

**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)

support and need, as early on the project, that is there is a document titled Support and Need for the Project. That document indicates that if we don't do anything, we're likely to have 10-12 hours of stop-and-go traffic jams as we approach 2030 over the I-5 corridor. All of my comments are based on the CRC Traffic Technical Report, good work of Doug's team, and so with that in mind, consider the replacement bridge, consider the bridge influence area, that's Exhibit 7-11 for future reference. On that document if you simply count up little red squares which reflect 0-10 mph of stop-and-go driving in the BIA southbound, you get 80 little boxes. Each little box is 15 minutes, so you get 20 hours. That's 20 hours of stop-and-go congestion southbound with the replacement bridge. If you then do the same thing with the No Build, and I'm not an advocate of No Build, I'm just making a comparison, you get 37 little boxes or 9 ¼ hours: 20 hours replacement bridge or 9 ¼ hours with the No Build. That's an awful lot of money that we're proposing to spend to get congestion that's twice as bad as No Build. And I don't mean congestion at less than 30 mph, I'm referring to congestion of 0-10 mph. Similar comments could be made in regards to this 15 hours at the bridge, that's not a valid statement. If you go stop-and-go, there also the No Build is better than the replacement bridge. Thank you.

**P-0778-001** **David Hetticans (SP?)**: As you know, for more than 2 years I and others have advocated the 605 western beltway option. You assured me that it would be studied as part of this project. It was not. We got lip service, no study and the best, most effective option was eliminated. I believe that violates the federal guidelines and is unconscionable and some of you should be ashamed of yourselves. Even by your own data, by the end of construction, traffic will be slower than is today. That's all I have to say at this time unless you have questions.

**P-0778-002**

**Ed Barnes**: Mr. Chairman my name is Ed Barnes. I live at 4009 NE 50<sup>th</sup> Ave. I relinquish my time up front so that people who haven't spoken can before but I'd like to have the opportunity again if you have time, sir. Thank you.

**Barbara Nelson**: I'm Barbara Nelson from Janzten Beach Moorage. I've been a resident of Janzten Beach Moorage for 17 years and also on the Board of Directors. This bridge decision has literally been hanging over our heads for many years. It has put our lives on hold until it happens. It affects 177 homes, most of us our full-time residence. Our utilities are interconnected, our parking, our neighborhoods, our friends. However many homes you choose to affect, you do affect all of us because we are one community. I also work part-time at the Janzten Beach Welcome Center and talk to many people about the beauty of both of our states. We do not need a signature bridge design. We need a bridge that will relieve congestion, improve air quality and improve our lives in this beautiful Columbia River area. We need a simple design that will allow us to see the mountains, Mt. Hood, Mt. Rainier, Mt. St. Helens, can all be seen on a clear day from a bridge the height it would be built. The river is a wonderful view with sailboats, barges, and pleasure craft of all kinds. Even the white-capping on a windy day is wonderful to see. We from the Moorage mostly prefer the replacement option with the adjacent light rail option. This would have a smaller impact on our moorage. The sooner it can happen, the sooner we can re-establish our moorage and begin to get on with our lives. It has been a long time. Is Peg here? She had our real comments from our moorage but she left before we did but is probably stuck in the traffic jam. We mainly support the adjacent because it does take a smaller footprint but we need everyone to help with this sooner because it is put down as tax lots and it doesn't say that that is our parking for all of our cars. It doesn't give our addresses. They know our addresses when they send our tax bills but they only say that it will affect some floating homes. Anyway, I hope Peg gets here so she can say the part she was supposed to say.

### P-0778-001

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River, and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why a third corridor, arterial crossing of the Columbia River, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need. For a general description of the screening process see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS. It should be noted that every proposal received from the public was considered, and many of the proposals that were dropped from further consideration included elements that helped shape the alternatives in the DEIS.

### P-0778-002

By 2030, the region's population is expected to increase by one million people. This increase will result in more people needing to travel between home, work, school, recreation, etc. In 2005, 135,000 vehicles crossed the Columbia River on the Interstate Bridge, which led to 4-6 hours of congestion each weekday. By 2030, 184,000 are predicted to cross the river, which would lead to 15 hours of daily congestion if no action is taken.

Congestion occurs when vehicle demand is greater than a transportation system's capacity. It results in slower speeds and increased travel times. CRC defines congestion as vehicles traveling less than 30 mph. The Columbia River Crossing project uses information gathered from Metro's nationally-recognized travel demand models to determine the project's effect on congestion. These models predict trip frequency, types or modes of transportation, destination, and time of day. Transportation

planners use these models to analyze the effects of such factors as increased population and employment, transportation improvements, and new developments on the transportation system.

Based on the Metro model's past ability to predict transportation effects, the CRC project is confident in the data received from Metro and uses it to determine what impact the project will have on congestion. The improvements proposed by the project to the highway and seven interchanges will help better accommodate increased future vehicle traffic. New auxiliary lanes and longer on/off ramps will allow safer and more efficient merging and weaving to enter or exit the freeway. Narrow lanes and shoulders will be widened to current standards. Shoulders will be added where they are currently missing. All of these changes will improve the flow of traffic in the bottleneck area of the Interstate Bridge.