

**Parametrix**

ENGINEERING • PLANNING • ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Subject: CRC Task Force Public Meeting: Hearing Testimony**

---

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

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

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

### Meeting Minutes (continued)

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

- P-0535-001** **in Karlock:** Thank you for the opportunity at one of the few open parts of this entire process. Once again I have been refused information I have requested. I requested cost information on all of these interchanges they're planning on building. I got an acknowledgement that they got my request but nothing else and it's been 3 weeks now. Here's a copy of my e-mail and the response (hands out copies). So I say this is hardly an open process, I say it's carefully managed to direct you to a conclusion that light rail is the thing to build and gee, if they have to build a road then I guess they have to. Let's talk about the CO<sub>2</sub> of this project (hands out more papers). It seems as if the EIS says this is going to save just a bit of CO<sub>2</sub> every year. Unfortunately that does not take in to account the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emitted when they build this thing. When you do that comparison, it's gonna take 150 years to break even on the CO<sub>2</sub>. Of course the bridge isn't going to last that long which means that this project is a net emitter of CO<sub>2</sub>. Energy consumption: same story. It'll take 137 years to [redacted] energy saving to make up for the construction energy so once again this project wastes energy. Cost? Well of course they don't give us a bunch of cost breakdowns because they're trying to commingle the transit and the road parts so we won't notice how terribly expensive the transit is. But you can figure that the proposed 6 million annual transit trips are going to cost \$9 per trip over the section in question and that's a 4 mile section so that's \$2 per passenger per mile. Compared to a car, gas would have to get around \$40 per gallon to make driving as expensive as this light rail. There's also some accounting tricks going on. I found this buried on Chapter 4, page 4-2, that the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate of the live load on the foundation. Now the live load is the weight of the vehicle, not the weight of the bridge structure so that all the weight of the bridge structure is being allocated to road costs not transit costs. That was one of the questions they haven't bothered to answer yet. We don't know that for sure but that's a pretty reasonable suspicion. Another thing, I'd like to see a process run by an organization that has no dog in this fight. But it turns out that one of your chief consultants has been donating money in favor of light rail in both the 1996 and 1998 ballot campaigns. I only have 5 copies of this so I'm saving one to turn in but I'll pass the others around. So this project appears to be managed by DEA which has a history of donating money to pro-light rail. Hardly sounds like an impartial process. May I suggest that you cancel this project, start all over looking at the real needs which was congestions relief, build a road and get rid of the light rail, get rid of all the interchange improvements up and down I-5 and just solve the problem at hand instead of trying to rebuild society. Thank you.
- P-0535-002**
- P-0535-003**
- P-0535-004**
- P-0535-005**
- P-0535-006**
- P-0535-007**

### P-0535-001

The project apologizes that you did not receive the answers expected to your questions or requests for information. The project strives to respond to questions and requests in a timely manner. The project did not respond to comments that were received during the Draft EIS comment period. Those comments are addressed in the Final EIS. If there is still information you are looking for, please feel free to contact the project at [feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org). In regards to your past requests for a cost breakdown of highway interchanges and other project elements, project records show that these requests were responded to. Information was provided that explained the project did not currently have a cost breakdown by interchange or project element at that time. Before a Locally Preferred Alternative was selected in July 2008, it was unknown what would be built. When the type of river crossing and transit mode were selected, project staff began to refine designs and develop more detailed cost estimates and financial information. This information is included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

### P-0535-002

Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected light rail to Clark College as the project's preferred transit mode. These sponsor agencies, which include the Vancouver City Council, Portland City Council, C-TRAN Board, TriMet Board, RTC Board and Metro Council considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force (a broad group of stakeholders representative of the range of interests affected by the project - see the DEIS Public Involvement Appendix for more information regarding the CRC Task Force) before voting on the LPA.

As illustrated in the DEIS, and summarized in Exhibit 29 (page S-33) of the Executive Summary, light rail would better serve transit riders than bus rapid transit (BRT) within the CRC project area. Light rail would carry

P-0535-008

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

more passengers across the river during the PM peak, result in more people choosing to take transit, faster travel times through the project area, fewer potential noise impacts, and lower costs per incremental rider than BRT. Additionally, light rail is more likely to attract desirable development on Hayden Island and in downtown Vancouver, which is consistent with local land use plans.

### P-0535-003

The FEIS estimates the project's impacts on operational GHG emissions as well as construction GHG emissions. The operational analysis is based on a travel demand model and an EPA emissions model. This method captures the primary energy savings associated with changes in trips and speed, but does not capture the energy savings from eliminating the congestion associated with bridge lifts or reducing the congestion associated with crashes. Bridge lifts and crashes both result in increased back-up, traffic idling and higher GHG emissions. This model also does not reflect the secondary energy savings associated with reduced fuel consumption. As such it is only a partial estimate of GHG reduction associated with operations.

The construction analysis uses a CALTRANS model that reflects the comprehensive energy "costs" associated with all construction activities and materials (both primary and secondary energy use and GHG emissions). Therefore, because the construction estimates and operational estimates are not comparable, there is no estimate of a GHG "payback" period.

### P-0535-004

Please see response to comment P-0535-003.

### P-0535-005

Chapter 4 of the FEIS provides an updated cost analysis. It is difficult to

P-0535-009

Jim Karlock  
Task Force Comment

fully separate the costs of transit and highway components, since they are integrated in the river crossing facility. The light rail system improvements have had to meet with stringent cost effectiveness tests put forth by the FTA.

**P-0535-006**

The consultants on this project are not the decision-makers. There are no provisions against a firm contributing money to a public policy objective in its own community.

**P-0535-007**

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) explains how the project's Sponsoring Agencies generated ideas and solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, and tribes for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need. This evaluation found that, on their own, individual transit, highway, and interchange improvements would not satisfy the project's Purpose and Need. For example, alternatives that did not include such improvements in the highway generally did not adequately address the seismic vulnerability of the existing I-5 bridges, traffic congestion on I-5, or the existing safety problems caused by sub-standard design of the highway in this corridor. Similarly, improved transit service along the I-5 corridor is an important element of Purpose and Need, and therefore, alternatives that do not include transit investments would not meet the project's Purpose and Need. On-going analysis has demonstrated that the Purpose and Need is best met by a multimodal alternative that improves highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and adds tolling to the highway river crossing.

## MORE ENERGY CONSUMPTION MORE CO2 EMISSION and SIX times the COST OF DRIVING

**CO2 Emission** 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.

**Energy Consumption** 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.

**Cost** 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 mile for each and every passenger every time.**

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.

### HOW MUCH MORE WILL YOU HAVE TO PAY?

Some local officials have claimed that the Federal Government will pay ALL of the transit portion of this project, so we asked one nationally known transit system accounting expert about this:

**Question:** What is the maximum percentage of a light rail project that the federal government might pickup? Under the best scenario of very effective local lobbies and more typical. This is for Portland's MAX system expansion across the Columbia River into the state of Washington, so we may get preferential treatment.

**Transit Accounting Expert:** As a general rule, **80% is the maximum.** For most projects, **50% is more common**, and the "Federal" 50% always seems to wind up smaller than the "non-Federal" one.

It is also **getting less and less common** for the Federal 49 USC 5309 "new starts" share of any project to exceed **\$500 million.**

Now, special complications for this one: It is a combined road/transit project. It is far more common for Federal road projects to get higher percentages of Federal funding. The cost accounting between the road and the transit part also gets very interesting – and it is common in such situations to try to make the "roads" share of the costs as large as possible. In actuality, the mass of a light rail train at speed in what can be a windy situation can impose some fairly large static and dynamic loads that the bridge must be designed to handle – and you will need an experienced bridge structural engineer to do a competent calculation.

More at: [PortlandFacts.com](http://PortlandFacts.com), [ORTEM.org](http://ORTEM.org), [publicpurpose.com](http://publicpurpose.com)

### P-0535-008

See response to P-0535-006.

### P-0535-009

Thank you for your comment.

### P-0535-010

See response above to comment P-535-003 regarding energy savings from operations versus energy consumption from project construction. See Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a discussion of project costs and cost effectiveness, as well as the project financial plan.

P-0535-011

## Data &amp; Calculations

## 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

P-0535-012

## Energy &amp; CO2 Emissions

Data (from Energy Tech. Report):			
Alt. 2.5 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. 1 Construction Energy	6,997,371.9 mBTU	585,536 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-4)
Alt. 2 Construction energy	7,221,671.3 mBTU	603,472 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-4)

## 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

## 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

P-0535-013

## Cost of Driving

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:			
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 ¢ + 6.9 ¢ = 21.4 ¢/mile	
Adjust AAA ownership cost per mile:	\$5,648 - 3,023 = \$2,625; divide by 15,000 = 17.5 ¢/mile		
At 5,000 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/mi.

Increase in \$/gal = 1.716\$/mi \* 27.5 mi/gal = \$47 / 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/mi.

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

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

P-0535-011

Thank you for your comment.

P-0535-012

Please see response above to comment P-535-003 regarding operational energy savings and GHG emission reductions, compared to construction-related energy consumption and GHG emission production.

P-0535-013

Thank you for your comment.