



**From:** [Jim Karlock](#)  
**To:** [Draft EIS Feedback](#);  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Karlocks comments attached with exhibit, comments only below To REPLACE earlier version  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 01, 2008 11:48:31 PM  
**Attachments:** [DEIS errors-Full.pdf](#)

---

# E-mail: [DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org)

### **Karlock's comments on the CRC DEIS**

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of tolling on low income people who must drive across the bridge to get to work.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Vancouver, of Portland criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Vancouver.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Portland, of Vancouver criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Portland.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on the various criminal justice systems around the region, of criminals having a wider geographic range due to transportation on light rail.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of bridge tolling on business in Jantzen Beach

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of possible I205 bridge tolling on business in Cascade Station.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of construction and of the presence of light rail, on Vancouver business: How many will go out of business? How many will have to move? How many jobs will be lost? How many people will be forced on to the welfare rolls due to job loss?

The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of seldom, if ever, being able to find empty seats on peak period trains due the all the seats having being taken by upper income Vancouver residents well before the trains reach the low income neighborhoods. Having to stand on the long (timewise) commute may affect their job performance by making them fatigued.

The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of full trains skipping stops in the low income areas of North Portland because the train was already full of upper income Vancouver residents (in addition to Portland residents up the line.)

The DEIS did not consider if there will be capacity on Interstate line after the Interstate Ave. Portion achieves its full zoned build out <sup>(1)</sup> of up to 23,000 new people along the Portland portion of the line. If 80% of these 23,000 new, low income, people are transit dependent (there will be few other options for mobility as Interstate Ave. is at capacity and surrounding streets have little capacity, especially as many streets already "calmed"), that would be 18,400 people in the morning and afternoon, or MORE 39,000 "riders", this almost would triple the largest number estimated in DEIS Table 30.

The DEIS did not consider that the highway has been overcapacity and is badly needed now, while there is little actual, current, need for the transit portion of the project as transit ridership is only 3,300 per day<sup>(2)</sup>

# E-mail: [DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org)

## **Karlock's comments on the CRC DEIS**

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of tolling on low income people who must drive across the bridge to get to work.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Vancouver, of Portland criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Vancouver.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Portland, of Vancouver criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Portland.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on the various criminal justice systems around the region, of criminals having a wider geographic range due to transportation on light rail.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of bridge tolling on business in Jantzen Beach

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of possible I205 bridge tolling on business in Cascade Station.

The DEIS didn't consider the effects of construction and of the presence of light rail, on Vancouver business: How many will go out of business? How many will have to move? How many jobs will be lost? How many people will be forced on to the welfare rolls due to job loss?

The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of seldom, if ever, being able to find empty seats on peak period trains due the all the seats having being taken by upper income Vancouver residents well before the trains reach the low income neighborhoods. Having to stand on the long (timewise) commute may affect their job performance by making them fatigued.

The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of full trains skipping stops in the low income areas of North Portland because the train was already full of upper income Vancouver residents (in addition to Portland residents up the line.)

The DEIS did not consider if there will be capacity on Interstate line after the Interstate Ave. Portion achieves its full zoned build out <sup>(1)</sup> of up to 23,000 new people along the Portland portion of the line. If 80% of these 23,000 new, low income, people are transit dependent (there will be few other options for mobility as Interstate Ave. is at capacity and surrounding streets have little capacity, especially as many streets already "calmed"), that would be 18,400 people in the morning and afternoon, or MORE 39,000 "riders", this almost would triple the largest number estimated in DEIS Table 30.

The DEIS did not consider that the highway has been overcapacity and is badly needed now, while there is little actual, current, need for the transit portion of the project as transit ridership is only 3,300 per day<sup>(2)</sup>

The DEIS did not consider adding enough road capacity to ensure free flow and running frequent buses in the general purpose lanes.

The DEIS did not consider running frequent buses in HOV/HOT lanes.

The DEIS did not consider a simple bus system upgrade in service, such as increasing bus routes and frequency, instead of fancy stations and exclusive lanes.

The DEIS did not consider eliminating park and ride by increasing bus routes and frequency.

Did the DEIS specify the East and West boundaries of the "bridge influence area" in a clear and

consistent manner?

The DEIS did not consider highway only.

The DEIS did not consider transit only.

The DEIS did not individually consider improving the on/off ramps that cause the most congestion.

The DEIS did not provide separable costs for the various components in a clear manner (if at all).

The DEIS did not consider the death rate of light rail which is over twice that of buses.

It appears that only live load on bridge foundations was assigned to rail (the rest presumably being allocated to the highway component):

*the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the "live load" on the foundation*<sup>(3)</sup>

The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to become much more energy efficient in the future due to Federal mandates.

The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to emit much less CO<sub>2</sub> in the future due to Federal energy mandates.

The DEIS failed to give costs in common units like cost per passenger-mile. This makes comparisons difficult.

The DEIS failed to give supporting data readily locateable. Many times a number would appear in the report with no obvious source in the technical documents.

The funding sources listed in the DEIS may overstate the available Federal funding for the transit portion.

The funding sources listed in the DEIS may understate the available Federal funding for the road portion.

Some alleged data in the DEIS, appears to be unsupported assertions.

This phase of the project is apparently managed by a company that has given money, in the past, to support one of outcomes under consideration.<sup>(4)</sup>

Some task force members own land in the affected areas and may profit from their decisions.

The task force did not consider the cost and benefit of each of the various options (and their components) before they were eliminated for consideration in the DEIS. This could have caused combinations of options (or parts thereof) that might have met the selection criteria to be rejected.

Task Force was not representative. It had only two automobile users representatives (of the 39 members), although automobile users are the majority of the transportation system users.

Task Force was not representative. A number of groups with an anti-automobile agenda were given memberships on the 39 member task force, although such radical views are only shared by a tiny minority of the general population. Several such groups were formed by one individual (Burkholder) who is also a task force member himself. He effectively had three (or more) votes.

The project management has refused numerous requests for information, relying on dubious legal distinctions or hiding behind the differences between Oregon and Washington public records laws.

For instance, although this is a joint project of both Oregon and Washington, they claimed that they did not have to give out copies of drafts because Washington law does not require them to, while Oregon law does require the release of drafts. Regardless of applicable law, this indicates a clear desire to hide information in what is claimed to be an open process. Some of the requests were never filled, including the projected bike and pedestrian volumes, costs (broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches) of the general purpose lanes; Pedestrian; Bike and Transit rail. See Exhibit 2. (Attachment 2 has the complete history.)

The project has failed to fill a request for information, sent on 6/3/2008, in time to complete this comment document by the deadline. The only response received was the email auto responder and an email a few days ago claiming that they had found my request in their spam filter. This fails to “ring true” as many of their replies, in the past, have had a subject header (from the original email request) with the line “flagged as spam” added. For an example see the email exchange in Attachment 1. This strongly suggests that most of their incoming email goes into the spam filter and, by implication, they check the spam filter on a regular basis. (Exhibit 2)

The proposed project will actually cause more CO2 emissions than “no-build”. Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to emit more CO2 than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 11 tons of CO2 per day at a construction cost of about 600,000 tons. It will take 150 years of savings to make up for the construction emissions. This is a longer payback time than the likely life of the project. (Exhibit 3)

The proposed project will actually use more energy than “no-build”. Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to use more energy than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 140 million BTU per day at a construction cost of 7,000,000 million BTU. It will take about 137 years to make up for the construction energy consumption. (Exhibit 4)

The cost of the rail portion is excessive, especially when compared to the cost of driving. The cost of the rail component is estimated at \$1.1 Billion, about \$55 million per year when annualized at 5%. The projected 6 million annual trips will cost \$9 each. This is for just the 4.2 mile project area, so the cost is \$2.04 per passenger-mile. (See Exhibit 5) For comparison, the average American pays \$0.324 per mile. (AAA gives a higher number because they assume the upscale usage patterns of its members, mostly their 2.5 year old car age, while the national average is 9 years. AAA reports cost per vehicle-mile, while we use passenger-mile to match transit data.) Gasolene would have to get to \$43 /gal. to cost as much per mile as just the construction cost of this project with today’s cars. With current hybrid cars, gas would have to cost over \$100 / gal. (Exhibit 6)

Conclusion: reject the project with a recommendation that they propose a modest road only project solution to serve the actual needs of the near future. If rail turns out to be needed in 20 years, then build it in 15 years. To build it earlier is merely to shove billions of dollars to construction companies and to satisfy Portland’s numerous profession prophets of impending doom.

1. Portland zoning proposals and Metro’s density recommendations. See Exhibit 1 for details
2. DEIS, page 3-24
3. DEIS, chapter 4, page 4-2
4. David Evans & Associates donated \$5000 in favor of building N-S light rail 1996 on the measure 32 campaign; \$2,500 in favor of building light rail N-S 1998 on the measure 26-74 campaign. See Line 4 of Exhibit 7

## Exhibit 1 - Zoning proposed for Interstate Ave.

Metro code (from <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/files/about/chap307.pdf> bold added):

(Effective 4/25/07) 3.07 - 10

3.07.170 Design Type Density Recommendations

A. For the area of each of the 2040 Growth Concept design types, the following average densities for housing and employment are recommended to cities and counties:

Central City - 250 persons per acre

Regional Centers - 60 persons per acre

**Station Communities - 45 persons per acre**

Town Centers - 40 persons per acre

Main Streets - 39 persons per acre

Corridor - 25 persons per acre

Employment Areas - 20 persons per acre

Industrial Areas - 9 employees per acre

Regionally Significant Industrial Area - 9 employees per acre

Inner Neighborhoods - 14 persons per acre

Outer Neighborhoods - 13 persons per acre

---

### NOTES:

Station Communities are defined in ns of these “design types” is in Metro Code 3.07.130 as:

Station Communities--Nodes of development centered approximately one-half mile around a light rail or high capacity transit station that feature a high-quality pedestrian environment.

### Calculations:

There are five “station communities” along Interstate avenue between Overlook and Lombard, inclusive shown on the Portland Planning Department map at <http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=202013>

The “station communities” overlap such that one can consider the area to be approximately rectangular. The abovementioned map, printed at a scale about 0.75" = 600 ft., shows this area as 2.5" x 14" after allowing for the freeway area to the East.

This is an area of about 514 acres ( $2000 \times 11,200 / 43,560 = 514$ ). At Metro’s recommended average density of 45 persons per acre gives 23,140 people.

## Exhibit 2 - Refused Information Requests

**2/21/07 Request:** (Excerpt, highlights added, See Attachment 1 for the complete history of this exchange)

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]

Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 1:31 PM

To: Gleason, Tonja

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Please note that the 30 period stated on March 14, the data that I emailed your "communications and public outreach" person.

I might add that it has been almost two weeks for this simple request.

Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

~~Automobile (and how many person per vehicle)~~  
~~Truck~~  
~~Other motor vehicle~~  
**Pedestrian**  
**Bike**  
~~Transit~~  
~~Other than above~~

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

General purpose lanes  
 Automobile if other than General purpose lanes  
 Truck if other than General purpose lanes  
 Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes  
 Pedestrian  
 Bike  
 Transit bus  
 Transit rail  
 Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?

Thanks  
 JK

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 14:15:20 -0700

From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>

To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Hello Jim-

I have logged your additional request and have attached a letter of acknowledgment to this email.

Regards-

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**

---

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 3:54 PM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks. However your attached letter left out these requested items:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

**Pedestrian**  
**Bike**  
Other than above

Also please note that this request was made on Feb 21, 2007 to your Communications and Public Outreach" person, Danielle Cogan, not March 26 as indicated on your letter.

Thanks  
JK

---

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records  
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 15:41:05 -0700  
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Thanks Jim-  
We have revised your request to reflect the three additional items.  
Regards

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**

---

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 5:15 PM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks.

I note that your letter still shows a request data of March 26, 2007 while the request was originally made on February 21, 2007 to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person.

Please make the appropriate correction.

Thanks  
JK

---

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records  
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2007 08:00:31 -0700  
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Jim-

The letters that you sent to me on the 23rd and the other on the 26th do not officially qualify as public records request. The request that I received on the 23rd was asking how to do something ie request records. I am giving you the benefit of the doubt and treating it as a request. The request that you believe was sent to Danielle Cogan on February 21st and was received by me on March 26th was already answered by Danielle. We will answer your request again, however it likely won't change. There are no corrections to make on the letters.  
Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
*700 Washington Ave. STE 300,*  
*Vancouver, Washington 98660*  
**360.816.2188**

Subject: Your Requests for Information  
Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 09:45:57 -0700  
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock-

In response to your request for records dated March 23,2007, we have the records requested:

*"(Danielle was apparently unable to simply forward my request form several weeks ago, so I am sending it directly to this address.)*

*How do I get copies of all sign in sheets from all open house type events of the CRC, plus the task force meetings.*

*Thanks  
JK."*

Please provide an address that we can send them to or provide a time that you would like to pick them up.

With respect to your request dated March 26, 2007:

*"How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge currently and projected for 2030 in each of these categories:*

*Pedestrian*

*Bike*

*Other Than Above*

*Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:*

*For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:*



*General purpose lanes*  
*Automobile if other than General purpose lanes*  
*Truck if other than General purpose lanes*  
*Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes*  
*Pedestrian*  
*Bike*  
*Transit bus*  
*Transit rail*  
*Other than above*

*What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?*

*Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?"*

As stated in Danielle's previous response to you dated March 23, 2007, we will study the cost of the alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative, we will estimate its cost during this period as well. There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide.

Sincerely,

**2 Jul 2007 07:12:34 (excerpt):**

Since that time, you have asked for a citation regarding exemption from public disclosure laws. Although that doesn't apply to your original request because we don't have completed estimates, we offer the following:

RCW – 42.56.280 Preliminary Drafts

Preliminary drafts, notes, recommendations, and intra-agency memorandums in which opinions are expressed or policies formulated or recommended are exempt under this chapter.

Estimates under preparation fall under this RCW.

Once again, we intend to have completed estimates prepared and available in September of this year.

**6/3/08 EMAIL**

Date: 04:47 AM 6/3/08

To: feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org

From: Jim Karlock <[Jkarlock@gmail.com](mailto:Jkarlock@gmail.com)>

Subject: Some questions

Please supply the following information about the project:

Provide separated data for the transit and highway components for the Daily energy use and CO2e emissions for each of the alternatives listed in your Exhibit 1-2

Provide separated data for the transit and highway components for the Construction-Related Energy Use and CO2e Emissions for each of the alternatives listed in your Exhibit 1-4

What is the cost of each element of the project broken down generally as:

Each highway interchange

Each highway segment between interchanges

Each bridge (Columbia slough, Columbia River and any Hayden Island portion not in the above request.)

Each light rail station

Each light rail segment

Each bridge (Columbia slough, Columbia River and any Hayden Island portion not in the above request.)

What are the projected bike and pedestrian volumes. (I can only find a chart of current daily volumes)

Cost estimate for the bike and pedestrian elements.

Of the total transit cost, of each option, what is the upper and lower limit of expected federal funding in dollars and percent of the total.

Of the total highway cost, of each option, what is the upper and lower limit of expected federal funding in dollars and percent of the total.

Your DEIS, chapter 4, page 4-2 (last paragraph) contains the statement:

*To divide the bridge cost into highway and transit components, the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the "live load" on the foundation, and the superstructure cost of the bridge was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the deck area on the bridge.*

With respect to the above quote:

What constitutes the "live load"?

What constitutes the foundation?

Does this mean that the cost of the foundation to support the weight of the transit deck area was not allocated to transit?

If so, where was it allocated?

What is that cost?

On what basis was this allocation decision made?

Thanks

JK

(Over)

**ONLY RESPONSES RECEIVED****1:**

Date: 04:46 AM 6/3/08

Subject: Your email was received

To: "Jim Karlock" &lt;jkarlock@gmail.com&gt;

Cc: "Columbia River Crossing" &lt;feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org&gt;

Thank you for contacting the Columbia River Crossing project. This email is to confirm that your information was received. If you asked a question or provided information that requires an immediate answer, we will respond soon in a separate message.

All comments are considered by the project on an ongoing basis. Comments received between May 2 and July 1, 2008, are identified as Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) comments and will be formally responded to in the Final EIS, expected in 2009.

Your involvement in the project is important and appreciated. Please contact us again if you have additional comments or questions.

Sincerely,

Columbia River Crossing

**2:**

Date: Mon, 30 Jun 2008 14:49:42 -0700

Subject: RE: Some questions

From: "Francis, Carley" &lt;francisc@columbiarivercrossing.com&gt;

To: &lt;jkarlock@gmail.com&gt;

Hello Mr. Karlock,

Please find attached a letter acknowledging receipt of this request for information. We will proceed on gathering the requested data.

After hearing your testimony at the June 24, 2008 Task Force meeting, we revisited our feedback box and found this request was flagged as spam. We recovered the request today. We are sorry for any inconvenience regarding your request for information.

Thank you,  
Carley

**Carley Francis*****Outreach and Planning Assistant***

Columbia River Crossing Project

700 Washington Street, Suite 300 | Vancouver, WA 98660

T 360.816.8869 | F 360.737.0294

## Exhibit 3 & 4 - CO2 & Energy

### Energy & CO2 Emissions Data & sources

**Data** (from Energy Tech. Report):

Alt 4&5 use more than baseline			(Ex. 1-2)
Alt. 1 Daily (baseline):	5,384.2 mBTU	463.3 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-2)
Alt. 2 Daily (Replacement+bus)	5,248.1 mBTU	452.3 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-2)
Alt. 3 Daily(Replacement+LRT)	5,242.3 mBTU	452.4 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-2)
Alt. 2 Construction Energy	6,997,371.9 mBTU	585,536 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-4)
Alt. 3 Construction energy	7,221,671.3 mBTU	603,472 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-4)

### Exhibit 3 - CO2

#### Energy Analysis:

Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.2 = 5,384.2 - 5,248.1 = 136.1 mBTU saved per day with bus

Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.3 = 5,384.2 - 5,242.3 = 141.9 mBTU saved per day with LRT

Considering construction:

6,997,371.9 mBTU / 136.1 mBTU saved per day = 51,451 days (141 years) to recover construction energy

7,221,671.3 mBTU / 141.9 mBTU saved per day = 50,893 days (139 years) to recover construction energy

### Exhibit 4 - Energy

#### CO2 Analysis:

Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.2 = 463.3 - 452.3 = 11.0 tons CO2e saved per day with bus

Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.3 = 463.3 - 452.4 = 10.9 tons CO2e saved per day with LRT

Considering construction:

585,536 tons CO2e / 11.0 tons CO2e saved per day = 53,231 days (146 years) to recover construction energy

603,472 tons CO2e / 10.9 tons CO2e saved per day = 55,364 days (152 years) to recover construction energy

### Exhibit 5 Cost of the rail element

**Data:** (from DEIS)

Cost of LRT to Kiggins Bowl:	\$1.148 Billion	(DEIS, Ex. 4.2-2)
Guideway Length, Kiggins Bowl:	4.22 miles	(DEIS, Ex. 2.3-14)
Annual transit ridership:	6,673,420	(DEIS, Ex. 3.1-32)
Amortization rate	5.0%	

**Analysis:**

\$1.148 Billion x 5% = \$57.4 million annual cost

\$57.4 million annual cost / 6,673,420 passenger = \$8.60 per 4.22 mile passenger trip

\$8.60 / 4.22 mile = \$2.04 per passenger-mile

### Exhibit 6 Cost of Driving a Car

AAA's 52.2 cents/mile is based on driving habits of their upscale members, not the USA average. This mainly shows in the cost of the car itself which is based on a new car every 5 years, an average car age of 2.5 years, while the actual national average is about 9 years. The latest AAA report (2007) used gas at \$2.256 per gallon.

Here is how we corrected for the above: Major differences between AAA and the actual USA average

**Variable Cost item:**

	AAA	Estimated USA average	Difference
Fuel	8.9 ¢/ mile (\$2.256 /gal)	15.8 ¢/ mile (\$4.00/gal)	+6.9

**Fixed Cost items:**

	AAA	Estimated USA average	Difference
Depreciation	\$3,392	\$1,100	-2,292
Finance	\$733	\$387	- 346
Insurance	\$985	\$600	- 385
		TOTAL Fixed difference	-3023

Adjust AAA variable cost per mile:  $14.5 \text{ ¢} + 6.9 \text{ ¢} = 21.4 \text{ ¢/ mile}$

Adjust AAA ownership cost per mile:  $\$5,648 - 3,023 = \$2,625$ ; divide by 15,000 = 17.5 ¢/ mile

At 15,000 miles/yr

(numbers in parentheses are passenger-mile at 1.2 passengers)

Variable costs per mile	\$0.214 (\$0.178)
Ownership cost at 15,000 annual miles:	\$0.175 (\$0.15)
TOTAL	\$0.389 (\$0.324)

**Question:**

Cost of gas increase for \$2.04 per passenger-mile (MPG of average car: 22.9 mi/gal=27.5 pass-mi/gal):

New cost - current cost:  $\$2.04 - 0.324 = \$1.716/\text{mi}$ ,

Increase in \$/gal =  $1.716\$/\text{mi} * 27.5 \text{ mi/gal} = \$47 / \text{gal}$ ; add the current \$4 = \$51 /gal

Cost of gas increase for \$2.04 per passenger-mile at 50 MPG (60 pass-mi/gal):

New cost - current cost:  $\$2.04 - 0.324 = \$1.716/\text{mi}$ ,

Increase in \$/gal =  $1.716\$/\text{mi} * 60 \text{ mi/gal} = \$103 / \text{gal}$ ; add the current \$4 = \$107 /gal

AAA is from: <http://www.aaaexchange.com/Assets/Files/20073261133460.YourDrivingCosts2007.pdf>

PC 2  
Rev. 11/97

### Cash Contributions, Loans Received and In-Kind

Please type or print legibly in black ink.

Candidate or Political Committee Name: <b style="text-align: center;">Yes on South-North</b>	Committee ID Number:	Page <u>9</u> of <u>33</u>
---	----------------------	----------------------------

Election:       Primary 19\_\_\_\_       General 1998       Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 Report:         1st Pre-election       2nd Pre-election       Post-election       September Supplemental

**SEE BACK FOR INSTRUCTIONS AND CODE DEFINITIONS**

**CODE 1: Contributor Type**

- B Business Entity
- C Political Committee (includes business and union PACs)
- F Candidate's Immediate Family (includes candidate)
- I Individual
- L Labor Organization
- O Other
- P Political Party Committee

**CODE 2: Contribution Type**

- CA Cash
- CO Cosigner Obligation
- IK In-Kind
- LR Loans Received

Line #	Name and Address of Contributor	Amount of Contribution	In-Kind Purpose <i>(see manual for suggested purpose codes)</i>	
Date Received	Occupational Information, Contributing Committee's ID#, or Description if Code 1 is "O"	Contributor Aggregate	Code 1	Code 2
1.	G.B. Arrington, Jr. 3801 NE Couch ✓ Portland, OR 97232	\$ 200.00		
√ 9/1/98	Dir.Strategic Planning, Tri-Met ✓	\$ 200.00	I ✓	CA ✓
2.	Bruce C. Harder 2555 NE 28th ✓ Portland, OR 97212	\$ 1,000.00		
√ 9/1/98	Finance director ✓	\$ 1,000.00	I ✓	CA ✓
3.	Hoffman, Hart & Wagner LLP ✓ 1000 SW Broadway 20th Floor Portland, OR 97205	\$ 2,500.00		
√ 9/1/98		\$ 2,500.00	B ✓	CA ✓
4.	David Evans & Associates ✓ 2828 SW Corbett Portland, OR 97201	\$ 2,500.00		
√ 9/1/98		\$ 2,500.00	B ✓	CA ✓
5.	Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. ✓ One Penn Plz. New York, NY 10119-0061	\$ 25,000.00		
√ 9/1/98		\$ 25,000.00	B ✓	CA ✓
See Instructions on Back and in Campaign Finance Manual	<b>Page Totals</b> (Add all amounts with the same contribution type. Do not include aggregates.) Cash (CA)                            \$ <u>31,200.00</u> ✓ In-Kind (IK)                            \$ <u>.00</u> Loans Received (LR)                \$ <u>.00</u>	<b>Accounting Period Totals</b> (Complete only for last page and transfer amounts to the Summary Statement, PC 1.) Cash (CA)                            \$ _____ Enter on Summary Statement, Column A, Line 1 In-Kind (IK)                            \$ _____ Enter on Summary Statement, Column A, Lines 4 & 9 Loans Received (LR)                \$ _____ Enter on Summary Statement, Column A, Line 2		

## Attachment 1

From: jim karlock [mailto:jkarlock@ipns.com]  
 Sent: Friday, February 23, 2007 2:27 PM  
 To: Cogan, Danielle

Danielle,

Thanks for your offer to supply information about the I-5 project.

Would you be kind enough to supply the following information with regard to the current alternative packages (In the below, substitute whatever date that you use for my 2030):

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

- Automobile (and how many person per vehicle)
- Truck
- Other motor vehicle
- Pedestrian
- Bike
- Transit
- Other than above

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

- General purpose lanes
- Automobile if other than General purpose lanes
- Truck if other than General purpose lanes
- Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes
- Pedestrian
- Bike
- Transit bus
- Transit rail
- Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?

A copy of the latest seismic evaluation of the I-5 bridges and any other bridges that you have similar data for.

Hopefully you will have most of these items already in a single document or spreadsheet, as they are all fundamental to the decision making process.

I understand that most of the costs will be preliminary estimates, not firm costs - so please give me what you have with the appropriate qualifiers/disclaimers.

(Please reply to all so that I will get redundant copies)

Thanks

Jk

---

Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2007 17:06:00 -0800  
 From: "Cogan, Danielle" <cogand@columbiarivercrossing.com>  
 To: "jim karlock" <jkarlock@ipns.com>

Mr. Karlock,

We are working on the answers to your questions and should have responses by Friday. Thank you for your patience. As you know, we spent a lot of time and energy working on the staff recommendation, and now we are dedicating our efforts to answering questions and providing staff support to the 4 Alternative Task Force Subcommittee.

---

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* RE: info request & more  
 Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2007 08:33:28 -0700  
 From: "Cogan, Danielle" <cogand@columbiarivercrossing.com>  
 To: "Jim Karlock" <jkarlock@earthlink.net>  
 Cc: "document.control" <document.control@columbiarivercrossing.org>, "Columbia River Crossing" <feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org>

Dear Mr. Karlock,

Thank you for contacting the Columbia River Crossing project about the number of current and projected vehicle trips for the year 2030 on I-5, the cost of each of the project elements under consideration, and the cost of a lid over I-5 in Vancouver.

You also requested the sign-in sheets for CRC Task Force meetings, open houses and the March 12 CRC Fourth Alternative Task Force Subcommittee meeting. Please direct your request for the sign-in sheets to the document control department of the Columbia River Crossing project by emailing your request to document.control@columbiarivercrossing.org.

The seismic evaluation of the I-5 bridges is available on the Project Documents page of the CRC website under the heading General Documents on this web page:

<http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/materials/projDocs.aspx>

The existing daily volume data for vehicle trips across the Columbia River is for the year 2005. These traffic volumes are estimated at 40- pedestrians, 160- bicycles, 122, 800-cars, 11,000- cars and trucks; and 200- transit vehicles for a total of 134,000 vehicles.

The vehicle traffic data for the year 2030 is an estimate based on forecasted data and may change. The year 2030 forecasted data describes vehicle trips during Peak 4- Hour Volumes for northbound PM traffic and southbound AM traffic.

**Southbound AM 4-Hr**  
2005 Existing Conditions  
 Cars- 19,025  
 Trucks- 900  
 Transit- 75  
 Total Vehicles- 20,000



2030 No-Build Forecasts

Cars- 21, 800  
Trucks- 1,025  
Transit- 100  
Total Vehicles- 22,925

2030 Build Forecasts

Cars- 26, 650  
Trucks- 1,275  
Transit- 150  
Total Vehicles- 28,075

**Northbound PM 4-Hr**2005 Existing Conditions

Cars- 20,400  
Trucks- 700  
Transit- 100  
Total Vehicles- 21,200

2030 No-Build Forecasts

Cars- 20,975  
Trucks- 725  
Transit- 125  
Total Vehicles- 21,825

2030 Build Forecasts

Cars- 31,875  
Trucks- 1,100  
Transit- 225  
Total Vehicles- 33,200

We will study the cost of the alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative we will estimate its cost during this period as well.

Thank you for contacting the Columbia River Crossing with your questions about the project. Please contact me if you have any further questions about the project development process.

Sincerely,

Danielle Cogan  
Communications Manager

---

Subject: Your Request for CRC Records  
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 09:03:06 -0700  
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock-

Please find the attached letter of acknowledgment concerning your request for CRC records. Please forward your address so that we can mail you the original.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Public Disclosure Coordinator**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**

Karlock03-26-07Letter.pdf

---

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 11:58 AM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Subject:** \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

When can I expect these copies to be mailed?  
What will the total cost be?  
Can I come to you office and pick them up.  
Can I bring a copy machine?

Thanks  
JK

jim karlock  
3311 n.e. 35th ave  
portland or 97212

At 08:03 AM 3/26/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:

Dear Mr. Karlock-

Please find the attached letter of acknowledgment concerning your request for CRC records. Please forward your address so that we can mail you the original.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Public Disclosure Coordinator**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**

---

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 12:47 PM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja

**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

At 10:08 AM 3/26/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:

**When can I expect these copies to be mailed?**

You will hear from us within 30 days to either provide you with the information you requested assuming that it is available or to give you an estimate of the time needed to fulfill your request.

**What will the total cost be?**

Until we identify and locate all the requested information we do not know what the total cost will be. The cost per state law of copies is as follows:

.15 cents per page for 8.5" x 11" black and white  
 .20 cents per page for 8.5" x 14" black and white  
 .25 cents per page for 11" x 17" black and white  
 .72 cents per page for 8.5" x 11" color  
 .77 cents per page for 8.5" x 14" color  
 \$1.44 per page for 11" x 17" color

**Can I come to you office and pick them up.**

Absolutely

**Can I bring a copy machine?**

I will check with the State of Washington to determine if this is acceptable.

I thought you were operating under BOTH Washington and Oregon rules. Oregon specifically requires you to allow a citizen to bring in a copy machine.

Can I bring my copy machine in to copy those sheets this afternoon? (Or pickup copies that you made if under \$15)

Thanks

JK

**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

**Date:** Mon, 26 Mar 2007 11:57:41 -0700

**From:** "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>

**To:** "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Jim-

You are correct that this project falls under the jurisdiction of BOTH states. This is precisely the reason I will need to check with Washington to see if you will be able to bring a copy machine in. Even if the answer is yes, we have 30 days to compile the information that you requested and to examine it for redactable information. This information is not readily available this afternoon, so you will be unable to do this today. We will however get this to you as soon as we are able.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**

**Project Controls Manager**

*Columbia River Crossing Project*

*700 Washington Ave. STE 300,*

*Vancouver, Washington 98660*

**360.816.2188**

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 1:31 PM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Please note that the 30 period stated on March 14, the data that I emailed your "communications and public outreach" person.

I might add that it has been almost two weeks for this simple request.

Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

~~Automobile (and how many person per vehicle)~~  
~~Truck~~  
~~Other motor vehicle~~  
**Pedestrian**  
**Bike**  
~~Transit~~  
~~Other than above~~

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

General purpose lanes  
 Automobile if other than General purpose lanes  
 Truck if other than General purpose lanes  
 Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes  
 Pedestrian  
 Bike  
 Transit bus  
 Transit rail  
 Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?

Thanks  
 JK

---

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records  
 Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 14:15:20 -0700

From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Hello Jim-  
 I have logged your additional request and have attached a letter of acknowledgment to this email.  
 Regards-

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
 Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**

---

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 3:54 PM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks. However your attached letter left out these requested items:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

**Pedestrian**  
**Bike**  
 Other than above

Also please note that this request was made on Feb 21, 2007 to your Communications and Public Outreach" person, Danielle Cogan, not March 26 as indicated on your letter.

Thanks  
 JK

---

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records  
 Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 15:41:05 -0700  
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Thanks Jim-  
 We have revised your request to reflect the three additional items.  
 Regards

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
 Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 5:15 PM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks.

I note that your letter still shows a request data of March 26, 2007 while the request was originally made on February 21, 2007 to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person.

Please make the appropriate correction.

Thanks  
 JK

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Request for CRC Records  
 Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2007 08:00:31 -0700  
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Jim-

The letters that you sent to me on the 23rd and the other on the 26th do not officially qualify as public records request. The request that I received on the 23rd was asking how to do something ie request records. I am giving you the benefit of the doubt and treating it as a request. The request that you believe was sent to Danielle Cogan on February 21st and was received by me on March 26th was already answered by Danielle. We will answer your request again, however it likely won't change. There are no corrections to make on the letters.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
 Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**

Subject: Your Requests for Information  
 Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 09:45:57 -0700  
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock-

In response to your request for records dated March 23,2007, we have the records requested:

*“(Danielle was apparently unable to simply forward my request form several weeks ago, so I am sending it directly to this address.)*

*How do I get copies of all sign in sheets from all open house type events of the CRC, plus the task force meetings.*

*Thanks  
 JK.”*

Please provide an address that we can send them to or provide a time that you would like to pick them up.

With respect to your request dated March 26, 2007:

*“How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge currently and projected for 2030 in each of these categories:*

*Pedestrian*

*Bike*

*Other Than Above*

*Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:*

*For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:*

*General purpose lanes*

*Automobile if other than General purpose lanes*

*Truck if other than General purpose lanes*

*Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes*

*Pedestrian*

*Bike*

*Transit bus*

*Transit rail*

*Other than above*

*What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?*

*Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?"*

As stated in Danielle's previous response to you dated March 23, 2007, we will study the cost of the alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative, we will estimate its cost during this period as well. There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
 Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**  
[www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org)

---

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2007 10:27 AM

**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Cc:** jimredden@portlandtribune.com; jimmayer@news.oregonian.com; john.laird@columbian.com  
**Subject:** \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Requests for Information

At 09:45 AM 4/19/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:

Dear Mr. Karlock-

In response to your request for records dated March 23,2007, we have the records requested:

*“(Danielle was apparently unable to simply forward my request form several weeks ago, so I am sending it directly to this address.)*

*How do I get copies of all sign in sheets from all open house type events of the CRC, plus the task force meetings.*

*Thanks*

*JK.”*

Please provide an address that we can send them to or provide a time that you would like to pick them up.

**I would like to pick them up this afternoon.**

With respect to your request dated March 26, 2007:

*“How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge currently and projected for 2030 in each of these categories:*

*Pedestrian*

*Bike*

*Other Than Above*

*Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:*

*For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:*

*General purpose lanes*

*Automobile if other than General purpose lanes*

*Truck if other than General purpose lanes*

*Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes*

*Pedestrian*

*Bike*

*Transit bus*

*Transit rail*

*Other than above*

*What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?*

*Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?"*

*As stated in Danielle's previous response to you dated March 23, 2007, we will study the cost of the*



alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative, we will estimate its cost during this period as well. There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide.

**That was not a request for official studies. That was, and is, a request for any documents containing any estimates, of any kind, preliminary or not, or guesses of any kind, in any way stating possible costs.**

**To state that no document in your possession contains any cost estimate of any kind, is simply not believable. I hereby demand that you produce the requested documents ASAP.**

**As to your claim that "There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide." Again, this is not a request for official documents prepared "to provide". It is a request for ANY documents in your possession that contain projections about 2030 Pedestrian or Bike projected volume, OFFICIAL OR NOT.**

**To state that no document, in your possession contains, any projection of any kind, is simply not believable. I hereby demand that you produce the requested documents ASAP.**

**If such documents do not exist, does this constitute your denial of published cost estimates such as these:**

"Although the cost of the so-called [Columbia River Crossing](#) currently is estimated at between \$2 billion and \$6 billion" *The Portland Tribune, Feb 23, 2007*

"\$2 billion - State officials say a six-lane span is needed..." *The Oregonian, Wednesday, November 22, 2006*

"When it comes to planning a \$2 billion, once-a-century bridge," *The Columbian, Sunday, January 07, 2007*

**I want you to produce the basis for those published estimates.**

Thanks  
JK

---

Subject: RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Requests for Information  
Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 11:18:49 -0700  
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Thank you Jim-  
Your documents will be ready for pick up at the front desk this afternoon. I will pass your comments regarding the validity of our response on to the appropriate project individuals.  
Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
*700 Washington Ave. STE 300,*

Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**  
[www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org)

---

**From:** Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 27, 2007 3:45 AM  
**To:** Gleason, Tonja  
**Subject:** RE: \*\*\* Detected as Spam \*\*\* Re: Your Requests for Information

I would like to thank you for providing copies of the sign in sheets.

As you will recall we discussed my unfilled requests and you stated that "works in process" and "data" were exempt from disclosure.

I checked ORS 192 ( <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/192.html>) and could find no mention of data being exempt, except under narrow circumstances, primarily confidentiality.

Likewise, I find no mention of "work in process" being exempt.

Please cite an ORS **and** Washington statute provision for your claim of exemption from disclosure laws, or supply the information that I requested on February 23, 2007.

Thanks  
JK

---

Subject: Your Requests for Information  
Date: Mon, 30 Apr 2007 14:39:24 -0700  
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock-

I have passed this matter on to appropriate staff for clarification. I will get back with you as soon as we are provided with direction.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**  
[www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org)

---

01:39 pm 5/4/07  
To: "Gleason, Tonja" <[GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org)>  
Re: Your Requests for Information

I has now been another week and my request from February 23 2007 is still not fully filled.

When can I expect his information?

Thanks  
JK

At 02:39 PM 4/30/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:  
Dear Mr. Karlock-

I have passed this matter on to appropriate staff for clarification. I will get back with you as soon as we are provided with direction.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
*700 Washington Ave. STE 300,*  
*Vancouver, Washington 98660*  
**360.816.2188**

---

01:33 pm 5/10/07

To: "Gleason, Tonja" <[GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org)>  
Subject: Re: Your Requests for Information

I has now been almost another week and my request from February 23 2007 is still not fully filled.  
When can I expect his information?

Thanks  
JK

At 02:39 PM 4/30/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:  
Dear Mr. Karlock-

I have passed this matter on to appropriate staff for clarification. I will get back with you as soon as we are provided with direction.

Sincerely,

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
*700 Washington Ave. STE 300,*  
*Vancouver, Washington 98660*  
**360.816.2188**  
[www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org)

Subject: Columbia River Crossing Cost Estimates  
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2007 07:12:34 -0700  
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>  
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock,

This email is in response to your recent request for the estimates prepared for the Columbia River Crossing project.

At this time, we do not have any completed or confirmed cost estimates for the project. We anticipate having completed estimates in September.

Please keep in mind that with all of our estimates for the project, we must first verify the estimate and then apply a risk assessment in order to ensure that the estimates are accurate and complete. That process is lengthy, but necessary given the limited amount of engineering that is typically completed by this phase of the project.

In your request dated March 26, 2007, you asked for projections and estimates for the project. We did not have estimates at that time, nor do we have completed estimates at this time. On April 19, 2007, we provided you with the information that we had and closed out your request.

Since that time, you have asked for a citation regarding exemption from public disclosure laws. Although that doesn't apply to your original request because we don't have completed estimates, we offer the following:

**RCW – 42.56.280 Preliminary Drafts**  
Preliminary drafts, notes, recommendations, and intra-agency memorandums in which opinions are expressed or policies formulated or recommended are exempt under this chapter.

Estimates under preparation fall under this RCW.

Once again, we intend to have completed estimates prepared and available in September of this year.

We appreciate your interest in the project and look forward to providing you with the cost estimates once they are completed.

**Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.**  
**Project Controls Manager**  
*Columbia River Crossing Project*  
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
**360.816.2188**  
[www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org)



The DEIS did not consider adding enough road capacity to ensure free flow and running frequent buses in the general purpose lanes.

The DEIS did not consider running frequent buses in HOV/HOT lanes.

The DEIS did not consider a simple bus system upgrade in service, such as increasing bus routes and frequency, instead of fancy stations and exclusive lanes.

The DEIS did not consider eliminating park and ride by increasing bus routes and frequency.

Did the DEIS specify the East and West boundaries of the "bridge influence area" in a clear and consistent manner?

The DEIS did not consider highway only.

The DEIS did not consider transit only.

The DEIS did not individually consider improving the on/off ramps that cause the most congestion.

The DEIS did not provide separable costs for the various components in a clear manner (if at all).

The DEIS did not consider the death rate of light rail which is over twice that of buses.

It appears that only live load on bridge foundations was assigned to rail (the rest presumably being allocated to the highway component):

*the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the "live load" on the foundation <sup>(3)</sup>*

The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to become much more energy efficient in the future due to Federal mandates.

The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to emit much less CO2 in the future due to Federal energy mandates.

The DEIS failed to give costs in common units like cost per passenger-mile. This makes comparisons difficult.

The DEIS failed to give have supporting data readily locateable. Many times a number would appear in the report with no obvious source in the technical documents.

The funding sources listed in the DEIS may overstate the available Federal funding for the transit portion.

The funding sources listed in the DEIS may understate the available Federal funding for the road portion.

Some alleged data in the DEIS, appears to be unsupported assertions.

This phase of the project is apparently managed by a company that has given money, in the past, to support one of outcomes under consideration.<sup>(4)</sup>

Some task force members own land in the affected areas and may profit from their decisions.

The task force did not consider the cost and benefit of each of the various options (and their components) before they were eliminated for consideration in the DEIS. This could have caused combinations of options (or parts thereof) that might have met the selection criteria to be rejected.

Task Force was not representative. It had only two automobile users representatives (of the 39 members), although automobile users are the majority of the transportation system users.

Task Force was not representative. A number of groups with an anti-automobile agenda were given memberships on the 39 member task force, although such radical views are only shared by a tiny minority of the general population. Several such groups were formed by one individual (Burkholder) who is also a task force member himself. He effectively had three (or more) votes.

The project management has refused numerous requests for information, relying on dubious legal distinctions or hiding behind the differences between Oregon and Washington public records laws.

For instance, although this is a joint project of both Oregon and Washington, they claimed that they did not have to give out copies of drafts because Washington law does not require them to, while Oregon law does require the release of drafts. Regardless of applicable law, this indicates a clear desire to hide information in what is claimed to be an open process. Some of the requests were never filled, including the projected bike and pedestrian volumes, costs (broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches) of the general purpose lanes; Pedestrian; Bike and Transit rail. See Exhibit 2. (Attachment 2 has the complete history.)

The project has failed to fill a request for information, sent on 6/3/2008, in time to complete this comment document by the deadline. The only response received was the email auto responder and an email a few days ago claiming that they had found my request in their spam filter. This fails to "ring true" as many of their replies, in the past, have had a subject header (from the original email request) with the line "flagged as spam" added. For an example see the email exchange in Attachment 1. This strongly suggests that most of their incoming email goes into the spam filter and, by implication, they check the spam filter on a regular basis. (Exhibit 2)

The proposed project will actually cause more CO2 emissions than "no-build". Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to emit more CO2 than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 11 tons of CO2 per day at a construction cost of about 600,000 tons. It will take 150 years of savings to make up for the construction emissions. This is a longer payback time than the likely life of the project. (Exhibit 3)

The proposed project will actually use more energy than "no-build". Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to use more energy than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 140 million BTU per day at a construction cost of 7,000,000 million BTU. It will take about 137 years to make up for the construction energy consumption. (Exhibit 4)

The cost of the rail portion is excessive, especially when compared to the cost of driving. The cost of the rail component is estimated at \$1.1 Billion, about \$55 million per year when annualized at 5%. The projected 6 million annual trips will cost \$9 each. This is for just the 4.2 mile project area, so the cost is \$2.04 per passenger-mile. (See Exhibit 5) For comparison, the average American pays \$0.324 per mile. (AAA gives a higher number because they assume the upscale usage patterns of its members, mostly their 2.5 year old car age, while the national average is 9 years. AAA reports cost per vehicle-mile, while we use passenger-mile to match transit data.) Gasolene would have to get to \$43 /gal. to cost as much per mile as just the construction cost of this project with today's cars. With current hybrid cars, gas would have to cost over \$100 / gal. (Exhibit 6)

Conclusion: reject the project with a recommendation that they propose a modest road only project solution to serve the actual needs of the near future. If rail turns out to be needed in 20 years, then build it in 15 years. To build it earlier is merely to shove billions of dollars to construction companies and to satisfy Portland's numerous profession prophets of impending doom.

\*\*\* eSafe scanned this email for malicious content \*\*\*

\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*