


1 really was kind of scary. After a while, it wasn't
2 a problem at all. So I certainly, as a cyclist,
3 don't want to spend 4.2 billion to get a bicycle
4 bridge and -- However, if it is going to happen, I
5 would like to see better cycling and pedestrian
6 facilities and light rail. Thank you.

7 **MR. HEWITT:** Thank you.

8 Now, to this table (indicated), I'd like
9 to invite Joe Morrison, Jim Howell, Randy Salisbury.
10 And the next speaker is Doug Klotz.

11 **MR. KLOTZ:** Hi. I'm Doug Klotz; K-L-O-T-
12 Z, 2630 Southeast 43rd Avenue, Portland 97206.

13 Many in Portland would know me as  a long-
14 time pedestrian advocate and, certainly, all the
15 build options to include improved pedestrian and
16 bicycle facilities, which is great.

17 However, as some of the previous speakers,
18 I am concerned about the modeling that is used to
19 determine traffic volumes and how that is -- would
20 be accepted by the current reduction in auto travel
21 that is occurring. And, certainly, most
22 commentators on the -- on the world scene would --
23 would -- would agree that oil prices are not going
24 down. Auto travel is going to be more expensive.
25 And to answer one of the previous speakers, yes,

1 there are other ways to power automobiles, but they
2 are not as cheap and not as convenient. And there
3 will be a reduction in traffic, regardless. So I
4 think we need to relook at that with the -- we look
5 at the congestion issue with a -- with a view to
6 what the likely congestion might be in the future.

7 I also want to note that congestion --
8 there's a definition of "congestion" in this report.
9 And I -- I don't know the exact figure, but it's
10 something like, you know, any speed below 40 miles
11 an hour, or so, is considered "congestion." And I -
12 - Having lived in Los Angeles for a while, that's
13 not congestion. Congestion is when you're stopped.

14 Anyway, so -- and they -- as the other
15 fellow said, the NEPA standards would point to
16 reconsidering under new circumstances that weren't
17 there ten -- ten years ago when the project was
18 started.

19 And I also note that freight capacity is a
20 lot of the concern for this corridor, and certainly,
21 that's -- that's an important issue. I have heard,
22 though, in talking to Portland's -- the coordinator
23 of Portland's freight master plan, that there is
24 actually desire for rail freight service. But
25 because of the way the rail industry is going with

1 major railroads only concerned with, you know,
2 shipping large -- moving large trains of similar
3 units from city to city, they don't have much
4 interest in moving freight -- goods around in a
5 metropolitan area. And, matter of fact, there is an
6 industry down on U.S. 30 -- I can't tell you what
7 industry at this point -- that couldn't get
8 reasonable service to move stuff to Vancouver.

9 So, at this point, I would say no-build is
10 the option I support, because all the rest of the
11 options add auto capacity, even if it's in the form
12 of auxiliary lanes that clear out the main lanes.
13 They add auto capacity, when I don't think it's
14 needed. We need to move the freight by rail with a
15 new rail bridge parallel to the current rail bridge
16 that that would open at the same time, or other
17 means. But I don't think that we need the excess
18 auto capacity.

19 **MR. HEWITT:** Thank you.

20 J.R. Robinson.

21 **MR. ROBINSON:** My name's J.R. Robinson.

22 Current address is 4503 Northeast 38th Street in
23 Vancouver.

24 I've worked for the last ten years in
25 Hillsboro, so I commute that quite a bit. And there