

Columbia River CROSSING *DRAFT Meeting Agenda*

MEETING TITLE: Task Force Meeting
DATE: June 26, 2007, 4:00 – 6:30 p.m.
LOCATION: ODOT Region 1
 123 NW Flanders Street, Portland

Note: Please turn off all cell phones, handheld devices, and pagers so that they do not send or receive a signal during the meeting. Transmitted signals disrupt the audio and recording equipment. Thank you.

TIME	AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
4:00 – 4:10	Welcome & Announcements	
4:10 – 4:15	Meeting Summary	Approve Meeting Summary
4:15 – 4:30	Progress Briefing and Report on Public Involvement	Presentation
4:30 – 5:10	Overview of Alternatives to be Analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement	Presentation
5:10 – 5:20	Upcoming Project Activities	Presentation
5:20 – 5:35	Public Comment	Receive Public Comment
5:35 – 6:25	Discussion of Alternatives	Discussion
6:25 – 6:30	Wrap Up and Next Steps	

DIRECTIONS BY TRANSIT

FROM PORTLAND: \$0 – Fareless Square from downtown Portland • No transfers
 Accessible by **TriMet bus #10, 33, 35, 44** or **MAX** light rail (Old Town / Chinatown stop). For route information contact TriMet at 503-238-RIDE or www.trimet.org.

FROM VANCOUVER: \$2.00 • Approx. 50 minutes total • One transfer
 From Downtown Vancouver (7th Street Transit Center) take TriMet bus #6 (Martin Luther King Blvd route) toward Portland. Get off at Martin Luther King Blvd and Convention Center. Transfer to MAX Red or Blue Line to City Center. Exit at Old Town/Chinatown, walk one block north to NW 1st and Flanders. For route information contact TriMet at 503-238-RIDE or www.trimet.org.

Meeting: Columbia River Crossing Task Force
Date: March 27, 2007, 4:00 – 6:30 pm
Location: WSDOT SW Region Headquarters
 11018 NE 51st Circle, Vancouver, WA

Members Present:

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Alternate Attending
Adams	Sam	City of Portland	
Armbruster	Grant	Portland Business Alliance	
Brown	Rich	Bank of America	
Burkholder	Rex	Metro	
Byrd	Bob	Identity Clark County	
Caine	Lora	Friends of Clark County	
Cruz-Walsh	Serena	Multnomah County	
Dengerink	Hal	Wash. State University- Vancouver	
Frei	Dave	Arnada Neighborhood Association	
Fuglister	Jill	Coalition for a Livable Future	
Grossnickle	Jerry	Columbia River Towboat Association	
Hamm	Jeff	C-TRAN	Scott Patterson
Hansen	Fred	TriMet	
Hewitt	Henry	Stoel Rives, LLP	
Isbell	Monica	Starboard Alliance Company, LLC	
Knight	Bob	Clark College	
Lookingbill	Dean	Regional Transportation Council	
Malin	Dick	Central Park Neighborhood Assn.	
Osborn	Dennis	City of Battle Ground	
Paulson	Larry	Port of Vancouver	
Phillips	Bart	Columbia River Economic Development Council	
Pollard	Royce	City of Vancouver	
Schlueter	Jonathan	Westside Economic Alliance	
Strahan	Elson	Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust	
Stuart	Steve	Clark County	
Tischer	Dave	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	
Valenta	Walter	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association	
Zelenka	Tom	Schnitzer Group	

Project Staff Present:

Ron Anderson
 Doug Ficco
 Tonja Gleason
 Heather Gunderson
 Barbara Hart
 Ryan LeProwse
 Jay Lyman
 Tom Markgraf
 John Osborn
 Peter Ovington
 Lynn Rust
 Carolyn Sharp
 Lynette Shaw
 Gregg Snyder
 Audri Streif
 Kris Strickler
 Rex Wong

Members Absent:

Bennett	Mike	City of Gresham
Eki	Elliott	Oregon/Idaho AAA
Halverson	Brad	Overlook Neighborhood Association
Imeson	Tom	Port of Portland
Lynch	Ed	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Pursley	Larry	Washington Trucking Association
Ray	Janet	Washington AAA
Russel	Bob	Oregon Trucking Association
Schmidt	Karen	Washington Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
Sundvall-Williams	Jeri	Environmental Justice Action Group
Walstra	Scott	Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce

NOTE: *Task Force questions and comments are in italics,*
Staff responses are in plain text

1. Welcome & Announcements

--Jonathan Schlueter – Held a breakfast forum on the findings of the statewide “Cost of Congestion” report (Appendix 1). Report was analogous to one done previously for the Portland metro region and focused on the possible negative impacts of congestion on the state economy in the next 20 years. Without investment in the transportation infrastructure, there will be a cost of \$1.7 billion annually and 16,000 jobs on-going. The projected freight volume in the region is projected to grow from \$530 billion annually today to \$1.3 trillion annually to, through, and from our state in the next 20 years. Washington and Oregon are trade and transportation dependent states, with 400,000 Oregonians employed in transportation related industries. Oregon is behind other states in the region who have invested in their infrastructures. This one page handout from Intel shows the wide range of areas in which their workers live (Appendix 2). It is up to us as leaders to make sure they can get to work in the morning and that their products can get out in the afternoon. Copies of the statewide congestion study are available electronically.

--Tom Zelenka – More than 200,000 jobs are directly related to transportation in Oregon. It is very important to remember the findings of these studies as we consider this project. Many Oregon firms are faced with the need to expand in locations outside the state as they grow because of the transportation problems.

2. Meeting Summary Approval

- **Action:** Approved – Draft summary of February 27, 2007 Task Force meeting

3. Report from Fourth Alternative Subcommittee

- **Presentation by Rex Burkholder, Steve Stuart, and Ron Anderson**

Burkholder and Stuart provided a summary of the Fourth Alternative Subcommittee’s membership, ground rules, and evaluation criteria. CRC staff Ron Anderson gave a more detailed overview of the alternative’s evolution and, finally, the recommended alternative itself. He outlined specific components and described next steps in 2007. A slide presentation is available on the CRC Web site under Task Force meetings.

- **Discussion**

--Henry Hewitt – There was a discussion on emphasizing improved transit and less dependency on the park and ride system. I do not see that caught in the recommendation.

Ron Anderson – There is more about transit in the memo handed out. We have to consider how to balance the system, and part of that is emphasizing transit to accommodate for less highway capacity. We are looking at 3,000 new park and ride slots with the staff recommendation. We can also look at better bus connectivity, and that is something we will do as we develop the fourth alternative.

4. Public Comment

- **Bill Montgomery** – Marketing manger at Rinker Materials, a major sand, gravel, and crushed rock supplier with its regional headquarters in Vancouver. Discussed impacts of I-5 congestion on his truck dependent business that makes up to 750 deliveries a day throughout the areas accessed by the affected area of I-5, sometimes with time sensitive products. Stated business has experienced a dramatic increase in delivery times over the Interstate Bridge that have translated to substantially raised prices when bidding for projects. Also stated problems with congestion dramatically narrowing the times of day that the company is able to offer deliveries without taking a loss or charging extra (Appendix 3).

- **Terry Parker** – Oregon resident. Stated that the fourth alternative process had been flawed in regard to transit and that the baseline for transit was prejudged with the same infrastructure assumptions as the staff recommendation. Stated the need for a mid-level transit option on existing bridge. Claimed the committee relied on social engineering and that the process was closed to public comment. Stated that without a lower cost transit option for comparison, the need for light rail could not be justified.
- **Ray Polani** – Co-Chair of Citizens for Better Transit. Quoted first page of federal Inter-modal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. Emphasized the need for economically and environmentally responsible solutions that move people and goods in an energy efficient manner, and claimed project as proposed fails to reach these standards. Supported inclusion of proposal by Association of Rail and Transit Advocates (AORTA), the need for a new lift span for light rail, bike, and heavy rail, and the modification of the BNSF span to line up with the I-5 bridge barge channel.
- **Jim Howell** – Expressed agreement with Ray Polani's statements. Offered suggestions on fourth alternative proposal to use Portland Harbor Bridge to add local connection along with light rail and to consider a more appropriate bridge for bike and pedestrians on the downstream side. Stated enhanced public transit is effective in all alternatives and most effective in a no-build option. Advised that next time a purpose and need statement is created, it should include considerations for oil depletion and carbon dioxide emissions.
- **Fred Nussbaum** – Offered approval of the fourth alternative. Emphasized that intensive transit was a very important part of the alternative and that it should be explicitly written in. Urged full task force to consider the recommendation. Stated disappointment over AORTA option not being accepted.
- **Sharon Nasset** – Stated that the I-5 corridor is geographically defined by the two ports, two rail lines, I-5 and I-84, and industrial terminals. Stated that the BNSF rail bridge should be considered in the heart of the I-5 corridor and requested that project documents that referred to it as outside the corridor be corrected to say such. Stated that there is wide public support for a third bridge and the need for a study to create an option that takes less private property. Distributed petition and flyer (**Appendix 4**).
- **Ed Barnes** – Involved in 1997 freight study and chaired I-5 Trade Partnership where he heard the importance of staying with the I-5 corridor. Stated concerns with seismic issues of the existing bridges and wondered who would pay for a retrofit. Expressed uncertainty that states would be able to afford the claims against them if the existing bridge collapsed in an earthquake. Stated that it was not worth the effort it would take to upgrade the current bridges.
- **Vinton Erickson** – Farmer and developer. Expressed disappointment in current alternatives and said the previously developed I-605 beltway was the right idea. Stated that these alternatives only dumped more cars back onto I-5.
- **Paul Edgar** – Oregon resident. Stated that even with a build option, there are 14 hours of congestion forecasted for 2030, and therefore the build options negatively impact the regional economy. Stated that an additional corridor was the only real option and that it could possibly incorporate the current BNSF railroad bridge. Warned against very negative impacts to people and businesses that would be caused by inducing more vehicles into the corridor through the build options.
- **Jim Karlock** – Stated that with four buses a minute, there is the same transit capacity with less space required than a light rail with two minute headways. Referred to sheet from TriMet (**Appendix 5**) that shows light rail is carrying 1.2 lanes of capacity, not 10. Referred to report showing the majority of personal travel even in Europe occurs by car and a Portland Business Alliance survey that shows declining percentages of transit commuting to downtown. Invited members to a free event featuring a speaker on transportation policy.

5. Discussion on Findings of Fourth Alternative Subcommittee

- **Motion:** To accept fourth alternative Subcommittee recommendation.

- **Discussion**

--Bart Phillips – *I understand why we would add this alternative, but I still feel uncomfortable going forward with it without more answers on the seismic, ownership, and other major issues it has.*

--Steve Stuart – *The seismic retrofit costs are roughly \$125 million and those are included. So long as there are highway components on the existing bridge, the ownership will remain the same as now.*

--Dave Tischer – *I am concerned about marine traffic with this alternative. Can the Coast Guard kill this? I also think that the cost of this alternative may be comparable to the others' cost.*

Ron Anderson – We feel that this is lower cost but cannot say yet how much lower. We do need to demonstrate that we are not going to worsen the conditions of the current navigation channel. On a new bridge, we would do pier spacing to provide a wider opening. Costs of seismic upgrades and the relocation of the railroad bridge swing span need to be considered and determined if they can be deferred or phased over time. We should be able to come back with a cost estimate in the summer.

--Sam Adams – *Is the railroad bridge fix an assumption? Do we need to clarify that upfront?*

Ron Anderson – It is put in as something that we could possibly do. If we didn't need to, we would not recommend it. Relocation costs might be near \$150 million, not the \$40 million estimated before.

--Sam Adams – *Would you assume the cost of a seismic retrofit if it happens at a later phase?*

Ron Anderson – Both the seismic retrofit and the railroad bridge are included in the cost estimates.

--Dennis Osborn – *I am voting neutral because I have not had a chance to brief my council.*

--Scott Patterson – *I can't vote for Jeff Hamm, but C-TRAN supports the presence of a fourth alternative.*

--Dave Frei – *This brings additional data to the process and provides a smaller option for which to find cost and environmental impacts. There are several components that can be used on the other alternatives too.*

--Jonathan Schlueter – *I think that this alternative was worth the wait and there is merit in it. I would like to hear more about impacts to the navigation channel. As a matter of policy, how does public money get used for a privately owned railroad bridge? How does this fourth alternative meet the litmus test of freight mobility, road capacity, commuter access, and public safety?*

--Walter Valenta – *You might have your mind made up now, but we are guiding a region through this process. Doing this lets people know that they have our ears. This is an in-between for the all or nothing options and will help us to better understand trade-offs. The lessons learned through this can be applied to other alternatives and also answers the people who really want a full spectrum look at the crossing. This decision is just about whether this alternative is appropriate to study.*

--Grant Armbruster – *I will support the measure to put this into the evaluation. The numbers will help us understand costs and impacts better and bring us to the best decision. I do have some questions. How does this affect interchange flow? Would the hump be eliminated on the existing bridges?*

Jay Lyman – From earlier work, we know changing the elevation on the existing bridges would approach the cost of building a new bridge.

--Jerry Grossnickle – When we talked about the supplemental bridge, one of the reasons it didn't work was because piers would obstruct barge traffic. How is this proposal different than that? How high would this new bridge be and how would it impact barge traffic? Do the lifts remain on the existing bridge? Have the necessary impacts on the channels that would be caused by a seismic retrofit been considered?

Ron Anderson – We have nine piers in the water now and are looking at five for a new bridge as we find out more about placement options. We will have to determine if we need to correct the railroad bridge span alignment. The high point of a new bridge needs be in line with the existing lift spans.

Jay Lyman – Seismic upgrades, if needed, would have impacts on the width of the existing channels. We are going to have to look at this to see if it does no harm. We might lose one of the channels but can't know yet.

--Jerry Grossnickle – Would there be more bridge lifts?

Ron Anderson – If we fix the railroad span, there would be fewer lifts.

--Serena Cruz-Walsh – I am prepared to support this proposal fully. Why would the bike and pedestrian options be put on the existing bridge?

Ron Anderson – The newer, higher level bridge would create more difficult grades. Also, the extra width of bike and pedestrian paths might push us into needing two separate bridges.

--Dean Lookingbill – I have learned how to be comfortable with being uncomfortable in these processes. The fourth alternative will have to deal with all the concerns that the others have to. If flaws are found, our process would weed that out.

--Dick Malin– I was predisposed towards using the existing bridges at the beginning of this process but am not any longer. I was impressed with the seismic report on the spans. The retrofit cost number shows \$250 million to bring it up to design standards. This starts to close the gap between the alternatives. Liquefaction under the current pilings is also mentioned in this report and it suggests that a retrofit go under the pilings into bedrock. This would require a lot of extra engineering and design. We would also have to replace the towers. I think that economy of scales start applying here. I see this as a step backward.

--Jill Fuglister – In regard to the transit portion, what percentage of total trips is 25,000?

Ron Anderson – Transit trips across the river are less than 7 percent right now. With the staff recommendation, that number is tripled. We are looking for even higher numbers with this option to accommodate for the lesser amount of highway capacity.

Jay Lyman – We don't go into this study with an assumed number. We develop a system to attract riders and then let the forecasting tell us how well we achieved that. So we cannot give you numbers first but can say that this alternative is set up to be more aggressive in attracting riders.

--Jill Fuglister – Would this alternative go beyond the areas' existing TDM/TSM plans and beyond what is listed on the memo?

Ron Anderson – We are going to pull all the strings on all the alternatives. We think there are good odds we will have to toll to pay for the project. That in and of itself will be a type of congestion pricing.

--Jill Fuglister – I would like clarification that this will model a robust transit system.

--Royce Pollard – Does this alternative meet the purpose and need statement?

Kris Strickler – It's not as developed as the other alternatives, but we think it is possible that it could.

--Royce Pollard – *I understand why this is proposed. For the City of Vancouver, we have an opportunity to heal a division that was created when these bridges first went through. There is uncertainty about right of way takings with this alternative.*

Ron Anderson – With fewer lanes and one less lane in Vancouver, the pinch-point might be less of a problem. We would likely have to swing more toward the west for this alternative.

--Royce Pollard – *We have a number of projects that are right on the corridor that are contingent on the present right of way remaining. I need some certainty that this will not take anymore right of way.*

--Tom Zelenka – *I understand the Mayor's concern as I lived along Interstate as the freeway first went in. I think that this alternative was intentionally focused on the purpose and need, and it aspires to meet it. If it does not, we will throw it out.*

--Lora Caine – *Is the staff comfortable with this alternative?*

Jay Lyman – We think this process of forming this alternative was very good. There were trade-offs, but we think this is a good alternative to carry forward for all the reasons mentioned.

--Lora Caine – *I would like for there to be a study of a local traffic connection across the Oregon Slough.*

--Rich Brown – *I am going to support this recommendation for two reasons. One is that there are some creative concepts that can be applied to any of the alternatives. The second is that it became clear to me that this process was in danger of collapsing so I think it is important to include this. I hope that whatever we came up with, those who put this forward would stay with all of the process even if the fourth alternative does not get recommended. I am going to put a cost of congestion overlay onto anything we do.*

--Fred Hansen – *The focuses on reusing the existing bridges, transit, and lower costs were given to us to use in the formation of this alternative. The purpose of the DEIS is not to have this be our favorite option but to help us examine all these elements and let people feel that these issues are being explored fully.*

--Monica Isbell – *If memory serves, we were never allowed to address the railroad bridge before because it was outside of the Bridge Influence Area. If that is so, how does that get funded and why was it not considered with the supplemental options?*

Jay Lyman – The previous alternatives focused on making navigation improvements around the highway bridges so that we would not have to touch the railroad bridge. Now that the highway is on the lower bridges, we need to find a way to minimize lifts.

--Hal Dengerink – *There are also mitigation issues if a barge channel is closed by a new bridge.*

--Monica Isbell – *Where does money for the railroad bridge come from? Is it a cost that is factored in?*

Kris Strickler- It would become mitigation for the project. There needs to be more analysis on whether or not we would need to move it.

--Monica Isbell – *If we just look at the cost of construction, are we not missing a huge piece on what maintenance would be? How do those get into the DEIS?*

Jay Lyman – We've been talking about a lower cost alternative from a capital standpoint. When we compare these to the other alternatives, we will look at lifecycle costs and cost-benefits as well.

--Bob Byrd – *I need a better understanding of the TDM pricing. Are we looking at putting an additional 25 percent of people into transit in this option? Would the toll change to do that? If we are going to force people to use transit, we have to increase pricing.*

Ron Anderson – We will be able to give you a good range on this when we have some more analysis. We will be able to provide some information on this, though not necessarily in the form of how much a specific toll would need to be.

--Eelson Strahan – *A lot of this seems like the repackaging of ideas that came up early in this process. There are some key things that might come from this. We are basing this on the supposition that we can adjust the rail bridge, but I still have real concerns that we still have a major highway going across a lift span. There are also issues of river navigation and its ability to match our long-term view.*

--Bob Knight – *I would not want this instance of adding on another option at the end of a long narrowing process to become a precedent. I am not sure that this will be lower cost when maintenance is considered. I am also concerned that bridge lifts would still be shutting down northbound interstate traffic.*

--Larry Paulson – *I approve of the method by which we got here. The things I was concerned with have been addressed. I share the concerns for navigation, maintenance cost, and bridge lifts. I am also concerned about the disparity of heights in the bridges and their touchdowns in Vancouver. I recognize that these concerns will come up in the evaluation and am looking forward to seeing those results.*

--Rex Burkholder – *The goal of this process is to get to success at the end, and the presence of this fourth alternative helps us achieve that. There are lots of questions. This provides us a larger set of options to consider and gives us the ability to better answer questions from the community. We are also well within the time limits of the funding cycle.*

--Steve Stuart – *We need certainty on all the alternatives that they will not impact the pinch point, but we don't have that yet for any of them. There are also lots of figures that have been thrown around. We don't know the costs on any of the alternatives yet, but having relative costs will be good for the cost-benefit analysis. This is not a panacea; it is just one big part of a wider system that has to be addressed. We need to make sure to find a way that we all can stay at the table.*

--Henry Hewitt – *It is important to remember that we are not voting on a final outcome but on whether or not to add another alternative to consider. This will make whatever we decide on a much stronger outcome that is backed by a better process.*

- **Amendment:** Clarification that option will model a robust transit approach that goes beyond just a park and ride system.
- **Amendment:** Places condition that the alternative may proceed into DEIS if it has no greater impact on existing buildings and structures or future economic development opportunities in the downtown Vancouver area including the Historic Reserve, than the two alternatives already moved forward.

Ron Anderson – What area is intended in this? There could possibly be less impact on the pinch-point, but there might be more on the waterfront.

--Royce Pollard – *The intent is the area around Riverwest and the pinch-point.*

Jay Lyman – If we can interpret this amendment to focus on the pinch-point, we are reasonably comfortable with that.

- **Amendment:** Consideration of a local connection across the Oregon Slough that would include the arterial bridge along with the high capacity transit bridge.

Jay Lyman – This refers to a local street connection in addition to the high capacity bridge and the new southbound bridge.

John Osborn – This amendment would be problematic from the Department of Transportation’s and staff’s perspective. We know that a profile of an HCT bridge would present challenges for integrating a local arterial connection and possibly have impacts on the floating home community and the Marine Drive interchange. It would address less than 5% of traffic that wants to be on I-5. We would be willing to work with the City of Portland or the counties on their arterial connection but see this connection as outside our project.

Jay Lyman – We have looked at different ways to create an alternative connection for Hayden Island and it is problematic. There are many technical issues and potential impacts to Marine Drive.

--Sam Adams – *We need to keep in mind potential needs of the Port of Portland as it is planning to develop the western side of Hayden Island. We should deal with this now and let the issue of who pays for it be addressed as a separate issue. I do not want it to not be considered as a piece of the overall puzzle.*

Jay Lyman – From a traffic impact perspective, we have agreed with the Port of Portland to consider potential development on the western side of Hayden Island. There is a big functional difference in where you would put the connection.

--Lora Caine – *I would be ok with a connection separate from the HCT bridge. I just see this as a way of mitigating the impacts the project will have on Hayden Island.*

--Serena Cruz-Walsh – *Isn’t it possible to amend the amendment to say the costs and ownership would not be attributable to the project?*

John Osborn – We are taking another bridge into account to make sure we accommodate it with what we build. If there is a regional issue about a local crossing, it resides with Metro. We can provide information and make sure the system is coordinated.

--Hal Dengerink – *If in fact we are having a negative impact on the communities on either side of the slough, then we need to understand what those impacts are, and how they’re going to be appropriately mitigated, rather than deciding here what that appropriate mitigation is.*

• **Amendment modification:** Modification of amendment on table to state that the study will clearly call out the impacts and appropriate mitigation to that portion of I-5 (deletes “Consideration of a local connection across the Oregon Slough that would include the arterial bridge along with the high capacity transit bridge”).

• **Action:** Vote on motion as amended passes with 25 in favor and 1 opposed.

Next Meeting

June 26, 4:00-6:30 p.m.
Oregon Department of Transportation
123 NW Flanders St., Portland, OR

June 22, 2007

TO: Columbia River Crossing Task Force
FROM: Doug Ficco, CRC Project Director
John Osborn, CRC Project Director
SUBJECT: Public Comment, March 28 – June 26, 2007

Introduction

The following five alternatives will be analyzed by the Columbia River Crossing project in the Draft EIS:

- Replacement bridge with bus rapid transit (BRT)
- Replacement bridge with light rail (LRT)
- Supplemental bridge with bus rapid transit (BRT)
- Supplemental bridge with light rail (LRT)
- No build

The project will continue seeking public comment and involvement through 2007 and 2008.. The Draft EIS will be completed in the spring of 2008 and a formal public comment period will follow with the selection of one of the five alternatives.

This draft report summarizes two types of public and agency comments:

1. Written comments received between the March 2007 Task Force meeting and June 14, 2007
2. Outreach event summaries for roughly half of the CRC related public events held between the March 2007 Task Force meeting and June 14, 2007. Appendix B includes a list of CRC related public events which have occurred or are scheduled to occur between March 28 and June 26, 2007

The final draft of this report will summarize all written comments and comments made at outreach events from March 28, 2007, to June 26, 2007.

The comments summarized in this memo are from a variety of outreach activities that occurred from March 28 to June 14, 2007, including:

- Agency coordination
- Presentations and discussions with neighborhood, civic, and business associations; faith groups and community organizations; and school and university classes
- Booths at street fairs, festivals, community celebrations, and farmers markets

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

Project communications and information also generated comments. Project communications and information available between March 28 and June 26, 2007, included:

- The updated CRC project Web site
- Monthly email news
- Project newsletters, fact sheets, and postcards
- CRC project traveling displays

Appendix A includes a listing of the frequency of comments received by comment type. Appendix B includes a comprehensive list of the public meetings and events that occurred or will occur between March 28 and June 26, 2007, as well as an estimate of the number of public attendees.

Comments

Notes on Comment Sources

Although the public comments included in this memo were taken from a variety of sources, they were submitted primarily as emails to the project office and comments made and recorded at outreach events. Appendix C lists the methods with which comments were submitted to CRC project staff.

Readers are cautioned that the comment-gathering methods detailed in this report were not conducted as statistically valid surveys, and therefore, the results are not necessarily representative of broader public opinion. More information on comment-gathering and comment summarization is included in Appendix D.

Comment Trends

During the period from March 28 to June 26, 2007, outreach efforts are focused on educating the community and agencies about the CRC project in general and receiving their input. As such, the input received covers a great number of issue areas. By far the largest comment type (84) relates to comments about, requests pertaining to, or questions asked about the CRC project process. These comments ranged from requests for specific reports and data sets to requests for the creation of a new CRC project work group.

As in the past, transit issues also received significant interest, with LRT supporters providing more comments than LRT opponents and bus / BRT supporters (18 comment sources supported LRT, with four comment sources opposed to light rail. Four comment sources supported buses and BRT, with two comment sources opposed to buses or BRT).

Few comment sources specifically supported or opposed replacement (four supported, none opposed), supplemental (two supported, one opposed), or arterial (two supported, none opposed) bridge alternatives. Tolling received mixed comments (three opposed, two supported). There continued to be interest in a tunnel crossing of the Columbia River (eight comment sources asked about or supported a tunnel crossing, none opposed). Third corridor approaches (west side bypass and a new east side freeway) received two comments in favor.

The following section summarizes public input received from March 28, 2007, through June 14, 2007.

General Feedback

The comments can be organized into twelve general categories:

- River Crossing
- Transit
- Interchanges
- Congestion
- Economy and Freight
- Safety and Seismic
- Community Livability and Human Resources
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Access
- Project Financing and Funding, Tolling, and Project Costs
- Process
- Other

Many categories below note the number of comments received pertaining to that topic (*in parentheses*). These numbers include comments from outreach summaries; however, each comment from an outreach summary is counted only once. Appendix A lists the frequency of comments addressing each category being tracked. In the few cases where a number is not provided in the headings below, it is because the topic corresponds to multiple issues listed in Appendix A.

Comments pertaining to multiple categories appear in only one section below, so numbers in parenthesis usually do not equal the number of bullets found below the categories.

River Crossing (included in multiple categories listed in Appendix A)

General

- Criticism that the current CRC project alternatives provide access to the following locations only from I-5:
 - Downtown Vancouver from Portland
 - Hayden Island from Portland or Vancouver
- Support for a new 12-lane bridge with the capability of supporting transit
- Support for limiting the focus of the CRC project to only addressing freight and transit issues, including the possibility of freight only lanes and or a freight only bridge. This comment was based on the statement that increased auto capacity would result in sprawling development in Vancouver
- Question regarding the height standard any new bridge over the Columbia River would be designed to meet

Supplemental Bridge (21 comments)

- Question as to whether the supplemental bridge alternatives would include keeping one or both of the existing I-5 Bridges
- Statement that the supplemental bridge alternatives “don’t make sense”

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

- Question of the cost of the supplemental bridge alternatives
- Request that the CRC project staff analyze an additional supplemental bridge alternative. This alternative would use the existing I-5 Bridge and on- and off-ramps to travel between downtown Vancouver / SR 14 and Hayden Island. This facility would remain connected to I-5, negating the need to construct new on- and off-ramps for the supplemental bridge. If CRC project staff determine that this alternative is not feasible, the commenter requested a detailed response explaining why it is not feasible
- Support for a supplemental bridge with LRT, based on the statement that the existing I-5 Bridge, if kept, would require a replacement of its wooden pillar foundation, and if the seismic upgrades failed in the future, the money invested in the existing I-5 Bridge would be wasted
- Support for a supplemental bridge with LRT, with LRT stations at Jantzen Beach and downtown Vancouver
- Statement that the fact that the I-205 Bridge is congested shows that a supplemental bridge with four lanes is inadequate to resolve future congestion

Replacement Bridge (16 comments)

- Support for a replacement bridge with dedicated bus lanes
- Support for a downstream replacement bridge with expanded bus service
- Support for the replacement bridge with LRT alternative, in part based on the belief that the cost of upgrading the existing bridges could cost as much as replacing them
- Support for an upstream, 12-lane replacement bridge. Commenter also supports:
 - Eliminating the I-5 curve in the vicinity of the Columbia River crossing
 - LRT on the replacement bridge
 - Increasing I-5 to ten lanes from SR 500 to the I-405 interchange
 - Making two southbound lanes “exit only” at I-405
 - Increasing I-5 to six lanes from the I-405 Interchange to the Marquam Bridge
 - Improving the Rose Quarter on- and off-ramps
 - Placing a \$2 per car and \$3 per truck toll on I-5 and I-205
 - Adding an additional north and southbound lane to I-205 between Portland and Tualatin

Existing I-5 Bridge (23 comments)

- Support for using the 1958 span of the I-5 Bridge for a bicycle, pedestrian, and arterial connection between Vancouver and Hayden Island, including the statement that an arterial connection could be routed in such a way so as to discourage through traffic use of the arterial bridge

Third Corridor (3 comments)

- Question as to whether the CRC project can enhance the existing rail bridge and develop an additional transportation corridor
- Statement that the expected growth in population within 50 miles of the western coast of the United States necessitates the construction of an additional north-south freeway. Comment included the statement that this new freeway should connect the cities of Yakima (WA), Bend (OR), Lakeview (OR), Reno (NV), Bishop (CA), and Riverside (CA). Comment

included the statement that, in addition to the new freeway, I-5 should be enlarged to a minimum of four southbound and four northbound travel lanes on its entire length

- Support for a westside freeway bypass instead of the CRC project

Tunnel (categorized under “Other Concepts”; please see Appendix A)

- Question as to whether a tunnel project, possibly traveling from the Burnt Bridge Creek to Portland Meadows, or Ridgefield to Highway 30, had been analyzed
- Support for a tunnel included the statements that:
 - Tunnel construction would be less disruptive to the community than the construction of a new bridge
 - A tunnel would be more attractive than a bridge
 - A tunnel would have less of an impact on the environment
 - A tunnel allows for flexible alignments (upstream or downstream)
 - A tunnel would not negatively impact river navigation or air traffic
- Statement that the tunnel alternative considered and rejected by the CRC project reflected outdated tunnel technology, technology which would result in expensive, long approach ramps, and that new technology is available that would allow for the tunnel to be built at shallower depths, and therefore allow it to have less expensive, shorter approach ramps. Comment included the statement that a tunnel alternative assuming the new technology should be analyzed by CRC project staff
- Question over why the tunnel option was removed from consideration

Transit (included in multiple categories listed in Appendix A)

Buses and Bus Rapid Transit (18 comments)

- Question over what type of fuel BRT vehicles would use, and whether the type of fuel used will be a consideration in which transit component is selected for implementation
- Support for increased use of buses, based on statements including:
 - That buses can have multiple routes and therefore serve larger areas and more riders than LRT
 - That Vancouver is too small to support LRT
- Question as to whether a “bus barn” facility would be needed for a BRT system

Light Rail Transit (30 comments)

- Support for bringing LRT into Vancouver and as far north as Woodland, Washington
- Support for LRT, with rights-of-way that would be upgradeable to commuter rail in the future
- Support for LRT based on the statement that global climate change will result in large population increases in the Pacific Northwest, resulting in the need for alternatives to “polluting” buses and cars

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

- Support for an LRT alignment east of I-5 as opposed to a Main Street alignment, based on statements including:
 - That a Main Street alignment would eliminate parking in Uptown Village, making it difficult for those who cannot walk far to frequent the Uptown Village shops
 - That Uptown Village is a pedestrian friendly environment and LRT on Main Street would make it harder for people to cross Main Street
 - That this alignment might result in a park and ride at 41st Street, which would result in cut-through traffic in the neighborhood and a safety risk for those using the Discovery Middle School crossing. This comment included the statement that if there were to be a park and ride at 41st Street that it should not include vehicle access on its west side, as well as the comment that a new park (though desirable) in the area would not offset the negative impact of a park and ride
 - That an I-5 alignment would bring LRT to the Rose Village neighborhood residents who want LRT access
 - That an I-5 alignment would facilitate a future high capacity transit connection to SR 500 and Vancouver Mall, and a commuter train to Battle Ground
- Statement that a street car system would complement the character of Vancouver’s Uptown Village and a LRT system would have a negative affect on the character of Uptown Village
- Statement that a mix of freight traffic and LRT would have negative consequences for Vancouver’s Lincoln Neighborhood
- Question over whether LRT on Vancouver’s Main Street would result in new, higher density land uses along the street
- Support for an LRT alignment to Clark College and Kiggins Bowl, based on statements including:
 - That Clark College has a large commuter student body and limited parking
- Support for LRT, based on statements including:
 - LRT to Vancouver would eliminate the transfer that would be needed to connect BRT to LRT
 - Because it is powered by electricity, LRT is better from an air quality and climate change perspective
 - Gasoline will become more expensive over time, making LRT more economical
 - LRT would increase economic development
 - A new LRT alignment would connect to an existing, large LRT network
 - LRT is faster than cars and buses
 - LRT is unaffected by traffic congestion
 - More people are willing to ride LRT than buses, so LRT will likely receive more financial support than buses
 - “There are many unsanitary, stinky people riding the bus, and many people were smoking at the downtown (Vancouver) bus terminal. There were even a few seemingly mentally unstable people shouting at me and my baby”

- Question over the capacity of LRT
- Statement that if LRT is included as a part of the CRC project, that the LRT should be paid for exclusively by LRT riders
- Statement that LRT has been voted down twice
- A request for adding the Portland LRT lines to the CRC project’s interactive map, to allow the visualization of how a new LRT line could connect to the existing LRT yellow line
- Statement that light rail was “obsolete 70 years ago,” with the question as to why it was being considered as part of the CRC project
- Statement that most Clark County residents do not support LRT

Other

- Statement that any rapid transit system located in West Vancouver would:
 - Decrease home values
 - Increase crime rates
 - Endanger school children
 - Result in drawing cars from outside the local neighborhoods to park and rides in the neighborhoods
- Statement that State of Washington residents do not support transit
- Question over whether future growth projections are used to determine public transit needs
- Question over whether LRT options have been compared with bus options
- Support for considering an east-west BRT alignment in Vancouver, an alignment that would link to a north-south LRT alignment
- Question as to the crime statistics at fare-free transit stations, including the statement that they are likely to be higher than non-fare-free transit stations
- Question as to whether the Main Street transit alignment was eliminated by the Vancouver City Council
- Statement that most people crossing I-5 will do so by car
- Question as to why the CRC project includes high-capacity transit along the I-5 corridor instead of the I-205 corridor, including the statement that transit demand in the I-205 corridor is likely greater than in the West Vancouver neighborhoods
- Support for, and question over, whether funding of the CRC project’s public transit component would be subject to a popular vote
- Question over whether the CRC project will include both LRT and BRT, or only one of those modes
- Question over whether the CRC project’s transit system will be elevated
- Question over how the overall CRC project design will accommodate both the transit system and road infrastructure
- Question over whether park and rides would be constructed on K Street in Vancouver
- Question over whether shuttles could be run between park and ride lots and transit stations

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

- Question over the expected frequency of LRT and BRT service
- Question over whether high speed rail had been considered for inclusion in the CRC project
- Support for electrified rail transit, based in part on the statement that it can be powered by domestic green energy
- Support for consideration of an aerial tramway to carry passengers between the LRT station at Portland’s Expo Center and Vancouver, Washington

Interchanges and Highway Alignments (11 comments)

- Question as to the CRC project’s affects on the SR 500 Interchange, and specifically whether the CRC project will increase or decrease access onto and off of the SR 500 Interchange
- Question over whether the CRC project would eliminate the 39th Street Interchange in Vancouver

Congestion (19 comments)

- Question over the number of freeway lanes that would be included in the CRC project alternatives
- Opposition to the existing HOV lane on I-5 in Oregon based upon the statement that eliminating the HOV lane would reduce congestion
- Question as to whether reversible lanes are being considered with any of the bridge alternatives
- Statement that elected officials in Oregon are not interested in building new roads
- Question as to how the CRC project will resolve congestion on I-5 at Portland’s Rose Quarter
- Question as to what percentage of users of the existing I-5 Bridge are commuters
- Question over whether a lane will be added to I-5 South near Delta Park
- Question as to whether the CRC project’s affects on I-205 traffic have been modeled
- Statement that the existing I-5 Bridge is not causing I-5 congestion, and instead, I-5 congestion is caused by:
 - Having only two southbound I-5 lanes in Oregon
 - Having a northbound HOV lane and three on-ramps onto northbound I-5 in Oregon

Economy and Freight (included in multiple categories listed in Appendix A)

- Support for building a new I-5 Bridge as quickly as possible to “ensure the economy isn’t slowed”
- Question over “how many businesses depend on the I-5 Bridge”

Navigation (11 comments)

- Question as to whether river navigation issues will be considered in the analysis of the supplemental bridge alternatives
- Question over the CRC project's impacts on barge traffic
- Question as to whether the middle of the Columbia River could be dredged to allow river traffic to move under the I-5 Bridge without necessitating a bridge lift
- Question over how marine vessels with heights over 95 feet will be accommodated by the CRC project
- Question over whether pleasure boats on the Columbia River could be restricted from traveling under I-5
- Question over how CRC project construction will affect river navigation

Truck Freight (9 comments)

- Support for building a truck bridge or truck lanes as a part of the CRC project
- Question over the ratio of truck traffic to overall traffic on Marine Drive
- Question over whether Port of Vancouver truck traffic on 4th Plain Boulevard and Mill Plain Boulevard will likely increase in the future, and whether such an increase would affect at-grade crossings of these streets
- Question as to whether truck use on I-5 can be limited to non-peak travel times

Safety and Seismic (10 comments)

- Support for including more lanes on a replacement or supplemental bridge, to provide on-ramp/off-ramp lanes for safety
- Question over whether the current design or location of I-5 on- and off-ramps causes safety problems
- Question over whether the Vancouver School District has been involved in the CRC project, and specifically if the Vancouver School District has any concerns that the CRC project would negatively affect the safety of students
- Question over whether the CRC project would make it unsafe to use Vancouver's 45th Street to bring students to the Discovery Elementary School
- Question over whether the existing I-5 Bridge is seismically sound
- Question over the remaining life span of the existing I-5 Bridge, including a question over the structural integrity of the bridge steel

Community Livability and Human Resources (included in multiple categories listed in Appendix A)

- Support for the CRC project's preliminary delineation of an Area of Potential Effects (APE) related to historic resources, with the caveat that the existing areas left out of the APE should be added back in until more information is available and that the APE will likely need to be amended as research and tribal consultation continues
- Question over whether the CRC project would require the elimination of homes in the Shumway and Rose Village neighborhoods

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

- Statement that the CRC project is not equitable
- Question over the CRC project’s effects on the Vancouver Land Bridge
- Request that the CRC project team, City of Vancouver, Port of Vancouver, and railroad hold a series of public meetings to discuss all the major transportation projects which are likely to occur in the future, so that the cumulative impact of all these projects on West Vancouver’s neighborhoods can be judged

Bicycle and Pedestrian (12 comments)

- Support for making the project bicycle and pedestrian friendly, and ensuring that it connects these modes of travel to Vancouver, Hayden Island, and North Portland
- Support for separating bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the river crossing, possibly by constructing two bi-directional paths, one for bicyclists and one for pedestrians, on either side of the bridge
- Support for using innovative design, such as a separate bridge or an elevated path, for bicyclists and pedestrians crossing the Columbia. Comment included a request for CRC project staff to research the dedicated bicycle and pedestrian bridges in Brisbane, Australia
- Support for improving bike safety on the paths leading up to the I-5 Bridge
- Statements that biking across the existing I-5 Bridge “doesn’t seem that bad to me, but I wouldn’t take my kids on it” and that “traveling over the bridge today is not all that bad but I can see how it would be difficult for novice riders”
- Statement that the existing I-5 Bridge is unsafe for bicyclists and therefore a barrier for bicyclists who desire to shop or be entertained in Vancouver or on Hayden Island

Project Financing and Funding, Tolling, and Project Costs (20 comments on financing and funding, 16 comments on tolling)

- Questions regarding tolling, including:
 - Is it possible to toll I-5 and I-205?
 - Has the price of the potential toll has been established?
 - Would the bridge would be tolled in one or two directions
 - Would tolling be electronic, and how it would be enforced?
- Opposition to tolls based on statements including:
 - No one will use a bridge with tolls
 - Tolling is an attempt to force people to use transit, and it will be unsuccessful because “you don’t change people’s minds by force”
 - Cars stopping to pay tolls will create traffic congestion
 - Tolling the I-5 Bridge would hurt the economy
 - The fact that the I-205 Bridge has no tolls is proof that tolls are not needed to ensure maintenance of a new I-5 Bridge

- Statement that engineers on the CRC project team are basing project costs and construction time tables on outdated construction techniques, and that the project can actually be built faster and for less money
- Question as to whether the CRC project was estimated to cost \$10 billion to construct
- Question over whether the State of Oregon is contributing funding to the CRC project
- Statement that the CRC project would take funds from other dedicated uses

Process (84 comments)

- Question over who makes the final decision over which alternative is selected for the CRC project
- Statement that transportation funding is “balkanized,” and that politicians need to show leadership and stop deferring transportation investments
- Question over the CRC project’s construction date
- Question as to whether there are any owners of businesses on Vancouver’s Main Street on the CRC project’s Urban Design Advisory Group
- Statement that the Arbor Lodge and East Columbia Neighborhood Associations should have representation on the CRC project’s Community and Environmental Justice Group
- Statement that CRC project staff have not communicated the Piedmont neighborhood’s support for LRT back to the larger CRC project team and that CRC project staff have not acknowledged that the Piedmont neighborhood is currently affected by congestion on I-5
- Statement that the CRC Task Force is not representing the citizens of Clark County and are instead supporting their own special interests
- Statement that the CRC Project is overdue and that Clark County needs a longer range transportation plan, one that would prepare for transportation needs 30 years into the future, and include other bridges, a beltway, and LRT network. Comment included the statement that long-range planning and securing future rights-of-way would reduce the future cost of transportation projects
- Request that all data that is being analyzed by CRC staff be shared with the public, and if it is not shared with the public, a request for a copy of the Oregon and Washington Statutes that allow some forms of data to be exempt from public disclosure
- Request for additional outreach to the pedestrian and bicycling community, including holding Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee meetings outside the standard workday and advertising the committee’s meetings on the CRC project Web site
- Support for additional public outreach on the CRC project to “combat the falsehoods” from critics of the project
- Statement that the existing I-5 Bridge should remain open during construction of a new bridge
- Statement that the CRC project has demonstrated excellent interagency cooperation and progress, and that the project is being considered for selection as a federal Corridor of the Future, and that, if appropriate, the project may receive accelerated review under the Executive Order on Environmental Stewardship and Transportation Infrastructure Project Reviews

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

- Statement that the Oregon Department of State Lands (ODSL) has concurred with the CRC project Evaluation Criteria being considered in the Draft EIS. The comment also included the statement that, at this stage in the NEPA process, there is not enough detailed design information for ODSL to begin the permitting process which implements the Oregon Removal-Fill Law
- Statement that the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office concurred with the CRC project Range of Alternatives being considered in the Draft EIS. Comment included support for moving supplemental bridge alternatives into the Draft EIS without linking the alternatives to specific funding sources, such as a toll. Comment included the statement that linking supplemental bridge alternatives with unpopular tolls provides a disadvantage to the supplemental bridge alternatives
- Statement that the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development concurred with the CRC project Range of Alternatives being considered in the Draft EIS. Comment included the statement that the no-build alternative being considered in the Draft EIS does not provide an adequate basis for comparison with the build alternatives, and supported consideration of a no-build alternative which includes congestion tolling along with other aggressive measures to effectively manage the existing demands on the transportation system. The comment also stated that this new no-build alternative should be based upon different land use assumptions than the build alternatives, based on the statement that the capacity constraints from a no-build alternative would likely lead to more jobs moving to Clark County and more housing being developed closer to downtown Portland
- Statement that the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concurred with the CRC project Range of Alternatives being considered in the Draft EIS. The comment also stated that the USFWS anticipates substantially greater environmental concerns with the supplemental bridge alternatives, based on the statement that these alternatives have greater in-water structure and construction associated with them
- Statement that the perspective of motorists are not being adequately presented to the CRC Task Force and CRC project staff, because work groups that represent non-motorist perspectives have been formed, while a motorist work group has not been formed. Comment included a request for the formation of a motorist work group, which would provide advice to the Task Force and CRC project staff on issues including tolling, congestion, transportation demand management, and managed lanes
- Question as to whether the meeting minutes from the Community and Environmental Justice Group are available to the public
- Question as to why the CRC project is taking as long as it is to reach a conclusion
- Support for expanding the CRC project boundaries north to Ridgefield, so traffic generated north of SR 500 is considered as a part of the project
- Question over whether keeping the existing I-5 Bridge goes against the CRC project charter
- Question over whether Mayor Pollard can prevent the CRC project from being implemented if LRT is not included
- Question over the length of the CRC project's planning horizon
- Statement that coordination is needed between the CRC project and other transportation projects, including Port of Vancouver projects
- Request that project staff bring a variety of new boards and information to neighborhood meetings, including:

- A map of all future expected major transportation projects
- A board with the definition of, and broad overview of, the LRT and BRT alternatives
- An example cross section showing how LRT and BRT would be added to the traffic lanes
- Information on the current Vancouver Comprehensive Plan, when it was enacted, and how many times it has been amended

Other (included in multiple categories listed in Appendix A)

- Statement that new regulations will be put into effect which will reduce diesel particulate matter and increase the percentage of diesel vehicles in the United States
- Question as to whether the Pearson Field runway could be moved east to accommodate a taller replacement or supplemental bridge
- Support for eliminating the Pearson Field so that a replacement bridge can be built high enough to eliminate the need for any bridge lifts
- Question over whether the CRC project has to consider air traffic clearances
- Statement that the FAA should and would compromise on air space issues
- Statement that the new design of the CRC Web site is well-written, easy to use, and attractive
- Statement that the new CRC Web site lacks content, specifically information on:
 - The planning process to date
 - How and why decisions have been made
 - When future meetings will occur and what their agendas will be
 - Short- and long-term transit costs
- Request for information on Mayor Pollard’s idea to cover I-5 to connect downtown Vancouver with the Historic Reserve
- Statement that the CRC project should provide for the ability of 50cc scooters to legally travel between Oregon and Washington, possibly through the inclusion of a travel lane that is wide enough to accommodate bicycles and scooter, with a posted and enforced speed limit. Comment was based on the statement that 50cc scooters are not allowed on I-5 and are not allowed on the I-5 Bridge bike lanes. Support for scooter use included the statements that scooters can:
 - Decrease congestion
 - Reduce fuel consumption
 - Provide a safe alternative to cars and bicycles
 - Reduce pollution relative to cars
- Question over whether the Thunderbird Hotel was closed because of the CRC project
- Question over whether consultants are being used on the CRC project team
- Question about what field survey work has been performed as a part of the CRC project

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

- Question over the construction staging of any new bridge built as a part of the CRC project
- Question over how long the construction of a new bridge would take
- Question over whether the City of Vancouver had committed to keeping land use patterns consistent north of McLoughlin Boulevard, and if so, whether that commitment was a land use action or verbal commitment
- Question as to the Vancouver City Council's perspective on the CRC project

Appendices

Appendix A – Frequency of Comments by Issue

Appendix B – Outreach Events in Washington and Oregon

Appendix C – Public and Agency Comment Submission Types

Appendix D – Notes on Comment Summarization

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

Appendix A – Frequency of Comments by Issue

The table below summarizes the number of comments that addressed a variety of topics. Comments that addressed more than one topic were counted in each applicable topic.

Issue	Number of Comments
Process	84
Light Rail	30
Other concepts	29
Existing Bridge	23
Neighborhoods/Business Districts	22
Supplemental Bridge	21
Funding/Financing	20
Traffic (Congestion)	19
Transit	16
Tolling	16
Replacement Bridge	16
Bus Rapid Transit	12
Bicycle/Pedestrian Access	12
Navigation/Marine Traffic	11
Interchanges/Highway Alignment	11
Transit Alignment/Stations/Park and Rides	10
Project Costs	10
Land Use	10
Construction Approach/Construction	10
Schedule	9
Freight	9
Natural Resources	7
TSM/TDM/Managed Lanes	6
I-205	6
Bus	6
Air Quality	6
Acquisitions/ROW	6
Seismic Safety	5
Highway safety	5
Aviation	5
Railroad/Heavy rail/Railroad bridge	4
Environmental Justice	4
Archaeology/Cultural	4
Third Crossing	3
Express Bus	3
Energy and Electromagnetic Field (EMF)	2
Delta Park Project	2
Architectural/Aesthetic Bridge Design	2
Public Services and Utilities	1
Noise and Vibration	1

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

Appendix B – Outreach Events in Washington and Oregon

Project staff is expected to make 51 presentations and gather feedback at neighborhood, government, business, and community meetings in Clark County and Portland between March 28 and June 26, 2007. More than 992 members of the public are expected to be engaged through these events.

NOTE: As of publication of this draft report, spoken public comments received by staff at some of the outreach events from March 28 – June 14 have yet to be summarized, and are therefore, not included in this draft report. The final draft of this report will summarize comments from all events in the table. Completed individual event summaries are available upon request.

DATE	ORGANIZATION	STATE	TIME	NUMBER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS
3/28/07	Columbia Corridor Assn., Sheraton Airport Hotel, 8235 NE Airport Way, Portland	OR	7:30-9am	20
4/3/07	SW Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) board	WA	4pm	n/a
4/5/07	Portland Freight Committee, Portland City Hall, Lovejoy Room	OR	7:30am	35
4/9/07	Northwest Oregon Labor Council, 1125 SE Madison St., Portland	OR	1:30pm	26
4/9/07	St. Johns Neighborhood Assn., St Johns Community Center, 8427 N. Central, Portland	OR	7pm	23
4/10/07	ITE / WTS Joint Luncheon, Embassy Suites, downtown Portland	OR	11:30am-1pm	130
4/10/07	Clark County Young Democrats, Longshoreman's Hall, 1205 Ingalls St., Vancouver	WA	6:30pm	12
4/16/07	Battle Ground City Council, Battle Ground City Hall	WA	7pm	7
4/17/07	Vancouver School District, CRC project office, 700 Washington St., Vancouver	WA	8am	1
4/17/07	Arlington Club, Portland	OR		35
4/18/07	Portland State University, Urban Studies brownbag discussion, PSU Urban Center, room 270, 506 SW Mill	OR	12pm	40
4/19/07	City Center Redevelopment Authority	WA	12pm	n/a
4/19/07	West Minnehaha Neighborhood Assn., 1500 NE 49th St, Vancouver	WA	7pm	27
4/24/07	City of Vancouver neighborhood liaisons briefing, Vancouver City Council chambers	WA	10:30am-12pm	10
4/24/07	Rose Village Neighborhood Assn. , Memorial Lutheran Church, classroom, 2700 E. 28th St., (off Grand Blvd), Vancouver	WA	7pm	16
4/25/07	Kiwanis Club, Peninsula chapter, Elmer's Restaurant, Delta Park, 9848 N. Whitaker Rd.	OR	12pm	11
4/26/07	Andresen / St. Johns Neighborhood Association, 4700 NE 78th, Vancouver, Clark County Public Works Maintenance Ctr.	WA	7pm	17

DATE	ORGANIZATION	STATE	TIME	NUMBER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS
5/3/07	North Salmon Creek Neigh. Assn, Three Creeks Library	WA	7pm	25
5/9/07	ODOT bridge design conference, Salem	OR		n/a
5/9/07	SR-502 Open House, WSDOT, Battle Ground High School	WA	4pm-7pm	15
5/10/07	Land Surveyors Assoc. of Washington, Boppin' Bo's, 7809 NE Vancouver Plaza Dr., Vancouver	WA	6pm	17
5/12/07	Walnut Grove Park dedication, 58th Avenue, Vancouver	WA	11am-2pm	18
5/14/07	Congressional staffers visit CRC office and tour project area, CRC offices and Bridge Influence Area	WA	11am-1:30pm	13
5/14/07	Lincoln Neighborhood Assn., Lincoln Elem. School, common area, 4200 NW Daniels St., Vancouver	WA	7pm	28
5/17/07	American Society of Civil Engineers, Old Country Buffet, Vancouver	WA	12pm	22
5/24/07	North Portland Business Association, New Dad's Restaurant, 8608 N. Lombard in St. Johns	OR	7:30am	25
5/24/07	Carter Park Neighborhood Assn., 2500 Main St., Vancouver Housing Authority	WA	7pm	21
5/30/07	Central Park Neighborhood Assn., Washington School for the Blind, cafeteria, 2214 E. 13th St., Vancouver	WA	7pm	23
6/1/07	Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board, Frito Lay, 4808 NW Fruit Valley Road, Vancouver, conference room	WA	11am	24
6/4/07	North Portland Neighborhood Services, Kenton Firehouse, 2209 N. Schofield at Brandon, Portland	OR	7pm	9
6/7/07	Hayden Island Mobile Home Owners and Renters Association, in clubhouse, 12221 North SouthShore Drive, Portland	OR	6:30pm-8pm	26
6/7/07	Shumway Neighborhood Assn., 3101 Main St., Vancouver School of Arts and Academics, Media Center	WA	7pm	11
6/9/07	Vista Meadows Neighborhood Park, NE 29th Ave and NE 147th St. - Adjacent to WSUV campus	WA	12pm-2pm	20
6/9/07	Vancouver Farmers Market (info table for farmers market and for bicyclists), Esther Short Park, W. 8th and Esther St.	WA	9am-3pm	39
6/11/07	Lincoln Neighborhood Assn., Lincoln Elem. School, common area, 4200 NW Daniels St., Vancouver	WA	7pm	39
6/12/07	Rosemere neighborhood group, Washington Elementary, 2908 S. St., gymnasium	WA	6:30pm	13
6/12/07	Hudson's Bay Neighborhood Assn., Harney Elementary, 3212 E. Evergreen, cafeteria	WA	7pm	7
6/13/07	Kenton Neighborhood Assn., Kenton Lodge, 8130 N. Denver Ave., Portland	OR	5pm-8pm	40

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

DATE	ORGANIZATION	STATE	TIME	NUMBER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS
6/13/07	Clark County High Capacity Transit Sounding Board meeting, Clark County Elections, 1408 Franklin St., Vancouver	WA	6pm	3
6/14/07	WSDOT SR 502 Open House, Battle Ground High School	WA	4pm-7pm	12
6/14/07	City of Portland Bicycle Master Plan Open House, Jefferson High School	OR	5pm-6pm	16
6/14/07	Hayden Island Neighborhood Network (HINooN), Former Hayden Island Yacht Club, 12050 N. Jantzen Dr	OR	7pm	48
6/14/07	Arnada Neighborhood Assn., 2500 Main St., Vancouver Housing Authority	WA	7pm	19
6/19/07	Hough Neighborhood Assn., Hough Elementary School, 1900 Daniels St (at McLoughlin)	WA	7pm	16
6/20/07	ODOT I-5 Delta Park project open house, Ockley Green School, 6031 N. Montana Ave., Portland	OR	4pm-7pm	25
6/20/07	Bridgeton Neighborhood Assn., Columbia School, 716 NE Marine Dr (at NE Bridgeton)	OR	7pm	33
6/21/07	Uptown Village Association	WA	8am	14
6/21/07	Vancouver's Downtown Association, 904 Main St.	WA	6pm	35
6/23/07	Good in the 'hood, King School Park, 4815 NE 7th Ave.	OR	12pm-7pm	49
6/25/07	Northwest Oregon Labor Council	OR	7pm	Number forthcoming
6/26/07	Rose Village Neighborhood Assn., Memorial Lutheran Church, classroom, 2700 E. 28th St., (off Grand Blvd), Vancouver	WA	7pm	Number forthcoming
TOTAL for March 28 through June 26, 2007				1,115 (running total)

Appendix C – Public and Agency Comment Submission Types

Appendix B identifies the number of comments received by topic between March 28 and June 14, 2007. Listed below are the six ways in which public comments were received during this period, along with the number of comments received by each method:

Comment Received Via	Number of Comments
Comments from neighborhood association and community meetings	23
Comment <i>forms</i> (tear-off sheets from BridgeNews newsletter, neighborhood meetings)	7
Emails (including info request) received via feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org	63
Letters received via U.S. mail/as .pdf copies	7
Phone	3
Total Comments	103

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY

Appendix D – Notes on Comment Summarization

Because public outreach efforts are not statistically valid surveys, comment summarization includes significant imprecision. Sources of imprecision include:

- Each outreach summary is composed of comments that may have been voiced by an individual or from multiple people at a single event. Because outreach summaries do not indicate the number of commenters on each topic, comments from outreach summaries are treated in this memo as a single “comment source”
- Public and agency feedback includes questions (for example, “How is barge traffic affected?”) and clear preferences (for example, “...put tolls on the bridge...”). Public and agency feedback, however, also includes feedback that is hard to distinguish between a question and a preference (for example, in context, the question of “Has there been an analysis on the possibility of tunneling under the river?” appears to be a statement of preference, as it is included in a page long discussion of CRC project constraints that the commenter believes would be solved by using a tunnel instead of a new bridge)

Because comment gathering methods are imprecise, this memo is best used as a reflection of the range of issues that have been communicated with project staff. The entire set of verbatim public comments is available on request.

DRAFT — FOR REVIEW ONLY



Public Outreach Events Summer 2007

As of this writing, the CRC project team is scheduled to attend these events this summer.
(For a summary of recent outreach, please see the attached public comment memo.)

DATE	ORGANIZATION	STATE	TIME	LOCATION
6/26/2007	Rose Village Neighborhood Assn.	WA	7pm	Memorial Lutheran Church, classroom, 2700 E. 28th St., (off Grand Blvd), Vancouver
6/27/2007	Piedmont Neighborhood Assn.	OR	7:30pm	Holy Redeemer School, 127 N. Portland Blvd, Clare Hall
7/9/2007	Neighborhood Associations Council of Clark County (NACCC)	WA	7pm	4700 NE 78th, Vancouver, Clark County Public Works Maintenance Ctr.
7/10/2007	East Columbia Neighborhood Assn.	OR	7pm	East Columbia Bible Church, 420 NE Marine Dr.
7/12/2007	Arnada Neighborhood Assn.	WA	7pm	Arnada Park, at the pergola (park is south of Fourth Plain, east of F St.)
7/15/2007	Vancouver Farmers Market	WA	10am-2pm	8th and Esther
7/17/2007	Humboldt Neighborhood Assn.	OR	7pm	room 101 of the Public Services Education Building on the PCC Cascade Campus
7/18/2007	West Hazel Dell Neighborhood Assn.	WA	6:30pm	Clearwater Springs Assisted Living Center, 201 NW 78th Street
7/19/2007	City Center Redevelopment Authority	WA	12pm	Vancouver City Hall, council chambers
7/19/2007	Esther Short Neighborhood Assn.	WA	6:30pm	indoor farmers market, 8th St. and Esther, corner of Esther Short Park
7/19/2007	Six to Sunset Summer Concert Series	WA	6pm-8pm	Esther Short Park
7/20/07 or 8/17/07	Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)	WA	9am-11am	1300 Franklin St., 6th floor, Vancouver
7/21/2007	Battle Ground Harvest Days	WA	12pm-7pm	Battle Ground fairgrounds
7/24/2007	Overlook Neighborhood Assn.	OR	7pm	Kaiser Town Hall, 3704 N Interstate Ave (at N Overlook Blvd).
7/28/2007	Ho'ike Hawaiian Festival	WA	11am-6pm	Esther Short Park
8/4/2007	Vancouver Farmers Market	WA	9am-3pm	8th and Esther
8/8/2007	Kiwanis, Russelville chapter	OR	12pm	Courtyard Retirement Home, corner of NE Burnside and 103rd
8/18/07 8/19/07	Uptown Village Street Festival	WA	10am-8pm and 10am-5pm	Uptown Village, Vancouver, WA Main & 13th
8/25/2007	PENDING CONFIRMATION: Arbor Lodge Community Fair	OR	??	Arbor Lodge Park, Portland
8/30/2007	Alberta Street Farmers Market	OR	5:30pm-9:30pm	NE Alberta St.

Summer Drop-In Events

The project also will host three informal sessions where community members can view maps of project alternatives while sharing questions and comments with staff. A postcard mailer to residents in the project area will announce the events, listed below:

Wednesday, July 25 ▪ 4 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Hayden Island Yacht Club
12050 N. Jantzen Drive (across from Safeway)

Saturday, August 4 ▪ 9 a.m. – 3 p.m.

Vancouver Farmers Market, Esther Short Park, W. Columbia St. and 8th St.

Saturday, August 11 ▪ 11 a.m. – 2 p.m.

Jantzen Beach SuperCenter (outside mall entrance near carousel and Target)

Media Coverage

March 28 – June 21, 2007

- **Bridge expert weighs in on interstate project crossing the Columbia**, April 05, 2007, *The Columbian*. A brief interview with Sharon Wood Wortman, a local bridge expert and historian.
- **Exhausted by exhaust: Residents say traffic on I-5 is making them sick**, April 10, 2007, *The Portland Tribune*. A report on community health issues related to air quality along I-5.
- **Fourth option adds to Columbia Crossing choices**, April 14, 2007, *The Reflector*. A summary of the March 27th Task Force meeting and the added fourth alternative.
- **All aboard the light-rail express**, April 18, 2007, *The Columbian*. Opinion editorial by the newspaper's editor emeritus, Tom Koenniger, supporting light rail and noting LRT plans in Puget Sound area.
- **Fourth option adds to Columbia Crossing choices**, April 19, 2007, *The Reflector* (Battle Ground, Wash.). Summary of February and March task force actions and DEIS alternatives.
- **Eugene: Onboard with buses**, May 6, *The Columbian*. Profile of new bus rapid transit system in Eugene, Oregon, placed in context of CRC decision between BRT and light rail.
- **In our view: Is BRT the best?** May 10, *The Columbian*. Editorial expressing support for studying bus rapid transit in the DEIS, but also cautioning that Vancouver has different transit opportunities and circumstances than Eugene, Oregon, had when they chose BRT.
- **Running on empty**, May 20, *The Oregonian*. Opinion article by architecture critic Randy Gragg about Portland's rapid growth but lack of a big-picture transit plan. Mention of CRC.
- **Expanded rail**, May 20, *The Oregonian*. A report on Portland's current transit system and what plans there are for future transit infrastructure in the metro area.
- **I-5 bridge is better than old pictures**, May 21, *The Columbian*. A brief article summarizing the historical nature of the I-5 bridges.
- **Poster promotes light rail**, May 22, *The Columbian*. Article highlights a new advocacy group consisting of downtown Vancouver businesses that support bringing light rail to Vancouver.
- **Motorists sit during I-5 bridge problem**, May 30, *The Columbian*. Report on the traffic delay caused by a lift span malfunction that occurred during an evening bridge lift on I-5.
- **Ever heard of half a bridge lift?** June 3, 2007, *The Columbian*. An opinion piece which supports building a new I-5 bridge without bridge lifts in order to improve traffic flow.
- **Building a new bridge: two groups driving future of Clark County**, June 3, 2007, *The Columbian*. An article highlighting the challenges posed by our region's diverse transportation needs. The report identifies and describes the area's two major transit projects, CRC and Clark County's High Capacity Transit System study.
- **River crossers need to go past opposite bank**, June 15, 2007, *The Columbian*. An opinion piece asking what would happen to bus rapid transit on I-5 after it leaves high-capacity lanes in the project area.
- **Money can be found for I-5 bridge**, June 21, 2007, *West Linn Tidings*. An editorial encouraging the region to collaborate in building a new I-5 bridge, suggesting the economic, environmental, and public safety values of the project outweigh its price tag.



Summary of Advisory and Working Group Activities June 2007

Community and Environmental Justice Group

The CEJG advises the CRC project in these areas:

- Conducting individual or group review of the CRC project materials.
- Identifying issues and concerns in the process, and present recommendations at key milestones to the project team.
- Assisting the project team in effectively engaging the public in the project by:
 - Reviewing and commenting on outreach plan.
 - Identifying service providers and community based organizations in the project area.
 - Informing the project team of known changes in demographics within the area of effects since the 2000 Census.
 - Assisting in identifying community reactions, issues of concern.
- Providing input to the project team into relevant areas of interest (or potential impact) such as air quality, noise, highway interchange alignments and design features to help inform the project's efforts to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate potential impacts of the project to their community.

The group recently elected two co-chairs, one from Oregon and one from Washington. Michelle Tworoger of Hayden Island is the Oregon co-chair and Dave Frei of the Arnada neighborhood of Vancouver, is the co-chair for Washington.

The thirteen members of the CEJG come from neighborhoods in the project area and include environmental justice communities (low-income, African American, Latino), one liaison from the CRC Task Force, and five at-large members. They represent the diverse interests and perspectives of Vancouver, Portland and Hayden Island neighborhoods potentially affected by the project.

The group has met monthly since August 2006. In that time, they have advised the project on the development of the project Web site, expanded neighborhood resource maps to identify community resources for the DEIS process, influenced the creation of outreach materials for diverse audiences in the project area and provided input at the key milestone of identifying alternatives to be analyzed during the DEIS process.

Freight Working Group (FWG)

- The purpose of the FWG is to provide advice to the CRC project on freight-related issues.
- The group has 10 members representing a variety of freight-related interests from private industry.
- Eight meetings have been held so far and the next meeting is scheduled for July 11. The FWG meets every one to two months and agency representatives often attend.
- This group has provided significant input to the project, including review of applicable freight-related components to highway design, input on the preparation of a truck freight report that documents truck travel conditions along I-5, background on freight issues and concerns, and advice on highway design of critical locations including the Marine Drive, SR 14, and Mill Plain Boulevard interchanges.
- At upcoming meetings, the FWG will continue to focus on proposed design issues related to truck movement.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC)

- The purpose of the PBAC is to provide advice to the CRC project on pedestrian and bicycle associated matters.
- There are approximately 20 members including agency representatives and advocacy interests.
- Four meetings of the group have been held since March 2007. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 11. The PBAC generally meets monthly, and holds additional meetings when necessary.
- Accomplishments include the development of a pedestrian and bicycle fact sheet, a map showing all existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle routes in and beyond the I-5 Bridge Influence Area, samples of pathways used on bridges throughout the world, parameters of good multi-modal pathway design, and multi-agency standards for pathways, sidewalks and bicycle lanes.
- PBAC members have participated in two working meetings to review potential pathway alignments across the Columbia River and Portland Harbor and to provide input on potential connections to the pathways for the Replacement Bridge options.
- In future meetings the group will provide input on potential connections for the Supplemental Bridge options, and advise the project on general pedestrian and bicycle related issues, including reviews of interchange options and transit stations.

Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG)

- The Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) provides advice to the CRC project on the appearance of the bridge, transit and highway designs, incorporation of context sensitive design and sustainability, and the development of guidelines for visual impact and urban design.
- The group is co-chaired by Vancouver Mayor Royce Pollard and Portland Commissioner Sam Adams. Last November, they jointly proposed that Portland and Vancouver have a lead role in exploring options and preparing recommendations regarding bridge architecture and urban design.
- The fourteen members – five each selected by each city and four selected by the CRC staff – are citizen volunteers representing architecture, arts, aesthetic design, cultural and historic resources, community connections, and sustainability.
- The UDAG has met monthly since March to consider key design aspects of the alternatives being analyzed by the project. The first two meetings concentrated on opportunities, constraints, and potential bridge types. More recently, the group has discussed the development of design guidelines to assist the CRC project team to refine bridge, transit and highway designs.
- In future meetings, the UDAG will focus on evolving design elements as the project alternatives are narrowed to select a locally preferred alternative.