

Introductions were made. Don Larson briefly laid out the purpose of the meeting, that it was to brief the FAA personnel on the drawings that were being submitted for a “feasibility analysis” for those that were performing the analysis. A copy of a letter dated February 24, 2006 was passed out to the group in which FAA accepted the invitation to participate in the project as a cooperating agency.

Lynn Rust passed out a copy of the project schedule and described the progress. The team has been working on screening the River Crossing components and the Transit components. The total river crossing components started with 23 and is down to 9; transit started with 14 and is down to 6. The next step is to screen the components on the basis of more detailed criteria, but it didn’t result in a discriminating analysis. So the focus has shifted to developing the alternative packages. The schedule shows that by the end of 2006 alternative packages will be narrowed in preparation to the Draft EIS. The feasibility analysis will provide input to the analysis that will help narrow the number of alternatives.

A question was asked as to how the BIA (Bridge Influence Area) was established. The previous partnership study established the influence area base on traffic volumes. Most of the traffic that travels across the bridge either originates from interchanges within the BIA, is destined to interchanges within the BIA or both. Currently the section of highway north of the BIA is being widened to its ultimate width and the section of highway south of the BIA is in the process having the environmental analysis complete on the ultimate widening for that section. The Columbia River Crossing project will complete the piece in between.

Karl described the packets submitted. The components presented in this study were previously presented. The difference is in the details presented. In discussion with Don, the materials were refined to their current status and hopefully will provide the information needed to perform the feasibility analysis.

Three clearance levels for the bridge were being considered. The high level, a level similar to the I-205 Bridge was thrown out due to its conflict with Pearson Airfield. The mid level and low level bridges are sampled with this transmittal. An extradosed type is shown for RC-3. RC-3 has its advantages because it’s downstream and further away from the airports. RC-4 is upstream and is as close to the existing bridge as possible with the airports in mind. The type shown is a reinforced concrete box girder, similar to the type of bridge found with the I-205 crossing. Both RC-3 and 4 are replacement structures that would remove the existing bridges. RC-8 is a low level supplemental bridge which is sited a little further upstream for seismic and staging concerns. In this scenario the existing lift towers remain and there would be intermittent penetrations with the moveable portion of the new bridge. The type has not yet been determined but for this submittal a bascule type has been assumed and is portrayed in the profile. The deck of the bascule would likely be a steel grate, with reinforced concrete box girder structure for the rest of the bridge.

Don pointed out the table on the plan sheets provide longitude, latitude, and elevation of the Part 77 penetrations and that it should help staff in performing the feasibility analysis.

Wade Bryant asked how the 3 RC components were chosen among the 9 RC components that remain. The ones screened from the 23 were far reaching and extreme in some cases and beyond the scope of this project in other cases. An alternative with a tunnel component has not been screened out yet but the one that remains would be a supplement to the existing bridge and of course the towers would remain in that case. With the 9 that remain, the plan is that they would be narrowed and packaged with 4 to 5 alternatives by the end of the year. The 3 that are in this submittal are intended to bracket the range of possibilities and be somewhat representative of the remaining 9 RC components. It was stressed again that this is intended to be a study and not a 7460 permit. With that said comments are what is expected and not exceptions or objections by the reviewers. The EIS process will also allow for comments. The intention is that the feasibility analysis will help in preparation of the 7460 permit so that it will go smoothly without surprises or fatal flaws.

Light poles and penetration into the airspace was raised as a concern and in particular ones that would be on the SR-14 ramps. The design is not at that level yet but the concerns are duly noted. Sign bridges will also be a concern when the design gets to that level of detail.

Don made the point that the Part 77 surface shown for PDX included the extension on the north runway and the potential new 3rd runway and that the ultimate airspace was being considered for PDX.

It was noted that the west bound departure procedures for Pearson have been restored.

Lynn asked a question about the effect of water quality retention ponds near and around Pearson and what the requirements for sighting them are. They cannot be located closer than 5,000' for propeller planes and not closer than 10,000' for jets.

A question was raised about the priority of this project and the funding of it. About \$14M in SAFETEA-LU funds have been allocated for Washington and Oregon, and \$50,000 from Washington State, but the construction is not funded yet. The Record of Decision is scheduled for the end of 2008 and typically the design is not advanced beyond a 30% design level without jeopardizing federal funding. 2010 would likely be the earliest construction start.

For questions Don and Lynn will be the key contacts. The length of this feasibility analysis is anticipated to be roughly 90 days.

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING BRIEFING, MAY 1, 2006

NAME	REPRESENTING	PHONE NO.	E-MAIL
Don Larson	FAA Seattle ADO	425-227-2652	DON.LARSON@FAA.GOV
Rob Norton	DEA	541-754-0043	RLN@DEAINC.com
Karl Winterstein	CRC	360-816-2169	wintersteink@columbiarivercrossing.org
Gavin Oien	CRC	360-816-2176	oieng@columbiarivercrossing.org
Jason Gately	Port of Portland	503-460-4570	jason.gately@portofportland.com
Chris Corich	Port of Portland-PDX	503-460-4112	chris.corich@portofportland.com
Thinh Vu (Tv)	FAA	425-227-2364	thinh.vu@faa.gov
Lynn Rust	CRC-WSDOT	360-816-2177	rustl@columbiarivercrossing.org
Sean Loughran	City of Vancouver	360-619-1295	sean.loughran@ci.vancouver.org
Dennis Franks	FAA Flt. Standards	425-227-2240	dennis.franks@faa.gov
Kerri Woehler	WSDOT Aviation	360-651-6312	woehlek@wsdot.wa.gov
Mary Vargas	FAA	425-227-2660	mary.vargas@faa.gov
Fred Mitchell	FAA-SEA FPO	425-227-2222	FREDERICK.MITCHELL@FAA.GOV
Norm LeFevre	FAA-ANM-230	425-227-1737	NORMAN.B.LEFEVRE@faa.gov
Bill Watson	SEA-ADO	425-227-2658	bill.watson@faa.gov
Karen Miles	FAA-Seattle ADO	425-227-2661	karen.miles@faa.gov
Calvin Ngo	FAA-Seattle-Tech. Ops	425-227-2345	calvin.ngo@FAA.GOV
Wade Bryant	FAA-SEA ADO	425-227-2659	
Kathie Curran	FAA-Air Traffic	425-227-2558	Kathie.Curran@faa.gov
Jason Schwartz	Port of Portland, PDX	503-460-4068	jason.schwartz@portofportland.com