

MEETING MINUTES

Project Name: CRC **Project No.:** 2733012004
Location: Clark County **Meeting Date:** June 24, 2008 **Time:**
Minutes by: Katie Clements
Attendees: **Company:**

Subject: CRC Task Force Public Meeting: Hearing Testimony

Henry Hewitt: I'm Henry Hewitt, one of the co-chairs of the Columbia River Crossing Task Force and Hal, the other co-chair, agreed early on that we would alternate who was going to chair which meetings and we would alternate meetings between Oregon and Washington but as it's turned out, the last several meetings have been in Washington. He told me it was my turn to chair the meeting so here I am. I'd like to welcome everybody and we do know that there's some problem on the I-5 highway on the Oregon side that's causing traffic delays and that people will probably be late in arriving, particularly those people coming from that direction. The reason for getting started is that at about 4:15 Gov. Gregoire is gonna call in and has a few words that she'd like to give with respect to the project and where we are and I think we at least want to be attentive for that for those of us that are here. In the meantime we'll get started with some of the formalities. Please turn off your cell phones. I've turned mine off and it tends to cause disruption with the technology if we leave the cell phones on. As always, our meeting tonight will be broadcast on CVTV and in Portland on the community media. You can watch the Task Force meetings on the internet through the link to the project (LINK). We have materials that have been distributed and we have a lot of paper tonight. Hopefully everyone either has a copy or can share with somebody who does. By way of background, we began this process in I think the February timeframe of 2006. I was asked to be co-chair and was told it would be a year and a half or two years of meetings, once a quarter. Well here we are more than 3 years later and my notes tell me this is the 23rd meeting, so that's more frequently than quarterly and longer than 2 years. Tonight we will hear a project update, get public input received on the DEIS, there will be time for public comments


We have people signed up and once again I would ask that you to be as brief as you can be and in any event we'll cut you off or have you close down at about 3 minutes so that we can get all the people that we have signed up in the allotted time and excuse me if I mispronounce names. The first person we have is Steve Citron.

Steve Citron: Thank you. My name is Steve Citron and I am a Vancouver resident. I am a PhD Engineer and a fellow of the Society of Automotive Engineers. I am concerned and my comments reflect an interest in congestion over the new bridge compared to the No Build option. So, very simply, one of the statements from CRC is that

Meeting Minutes (continued)

Roger Staver: I'm here today as the Chair of the Hayden Island Neighborhood Network, specifically the area of High Noon. I do also have a letter I'd like to leave for the record. High Noon is probably going to be the most affected neighborhood of this project. The better part of the bridge footings will be in our neighborhood and we're going to have to deal with this for as long as the project goes on. In spite of that, representing virtually the entire residential population and many small businesses, High Noon's members and board have voted to support this project on at least 2 occasions. We support the replacement bridge with light rail with the light rail being as close to the new bridge as possible. On Hayden Island we don't have medical facilities, we don't have a lot of the amenities as Ed Garen already mentioned. If there is a problem on the freeway, we can't get people off the island or emergency services to the island quickly. Our concept plan is based on the CRC project going forward. We've spent over a year putting our concept plan together and it has a great deal to do with CRC which is very important to us, important to the island, and to the surrounding areas. CRC represents not just a single solution to a single problem but multiple solutions to a myriad of problems. It covers over 5 miles of freeway. If you try to just solve part of the problem, you're not going to reach the goal that was intended. It needs to have all of the problems solved for all of the problems to be fixed. It isn't a project, it's an opportunity. High Noon is eager to see CRC proceed. We want to see it go forward with as little delay as possible and thank all of you for all the hard work you've done and have been happy to have our members support you in very way we could.

Peg Johnson: I am a board member of the Janzten Beach Floating Home Moorage who I am representing today. Our moorage is the one that is most impacted on Hayden Island. We're right across from the Expo Center and we've been following this project since it started. I want to make sure the Task Force is clear that we do support Alternative 3. For selfish reasons we feel this has the lowest impact on us but we also feel it is a good combination of light rail and highway improvements. Even though we have worked closely with the CRC over the last few years, we also have 2 members on the CEJG and we've hosted CRC delegations to our moorage, We have basically been shocked at the short shrift we've been given in the DEIS and I want to bring that to your attention. Throughout the DEIS graphics and narrative, the floating home community which bears the biggest impact of anything on the OR side, our value and presence as housing stock has been underreported. We want to remind this group that floating homes, even though they are not real property, they are actually personal property, but they still provide actual houses that people live in and are actually a priority housing stock with both Metro and the City of Portland saying they want to see people live densely as we do. We also live in an industrial area, an area impacted by the airport flight path, the existing I-5, the existing railroad, and a lot of marine industrial uses. We think we're pretty valuable and we're disappointed that the impact of this project is not portrayed accurately in the DEIS. So I wanted to make sure that you realize that there are actual homes affected in Hayden Island, not just parking lots and other infrastructure. In addition to the fact that our configurations are not shown on graphics we have high concerned which we are expressing in our letter to the Task Force about noise analysis and the lack of attention to noise propagation as it varies according to river levels, there is no river level information corresponding to where measurements were taken (river higher = noisier). We want to work with you about this and want to make sure you know that we exist: we're valid housing, we're real people and we have lived in the middle of this intolerable situation for years. We look forward to a solution being implemented and we don't want to be forgotten in the process.

Pam Ferguson: I have proudly been watching this Task Force and the project team over the last 3 years do a fantastic job. Even though Hayden Island does not have a neighborhood representative on the Task Force we that Walter for watching out for us. I represent the ner form of alternative housing on the island: the manufacture home community. I want to give Peg kudos for saying what she did and we need to pay more attention to alternative forms of housing. I represent about 440 home owners and 150 RVers in the park. Some of these residents have lived here 35 years. We are a diverse and opinionated community of low-income, senior citizens,

Meeting Minutes (continued)

single parent, working singles, handicapped people, and veterans. We are diverse but have one thing in common: we love Hayden Island and do not want to live anywhere else. We are most concerned with reducing congestion on I-5. It took me 1.5 hours to get from downtown Portland to the bridge today. The standing joke among seniors in our community is that when they have their heart attack, they hope it is not between 3-7 pm when traffic is too heavy to get an ambulance to them. In addition, we specifically want easy access on and off I-5, easy access to Marine Drive provided by the replacement bridge only. Light rail, we feel, is much sexier than the bus, east-west public transit on the island and an exclusive residential light rail parking lot. We understand the issue of tolling but we hope that local residents will be cut a deal as we do more shopping and recreating in Vancouver than we do in Portland. Our closest Fred Meyer is now in Vancouver and we would hate to pay a toll to get there. We prefer the transit alignment having the least impact to the island and to Peg's community at the moorage. We also want a beautiful bridge appealing to the eye and soul, something to be proud of and perhaps a park under the bridge giving the history of this project. Our community asks you to vote to support our choices.

Jim Karlock: Thank you for the opportunity at one of the few open parts of this entire process. Once again I have been refused information I have requested. I requested cost information on all of these interchanges they're planning on building. I got an acknowledgement that they got my request but nothing else and it's been 3 weeks now. Here's a copy of my e-mail and the response (hands out copies). So I say this is hardly an open process, I say it's carefully managed to direct you to a conclusion that light rail is the thing to build and gee, if they have to build a road then I guess they have to. Let's talk about the CO₂ of this project (hands out more papers). It seems as if the EIS says this is going to save just a bit of CO₂ every year. Unfortunately that does not take in to account the amount of CO₂ emitted when they build this thing. When you do that comparison, it's gonna take 150 years to break even on the CO₂. Of course the bridge isn't going to last that long which means that this project is a net emitter of CO₂. Energy consumption: same story. It'll take 137 years to of energy saving to make up for the construction energy so once again this project wastes energy. Cost? Well of course they don't give us a bunch of cost breakdowns because they're trying to commingle the transit and the road parts so we won't notice how terribly expensive the transit is. But you can figure that the proposed 6 million annual transit trips are going to cost \$9 per trip over the section in question and that's a 4 mile section so that's \$2 per passenger per mile. Compared to a car, gas would have to get around \$40 per gallon to make driving as expensive as this light rail. There's also some accounting tricks going on. I found this buried on Chapter 4, page 4-2, that the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate of the live load on the foundation. Now the live load is the weight of the vehicle, not the weight of the bridge structure so that all the weight of the bridge structure is being allocated to road costs not transit costs. That was one of the questions they haven't bothered to answer yet. We don't know that for sure but that's a pretty reasonable suspicion. Another thing, I'd like to see a process run by an organization that has no dog in this fight. But it turns out that one of your chief consultants has been donating money in favor of light rail in both the 1996 and 1998 ballot campaigns. I only have 5 copies of this so I'm saving one to turn in but I'll pass the others around. So this project appears to be managed by DEA which has a history of donating money to pro-light rail. Hardly sounds like an impartial process. May I suggest that you cancel this project, start all over looking at the real needs which was congestions relief, build a road and get rid of the light rail, get rid of all the interchange improvements up and down I-5 and just solve the problem at hand instead of trying to rebuild society. Thank you.