used a white board and easel board to list three columns of topics relating to the position of the Bi-State Coordination Committee. First, the Current State, second, the Intent/Means, and the final as the Desired Future State. Committee members offered items describing those conditions and are listed as follows.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Current State**

- Uncertainty regarding I-5 Crossing decision-making process/ role of Bi-State;
- Composition of Coordination Committee;
- Uncoordinated land use plans;
- Uncertainty and sustainable transit funding / Clark County & Oregon;
- Unacceptable congestion;
- Uncoordinated economic development plans;
- Aging rail and truck infrastructure (including rail bridge), public vs. private roles concerning ownership, operation, and freight passage
- Risk of becoming fixated on I-5 bridge alone;
- Coordination Committee not adequately staffed;
- Unmet/latent demand for multi-modal transportation;
- Technical tools to evaluate can be vastly different;
- Political decision-making differences

### **3<sup>rd</sup> Desired Future State**

- 20 years from now, the BCC still plays a vital role;
- People will report BCC made smart recommendations;
- River not seen as a divider, instead as a binder for regional economic development;
- Created a common culture;
- Community wide recognition that this is not just a bridge project; defines new community;
- Created complete communities vis-à-vis this suite of projects;
- Funky future created;
- BCC seen as very credible;
- The BCC itself is sustainable as elected leadership changes;
- The BCC: a group that creates solutions

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Intent / Means<sup>1</sup>**

- Reforming the public's investment in rail;

- Members become better informed on all I-5 issues;
- Look holistically at systems;
- Understand everybody's comp. plans;
- TDM program coordination;
- Have to have deliverables that grow economically;
- Balanced and improved neighborhood conditions and environments;
- Persuasive program for everyone who controls the money; grass roots up;
- Fueling economic activity; jobs connect

---

<sup>1</sup> These items identify the gaps in capacity to make the intent actionable.



Kate Marx said from the discussion and list, she saw two things. One, she said the current charter is good, but given this list, there may be some things to add to the charter to firm it up. The charter can help define the Committee's future course of work. Having a charter that is flexible yet inclusive is key to meet some of the Desired Future State ideas. She said the discussion lists also look like a start of a work plan and an agenda as to how you might add chunks of work as a group. She said this could be brought back and prioritized. She said the next step of this process is to make sure that you have enough strategic Intent and Means to get you to the Desired Future State.

Rex Burkholder said this would be use to analyze where we want to go and the next steps. He said he and Vice Chair Craig Pridemore would look at this in deciding plans for the next year.

Don Wagner said in regard to credibility or the lack there of, to be cautious of throwing numbers out. He said we don't have a project yet to have any idea of what the cost of an I-5 crossing may be. He cautioned stating numbers and getting quoted by the media, when there is no idea what that number may be. We don't want to lead people to an assumption of what that cost may be when the project is not yet even determined.

#### **4. Washington State Congestion Relief Study - Update**

Dean Lookingbill referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet and introduced Bob Hart, RTC, to begin the presentation. Mr. Hart said that Mark Garrity, WSDOT, would be giving a PowerPoint presentation on this item, but Mr. Hart began with an overview of the study. He said the 2003 state legislature directed WSDOT to conduct a congestion relief analysis for the Puget Sound, Spokane, and Vancouver metropolitan areas. The bill requires the following: "The study must include proposals to alleviate congestion consistent with the population and land use expectations under the Growth Management Act and must include measurement of all modes of transportation." The study will look at what it would take to eliminate congestion on the state highway system. The Study will 1) identify travel demand assuming planned GMA growth, 2) evaluate multi-modal solutions, and 3) analyze cost and impacts of congestion relief strategies. The range of options to be developed includes No-Action, Unconstrained Demand, Bookend, and Mid-Range Alternatives. Mr. Hart said the legislative interest grew primarily out of the Puget Sound region and in response to a couple of privately funded studies called "Reduce Congestion Now" and "End Gridlock Now". The studies concluded that a \$22 billion investment in highways would accommodate forecasted growth, reduce today's level of congestion by one-third, and save \$46 billion in delay reduction benefits.

Mr. Hart said while the results of the Congestion Relief Study are not intended to represent a plan or make improvement recommendations, they will raise difficult and complex transportation policy issues. Some of those issues include:

- How is congestion defined and how is congestion relief measured?
- Highway versus transit investment.
- "If you build it, they will come" and the land use/induced growth issue.
- The public's willingness to pay for transportation capacity improvements versus their willingness to tolerate traffic congestion.
- "You can't build your way out of traffic congestion" versus the need to make transportation investment to support economic development.
- Jurisdictional needs/preferences for different transportation modal investments working together versus competing against each other.



Mark Garrity said he wanted to emphasize the fact that Mr. Hart said "End Gridlock Now" was a privately financed study by a group that is not associated with Washington State Department of Transportation. This Congestion Relief Study was started in December and hopes to finish in August 2004. The study is being lead by WSDOT Urban Planning Office in Seattle and Parsons Brinckerhoff is the assisting consultant. Key participating agencies include WSDOT SW Region, RTC, C-TRAN, Metro, and Tri-Met. Mr. Garrity said because a lot of the traffic impacts of traffic congestion flow across the river, it is necessary to look to Portland as well, so they are a part of the study area. He displayed a map of the study area showing the study as far south as downtown Portland I-5 south to I-405 including I-405 loop and I-84 and I-205 and I-5 north to SR-502.

Mr. Garrity highlighted the range of options to be developed. The No Action option assumes minimal investment beyond what is funded. It is a baseline comparison with other levels of investment. It includes the Washington State "Nickel" projects, Delta Park Widening, and 99<sup>th</sup> Street Park and Ride. The Unconstrained Demand option is theoretical unlimited capacity for highway and transit. This is to better understand the impacts of unconstrained demand and is a starting point for establishing bookends. The Bookends option is a network supply matched to meet unconstrained demand, and attempted to accommodate demand. This was developed for highway, transit, and pricing.

Rex Burkholder asked about the cost assumptions that were used in the process. Mr. Garrity said that has to do with the modeling that was done in this process, and that was done by RTC. After he completed the explanation of the process, he would have Bob Hart explain the modeling work.

The Highway Bookend option assumed additional lanes on major existing roadways, no new corridors. The Columbia River bridges were widened, as well as the freeways and major arterials including I-5, I-205, I-84, and I-405. The Transit Bookend is greatly expanded local bus service, transit priority corridors, and high capacity transit. The Pricing Bookend applied to all roadways, user pays to drive with user charge based on level of congestion. The more congestion, the higher the fee. Mr. Garrity said they took the three bookends and brought them a bit more to reality, and are developing mid-range options. These are being done for both highway and transit and are multi-modal, a mix of highway and transit.

The next steps are a detailed evaluation of bookends and mid-range. They are measuring congestion impacts, travel time, accessibility, environmental impacts, land use impact analysis, cost effectiveness, and overall benefit and cost. The outcome is for a greater understanding of a range of investment in various modes, at various levels of congestion, and transportation system performance, and the cost of trying to eliminate congestion. Mr. Garrity said in summary, the Study was requested by the State Legislature, compares multi-modal scenarios, and looks at what it would take to reduce highway congestion.

Bob Hart said in the modeling for this study, they assumed the cost of operating an automobile, or the cost of travel remains the same over time. In the overall travel forecasting process, they assume the cost of inflation and the cost of operating the automobile stay the same. The model is calibrated to the current status.

Phil Selinger said Fred Hansen has some concerns about what this process tells us, basically what we already know. It is really an analytical exercise, and questioned the good of it. He said also as an analytical process and not as a planning exercise, it doesn't have the public involvement component. As it is rolled out into the rest of the world, how does the public interpret it as it comes out? Mr. Hart said at the state level and the consultant have had discussions of how it is presented and discussed. He said it is a good point in terms of how the public will perceive this for what it is.



Don Wagner thanked everyone who has worked on this study, saying it is not something that is generated for us. He said that a lot of what we would find out, we already know. He said in Washington State, particularly in the Seattle area, they have two things going on. They have the Kemper Freeman discussion that says that you can build your way out of congestion, just build more roadways. That has been going on for several years, and legislators are saying that if we cannot repute this, maybe they are right. The second thing is that in 2003, the legislature increased our gas tax with a focus on congestion relief. In looking at it, they have put a lot of money out there, and they are not seeing any relief. They said maybe they need to look at this and get some data back to the Kemper Freeman discussion of can you build your way out of this. The Kemper Freeman approach is not really multi-modal. It is looking at just increasing lanes. He said this study really goes against our philosophies for this area that we have been working on for the last 20 years. He said he thought it would do some good for Washington State. Even though the study is not complete, the word in the legislature is maybe we should not be focusing on congestion relief. If there are any revenues, put them toward safety, preservation, and integration of the system.

Rod Monroe asked if Kemper Freeman could show one example where they have relieved congestion by building more and more lanes. Mr. Wagner said that the right question is being asked of the wrong people. He said he did not think it was an issue of them proving their point, but that we have the data to disapprove. He said from what has been seen so far, you cannot build your way out.

Rex Burkholder said it is good in that it does lay out how smart the choices are and should help us. Serena Cruz said this is not about one issue. There are many issues, land use, environment, economic development, and neighborhoods to name a few. She said if not all of these are looked at, how can you be sure it will not perform well under one issue.

##### **5. I-5 Corridor: Choke Point or Opportunity?**

Lance Grenzeback with Cambridge Systematics gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding a report they did for the Oregon Department of Transportation about the regional effects of congestion on freight in the I-5 corridor. He said the I-5 Partnership looked in detail at the design of the crossing area, but they have not looked at freight issues beyond the crossing area. He said the bottom line is that both the crossing of highway and rail do have an effect, not just in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area, but broader Washington and Oregon and the whole Pacific Northwest. He said the core message is, pay attention to it. It doesn't comprise huge portions of the freight out there, but he said it is like the water supply to your house; if you cut it off, every room is affected and your lifestyle deteriorates quickly.

He listed the core problems. He said there are three bridges, the I-5, the I-205 and the Burlington Northern rail bridge. He said this is only two highway crossings and one rail; this is fewer than most other river cities, a wonderful river valuable for transportation, but getting across it is a problem and creates congestion. He said with the growth of the metropolitan area, which is substantial in the next 20 years, you basically are trying to squeeze more vehicles across the river. Now, we are at a two-hour peak period and this increases as vehicles increase. He said in 2020, this could increase to two to four hours in the morning and the evening from two to five and a half hours. He said the freight affect on that is that doesn't leave much time in the mid-day. A motor carrier operating in the early morning or the late afternoon peak would only cross at these peak times if absolutely necessary. That mid-time for motor carriers to use gets squeezed out and it gets costly. He said they have to start very early in the morning. The problem for freight is not just highways; it is also in the rail complex.



Mr. Grenzeback said the rail complex was referred to as the Portland-Vancouver Rail "Triangle". This is the North/South and East/West intersection in the Portland-Vancouver area for the transcontinental lines. Portland benefits from it because everybody has to go through here, but there is congestion. An earlier study done for the I-5 Partnership showed about 40 minutes of delay per train here, which is about twice as much as Chicago. Mr. Grenzeback said the positive side of that is that Chicago put together a consortium of railroads in the city, and they are anticipating a \$400 million to \$900 million earmark if we get reauthorization this year. He said if we could make a good argument that we are twice as bad as Chicago, get the political support, and try for the money to deal with this issue. He said the problem is not just at the "triangle" of the Ports. There are other corridors. The north/south is the Seattle/Portland coming through the Willamette Valley, which has a capacity issue. As people start taking passenger trains and the freight volume grows, it gets tighter. He said with trains, you cannot have a high-speed passenger train pass a freight train by just going around it like you do on a highway. He said the corridor through the Gorge has lower overhead tunnels and snow sheds, which make it difficult to double stack containers and more expensive to move. He said in the Gorge, it is basically single track, one on each side of the river. He said the volume is going up substantively, and a difficult area to add another line.

Something to pay attention to in freight is how the national railroads are organizing. They have a core problem, which is money. They were deregulated in the 1980s, and as a result, productivity in the railroads has gone up hugely. While it has gone up, prices to shippers have gone down. What has not gone up is revenue. Railroads spend about five times as much on maintaining their track and rails as almost any other industry does. It is a huge investment that takes about 20 percent of their revenue just to keep railroads going. The whole system needs to be maintained or none at all. He said they don't have a lot of money so they are basically downsizing. The major class railroads are headed toward the big pipe world. He said there is a big pipe from LA to Chicago, one from Seattle to Chicago, and down to Atlanta and on to New York. He said they are basically focusing on huge volumes where you can pump 100 to 150 loaded train cars through and make money on that. They do well on coal and grain, and well on the inter-modal volumes, but single carloads delivered is a money loser. They are beginning to shed that, and that is what affects local industries. In addition to that, he said mobile business is growing like crazy. They are beginning to rationalize this to fit the pipes. They moved their big set of inter-modal operations in Chicago out to a new facility outside Joliet. They have done the same thing in Texas. They are beginning to look at this consolidation in the Los Angeles area. He said something to look at for this area is what they are going to do in the Pacific Northwest. They may well see the economics to move to a single inter-modal terminal possibly between Seattle and Vancouver or Seattle and Portland, but see they can't get through Portland. Do they look at somewhere like Pasco? That is the global scale that they look at.

Mr. Grenzeback asked why we want to look at the bottleneck at I-5. He displayed a map of the national truck freight flows for goods with origins or destinations in Oregon or Washington. He said you want to look at the I-5 crossing freight issues because we are sitting on the major access north/south as well as the I-84 or I-90 routes east. Those truck routes are the access for suppliers and businesses in this area to make money. Mr. Grenzeback highlighted the Oregon and Washington origins and destinations for truck freight crossing the I-5 and I-205 bridges at Portland-Vancouver with tonnage of freight on truck routes used to access bridge. He also highlighted the Oregon and Washington origins and destinations for rail freight using the Portland-Vancouver rail triangle with tonnage of freight on rail lines used to access triangle. He highlighted the trips for different products by truck and rail.



Mr. Grenzeback said with moderate economic growth (3.1 percent), import/export freight tonnage could double by 2020 and domestic freight tonnage could increase by about 60 percent. He said the question is what can be done in the corridor to maintain travel time and cost and reliability at a level that doesn't affect industry. He said you want to make investments that improve the system efficiency to maintain and keep them from deteriorating so that maintains the productivity of the freight transportation system and access to labor market areas.

Rex Burkholder said Mr. Grenzeback raised some important issues that need to be included in further discussions.

## 6. Public Comment

Sharon Nasset recommended that as the area and future economic development and transportation is looked at that the Portland and Vancouver area not be looked at as a shipping and receiving area only. She said instead, have our goods going through here and shipping them out in the largest pieces that we can and fixing our rails and sending it out on rail and barges in the harbors. She said just because they leave here, they do not have to leave in small packages. She said this would be good for our economy. She said we also need to stop looking at the Federal Government, and look at what we can do for ourselves to get funding. She encouraged lottery for transportation, and also said that more people need to use the rail system.

John Fratt, Port of Vancouver, said the Washington Port Association just had completed a conference here, and they had a discussion on rail capacity. He said the commodity flow forecast for Metro, Port of Portland, Port of Vancouver, Port of Seattle, and Port of Tacoma, all say in another 20 years we will double our freight volume, but we do not say we will double our capacity. He said Mr. Grenzeback gave an excellent vantage point. He said it is either the Portland triangle or the Vancouver Y, and whether it is the bridge that was built in 1908 or sidings that are 5000 feet in length with trains that are 7000 feet in length. He said all in this room need to look forward to try to help the railroads fix this problem, because he said they will sit on their hands and say no. He said at the same time, we are a part of the problem. We want eight Amtrak trains up to Seattle and eight Amtrak trains back a day. When this is done and the speed is increased to 92 mph, which forces the railroad to operate passenger rail and takes the freight off. If indeed this region, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, is to grow and maintain to see the future, we need to look forward too. He said that we do need to look at the Federal Government as a partner. We have products that go from here clear across the country to other states, and we need to include them in this whole process. He said the next big thing to address in this region is rail.

Dave Roewe Executive Director of the Building Industry Association said he was glad to see long range planning being done. He said as a credibility issue, the people on the Washington side of the river have had issues with the Oregon side of the river for years, one being the Delta Park Interchange widening project. He said it has been promised for 20 years, and unless something happens on the Oregon side of the river, they're not going to get that credibility from the Washington side of the river. He said in talking to the Portland folks, we need to do something about it. It needs to be widened. We need to have what has been promised for 20 years, open that up. He said it has been promised for so long, it is time to deliver on it.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 a.m.

The June meeting was cancelled. The next scheduled meeting will be on July 22, 2004, at RTC.



# Bi-State Coordination Committee

The Bi-State Coordination Committee is chartered by member agencies to review, discuss and make recommendations about transportation and land use issues of bi-state significance.

*Metro*  
Councillor Rex Burkholder  
CHAIR

*Clark County*  
Commissioner Craig Pridemore  
Vice CHAIR

*Multnomah County*  
Commissioner Serena Cruz

*City of Vancouver*  
Mayor Royce Pollard

*City of Portland*  
Commissioner Jim Francesconi

*City of Battle Ground*  
Eric Holmes, City Manager

*City of Gresham*  
Councillor Larry Haverkamp

*C-TRAN*  
Lynne Griffith, Executive  
Director/CEO

*Tri-Met*  
Fred Hansen, General Manager

*Port of Vancouver*  
Larry Paulson, Executive Director

*Port of Portland*  
Bill Wyatt, Executive Director

*WSDOT*  
Don Wagner, SW Administrator

*ODOT*  
Matthew Garrett, Reg. 1 Manager



1300 Franklin Street Floor 4  
PO Box 1366  
Vancouver, Washington  
98666-1366

Tel 360-397-8067  
Fax 360-397-6132

[www.rtc.wa.gov](http://www.rtc.wa.gov)



**METRO**

600 NE Grand Avenue  
Portland, Oregon  
97232-2736

Tel 503-797-1700  
Fax 503-797-1797  
TDD 503-797-1804

[www.metro-region.org](http://www.metro-region.org)

July 20, 2004

Mr. Matt Garrett  
Region 1 Manager  
ODOT  
123 NW Flanders St  
Portland, OR  
97209

Mr. Don Wagner  
SW Administrator  
WSDOT  
PO Box 1709  
Vancouver, WA  
98668

Thank you in advance for sharing your proposal for oversight of the Columbia River Crossing Project at the upcoming meeting of the Bi-State Coordination Committee on August 10, 2004.

As you know, the bridges over the Columbia are critical to the future of this region: overseeing and nurturing the growing relationship between north and south is the heart and soul of the Bi State Coordinating Committee (of which both of your departments are charter members).

In our communication to the joint committee of the State Transportation Commissions this spring we gave the history of this effort, including the recommendations of the I-5 Partnership. We know that you recognize the significance of any activity affecting the two bridges (three if you include the rail bridge) to the communities on both sides of the River. Our commitment to improving these connections remains strong as does our concern that the process be designed to benefit those communities.

It has now been almost two years since the I-5 Partnership finished its work and its recommendations adopted by state and local governments. We know that you are as anxious as we are to get started. We would like to reiterate the Bi-State Committee's offer to serve as the local review body for this process, understanding that both Commissions would like to have additional voices at the table.

We trust that your recommendation will address these concerns so that we can go forward together on this important project. Thanks once again for your efforts on our behalf.

Rex Burkholder  
Chair, Bi-State Coordinating Committee

Craig Pridemore  
Vice-Chair

Copy: Councillor Rod Park, Chair, JPACT  
Stuart Foster, Chair, Oregon Transportation Commission  
Dale Stedman, Chair, Washington State Transportation Commission



# **OREGON RAIL USERS' LEAGUE (ORULE) MISSION STATEMENT**

---

**Problem Statement**— Rail transportation is a vital part of the state's economy. The viability and competitiveness of Oregon's freight-rail system to meet current and future business needs is in jeopardy. Economic growth over the next 20 years will double the demand for freight transportation, straining the capacity of the highway and freight rail systems. Additional capacity must be found to meet demand of the anticipated growth. This will be a challenge because while the rail industry today is stable, productive and competitive, it does not have the resources to replenish its infrastructure to meet Oregon's future.

**Mission Statement**—The Oregon Rail Users League (ORULE) is committed to working with all rail shippers, Class I railroads, Short line railroads and public agencies to secure funding for a well-maintained and growing rail system as part of a balanced and efficient transportation network in Oregon. We are committed to strong representation for all rail users and operators in their dealings with public and private entities. We seek to ensure that investments in rail are targeted for maximum economic benefit for the state's economy and its transportation users. We are also committed to ensuring that all possible public resources, including federal, state and local, are available for rail investment and put to the best possible use.

**Immediate Stakeholders:**

- Class 1 representatives
- Shippers
- Short line representatives
- Amtrak and passenger rail advocates
- Ports
- Transportation service brokers
- Construction firms and associated service providers
- Oregon Highway Users' Alliance and individual members
- Rail car manufacturers



***Basic Principles:***

- Investment targeted for: infrastructure, operations and facilities
- Connected investments to improve system efficiency and functionality.
- Sustained focus and effort on getting investments made in the rail system that will increase capacity, efficiency and performance.
- All ORULE participants are interdependent and can all work together for sustained improvements.
- Rail, as a transportation mode, must speak with a unified voice in working with other transportation modes to achieve a more robust and vibrant transportation network throughout Oregon.



**DRAFT 8-05-04**  
**I-5 COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING TASK FORCE**

**CHARTER**

The Interstate 5 Columbia River Crossing Project is one of a finite list of transportation projects that have Pacific Northwest region-wide significance. The Interstate 5 Columbia River Crossing Task Force's role will be to provide input into the Columbia River Crossing Project. Within the context created by the I-5 Strategic Plan the Task Force will: respond to and advise the Joint Project Team on technical data leading to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); provide advice to the Joint Commission Subcommittee throughout the EIS until the issuance of the Record of Decision; and represent and report back to their representative organizations.

**COMPOSITION**

The composition of the I-5 Partnership was used as a foundation for the formation of this Task Force. Due to the Northwest region-wide significance of the Columbia River crossing, the Task Force membership will also include statewide representation from Oregon and Washington.

*Selection Process -*

The Joint Commission Subcommittee will appoint a co-chair from each state. They will seek assistance from public agencies, community and business groups in the appointment of other members.

*Membership (from each state)-*

- Co-Chairs
- Public Agencies
- Trucking Industry
- Neighborhoods
- Businesses
- Community Organizations
- Statewide Organizations
- Environmental Organizations

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

- The Columbia River Crossing Task Force will provide input and response to the Joint Commission Subcommittee on work products and information generated by the EIS process.
- The task force co-chairs will report input to the Joint Commission Subcommittee.
- Each Task Force member is responsible for representing and communicating with their organization.

**STAFFING & OPERATIONS**

- The Columbia River Crossing Task Force will be staffed by the DOT Joint Project Team.
- The co-chairs will be responsible for developing methods by which the task force will make decisions and conduct meetings.

**DURATION**

- The Task Force will be developed in fall 2004, with the kickoff meeting tentatively scheduled in late fall 2004.
- The Task Force will then meet quarterly.
- The EIS is a multi-year process. Therefore some turnover is to be expected. Duration of tenure should provide consistency of representation for major milestones.



Subcommittee

Cochairs: John, John  
Business person  
(one bi-state chair)

Exec. Committee  
Cochairs: John, John, Craig  
& Rex

REC

Public  
Involvement

1. Who will staff Bi-state?
2. Bi-state will not merge? but involved.
3. See rules as derived in Partnership
4. Thoughts of Conrad & McDonald by end of next week.
5. Also include state legislators that are not in area.
  - like Senate & House Transportation Committee leads
  - 6. Also Federal elected, local elected, union, business, FORTWA.
- \* Engaged group after September meeting. Use this group to get information.
7. Need resolution on "Enged team"