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Commissioner Sam Adams,
You asked why study a third bridge corridor. In this booklet, I have sited several studies stating why a new third bridge and direct access into our ports and industrial areas is so important. FHWA requires a range of viable options be studied, and I-5 Partnership called it viable. The CRC accepting it for study and then stating they did not do any studying only accepted it for study. Then kicked it out on conflicting and very limited information at the end of an extra long meeting with $1 / 2$ the member not present, able to vote, nor did they know the vote would take place.

The third bridge corridor has proven to have great merit and helps significantly with relieving congestion on I-5 and providing an additional route I the case of emergencies. mobility. It helps with are pollution in our neighborhoods, spillover traffic in our neighborhoods, it helps density our industrial area supporting current business, attracting more business and densifing our industrial areas which means less sprawl. The land is mostly under utilized, less expensive, and is strategically located connecting Oregon and Washington's ports and industrial area together strengthening our economy. It provides efficient north/south and east/west arterial connections. The Bridge Influence Area does none of those things. It actually causes more air pollution on I-5, more spillover into our neighborhoods, is in a high density, and destroys sound buildings, homes, business as well a our bridge that received an A-one rating with 50 years of life left. The BIA was not the only thing recommended for further study in the findings of the I-5 Partnership. What about building on one of only two corridors bridges crossing the Columbia River? They're many more legitimate questions that must be answered before where the crossing is placed can be decided.

Tell me why do you think the BIA with all the disruption to I-5 and that it does nothing to help a major of the problems should receive all the study?

As you are aware at the March 2006 meeting they voted to not study the third bridge corridor options. They did this with less than 20 task force members voting, which means that is $1 / 2$ the task force was missing.

You asked them not to vote later because you had to leave early, you left they voted anyway. Commissioner Steve Stuart said "he felt like a fog in water and the heat was being turned up." So he was being slowly cooked. Jerry Sundval said "this was the worst process she has been involved with it damaged the community, lacked honesty, and she felt steam rolled." By CRC staff. The projects where voted on in a one lump sum not individually and because staff said, there where all kinds of flaws. When you read this booklet you will find that there is conflicting data on the "flaws." In one instant it is a flaw and in the next instant is not a flaw.

I am asking that you require the CRC to study the project that they accepted. I am also asking that you demand that they provide the same amount of engineering expertise to all options. Also that I have access to 1 or 2 engineers and would like the opportunity for one month to have a full-scale project designed to present at the September task force meeting. It is time to find out what a new third corridor bridge will look like, how it would perform, and how much it will cost. I would much rather move forward with a new $21^{\text {st }}$ century bridge for our $21^{\text {st }}$ century economy. It is time to stop discussing all the problems of the, inequalities, flawed documents, and environmental justice issues and lay down side by side data so all can see why and how the decision was reach no matter which way it goes. We must have realistic evaluations with dollar amounts attached before a major decision
like this can be made. Whether we build it or not we must keep those afraid of studying it from try to lead us into darkness..... This project, like most will only be made better by day light with full and honest discussions based on verifiable information. Please do what you can so we can go forward in honest and openness..... Warring is not the answer. I'm a believer that we can work together inspite of what has taken place.

There are $50+$ employees working on this project. 18 months into it, they have done little or no work on a project according to their own statements. That seems strange with this many experts working on a project, yet we have not seen any of the progress they have made. If their information is credible I am not sure why they are hiding it from the public. You would think they would set it out there and let the public see honest data and comparison. This would get rid of citizens bugging them about some plan that doesn't make sense. March 22, 2006 DVD is a real eye opener. It shows task force members asking for reasonable things they don't receive, the public pointing out all the reasons it an unfair and a closed process. There are task force members, elected officials pointing out unreasonable parts in the screening A questions. The DVD is in this package.

I have tried to lay out the information and data that you asked for in an understandable manner. After 6 years of transportation meetings, I have heard so many things that have helped connect the dots. I may be missing some of the information that connects the dots in this booklet. I would be happy to go over this booklet with you, so there will be clarity. I will sit quietly and wait for you to ask questions, so I do not go over information that you already have a clear understanding of.

Respectfully,
Sharon Nasset

Hello Sam,
Thank you again for asking me to write my concerns and what direction I would like to see the current EIS take and why.

I have tried to keep simply and clear a very complex subject. I have taken the four different questions you asked and chosen format for each. The sections are set up in a preference references, references pages, and summary page. Every comment, statistic referred to, in this presentation is found in the list of documents below.

Index and tabs

1. Explanation of the 6 option west of the I-5 and differences.
2. Studies and Status of the 6 options
3. Need for a study of a third bridge option and transportation documents call for bridges and arterial on the same alignment Oregon, Washington, and Metro.
4. Fatal flaws in our transportation modeling
5. Screening conflicting data in general
6. Screening conflicting on Bi-State Industrial Corridor (RC-14) with data each of the 6 criteria
7. Industry standards not being followed and environmental justice issues (EJAG)
8. EJAG issues and problems with staff and meetings.

Every comment, statistic referred to in this presentation booklet is found in the list of documents below. I downloaded and bound these booklets for you. You can find them on our web site newinterstatebridge.com after September 1, 2006. I also am including 3 DVD's and I have copies of all the task force meetings on DVD if you want more information.

Attached booklets
Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Study Final Report
Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Study Final Report summary report
Regional Economic Efforts of the Columbia River Crossing Transportation Choke Points.
Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan
Transportation and Trade Partnership option design and property displacement map
Portland City Council meeting note on St. Johns' Truck Strategy
St. Johns Truck Strategy final findings
University of Portland Pedestrian Study
Advisory Committee Minority Report on St. Johns' Truck Strategy
NW Passage booklet (copies in Multnomah County Library)
Portland Freight Master Plan
Industrial Districts Atlas Portland Oregon 2004
The Cost of Congestion to the Economy in Portland Region
The Cost of Congestion to the Economy in Portland Region Executive Summary
Reduce congestion with a New Third Bridge Corridor
Columbia River Crossing A Screening booklet

# Explanation of the <br> 6 Options West of the <br> I-5 Interstate Bridge <br> And Their differences 

| Features of the 5 different bridges or corridors to the west of I-5 | Interstate West Bypass I-605 (1988) <br> Citizen | West Arterial (2001) ODOT / WADOT | NW Passage (2000) Citizen | BI-State Industrial Corridor (2003) Citizen | RC-14 New Corridor Crossing **BIC/ web-site** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North end |  |  |  |  |  |
| Southern end | Tualatin and I-5 | HWY 30 | HWY 30 | HWY 30 | Missing data |
| Intersections / connections | Unknown | Mill Plain I-5 Jantzen Beach, Marine Dr. Corridor, Columbia Corridor, Lombard St., HWY. 30 | Mill Plain I-5 <br> Jantzen Beach, Marine Dr. <br> Corridor, Columbia <br> Corridor, Lombard St., <br> HWY. 30 | North Unknown (I-5) <br> Ridgefield (?) <br> Aligned with the BNSF not replacing Fruit Valley Rd., Mill Plain, <br> Jantzen Beach, <br> Marine Dr. Corridor, Columbia Corridor, Time Oil Rd., HWY 30, | Unclear data |
| Bridges <br> Columbia River, Columbia Slough, Willamette River | Columbia River, Columbia Slough, Willamette River | Columbia River, Columbia Slough, Willamette River | Columbia River, Columbia Slough, Willamette River | Columbia River, Columbia Slough, Willamette River | Columbia River, Columbia Slough, Unclear data |
| Rail freight | No | No | Yes (2 track heavy/speed) | Yes (4 track/2speed heavy) | No |
| Rail Commuter | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Goes through North Portland Cut | No | Yes | Yes | No | no |
| Connect to Swan Island | No | No | Yes | No | no |
| Goes through Forest Park (At $124^{\text {th }}$ NW) | Yes | No | No | No | Unclear data |
| Levels | 1 | 1 | 1 (plus heavy rail) | 2 (plus heavy rail) | Unclear data |
| Lanes totals | Unknown | $2 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ | 4 N/S | $12 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ (Multi-modal) | Unclear data |
| Lane type |  |  |  |  |  |
| High/Wide oversize truck grade friendly | possible | No | $1 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}-\mathrm{High} /$ wide | 4 N/S- High/Wide lower level | Unclear data |
| Transit only | No | No | No | Yes $1 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ | Conflicting |
| General purpose | 3 each direction | 2 each direction | 4 each direction | 4 each direction | Unclear data |
| Reversible lanes | No | No | $1 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ | $2 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ each level | No |
| Bike | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Conflicting data |
| Pedestrian |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Conflicting data |
| Look out points | No | No | Yes | Yes | Unclear data |
| Freeway | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Unclear data |
| Stop lights | No | Yes (7-9) | No | No | Unclear data |
| Lift span | No | Yes | No | No | Unclear data |

## Northwest Passage Description

1. The Northwest Passage includes three bridges. First over the Columbia River, second the Columbia Slough, and third the Willamette River.
2. From Mill Plain in Vancouver (I-5) follows the BNSF line and uses as a viaduct "The Cut"
to Highway 30. This is 7 lanes, one center lane for emergency and emergency lanes on the curb side. (center lane reversible making 3-3 or 3-4 lane combination)
3. The NW Passage does not include a iift span bridge over the Columbia River and uses on and off ramps not stop lights on the express way.
4. An access road to Swan Island makes a second road out, that does not access 1-5, and connects with the major industrial area on one continuous corridor.
5. The NW Passage also adds heavy rail capacity of 4 new train tracks and a for freight and commuter rail.
6. Accommodation is made for bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

## West Arterial Description

1. A four-lane lift span bridge with two northbound and two southbound lanes.
2. Includes $\mathbf{5}$ to $\mathbf{7}$ stop lights which bring the traffic to a full stop.
3. No addition of heavy rail or commuter rail in comparison summaries
4. No additional lanes for bike and pedestrians.
*The NW Passage was not modeled by the BI-State I-5 Trade \& Transportation Pattnership.
*The Western Arterial was a verion of NW Passage.

## BI-State Industrial Corridor (BIC)

1. From highway 30, 124th to Oil Time Road in Oregon connects with existing arterials Marine Dr., N. Lombard St., Columbia Blvd. and North Portland Rd. to Vancouver Washington along the east side of the BNSF north alignment to perhaps Ridgefield Washington.
2. BIC is a freeway corridor and would have nine or more complete ramps as entrance and exit access with NO stop lights.
3. A complete ramp is north and south access ( 18 or more). This would be in addition to and with no change of Fruit Valley Rd. There are several existing arterials in Vancouver that currently connect with the BNSF rail line.
*Due to grade issues the trenching of Mill Plain has been removed.

## Columbia River Bridge (BIC)

1. A high span bridge with 2 levels and no lift span.

The Lower Level Consistingonsisting of 8 lanes with 4 in each direction. Truck friendly lanes thirteen feet wide with emergency lanes in the center and on the sides. This level is to be built to accommodate high wide and needs to remain at about a 2 percent grade.
The Top ILevel Four lanes with 2 general purpose lanes in each direction general and an emergency lane on the side.
Three lanes transit only, 1 as a future reversible lane and 2 lanes for transit. Two lane width for sidewalk, bike and viewing.
2. New rail tracks lift span bridge with 4 tracks(lor 2 extra heavy for high speed and large loads.) Commuter rail to be established with the new additional capacity.
3. Remodel of the existing BNSF from a swing to a lift span, adding a second lift to line up with the current I-5 bridge.

## North Portland Road

North Portland Road to be upgraded to 4 lanes each in North/South direction. The upgrade from Marine Dr. to Columbia Blvd. As North Portland Rd. borders both Smith and Bybee lakes, this would provide both access and create a pedestrian friendly promenade.

## Willamette River Bridge (BIC)

1. A one level bridge with no lift span consisting of 5 lanes, 4 general purpose truck friendly lanes, thirteen feet wide with emergency lanes in the center and on the side.
2. To be built to accommodate high wide, it needs to remain at about a low percent ( $2 \%-3 \%$ ) grade.
3. One center lane to be used as a future reversible lane.
4. Two lane width right of way for bicycle and pedestrian traffic on east side of bridge.
5. New lift span bridge with 4 sets of heavy rail tracks, one or more set being for high speed or every heavy rail.

## *

Upgrade Mill Plain Extension to a below grade freeway connecting to I-5:
The Port of Vancouver and the Vancouver industrial areas surface level truck route through downtown on Mill Plain to I-5 is near capacity.

ETA is proposing to trench a deep new, below grade connection to I-5. This removes the surface level truck route on Mill Plain Extension in downtown Vancouver. The addition of capacity to Mill Plain below grade, will prevent $4^{\text {th }}$ Plain from being expanded into a truck route. Trenching can provide an efficient transportation solution for our future needs.


| Highway Type | Hourly Lane <br> Capacity |
| :--- | :---: |
| Freeway | $2,000-2,200$ |
| Principal Arterial | $900-1,200$ |
| Minor Arterial | $700-1,000$ |
| Major Collector | $600-800$ |
| Minor Collector | $450-650$ |
| Local | $300-500$ |

- Adapled from FHWA guidelines


## colluntroisising NEW CORRIDORS/CROSSINGS



## Western Corridor Crossing (RC-14)

A new travel corridor and bridge crossing for freight trains, trucks, cars, buses, bikes/pedestrians, and potentially light rail located west of the existing BNSF railroad. The corridor would begin near Mill Plain and Fourth Plain boulevards in Vancouver, travel through Hayden Island and connect to Marine Drive near North Portland Road in Portland.

## Arterial Corridor Crossing (RC-15)

A new travel corridor and bridge crossing for freight trains, trucks, cars, buses, bikes/pedestrians, and potentially light rail located west of the existing BNSF railroad. The corridor would begin near MIII Plain and Fourth Plain boulevards in Vancouver, travel through Hayden Island, and connect to Marine Drive near North Portland Road in Portland. In addition, this proposal would improve the existing bridges by raising the height, decommissioning the lift span, and adding two travel lanes.

## Western Highway (1-605) (RC-16)

A new western highway to bypass the $1-5$ corridor and connect suburban Clark and Multnomah counties.

Proposal does not meet four of the six criteria from the problem definition. By focusing efforts on a new travel corridor, this proposal does not improve transit service, traffic safety, bicycle/pedestrian mobility, or earthquake safety within the project area.

It is not feasible to widen the existing $1-5$ bridges to accommodate additional travel lanes. A new highway corridor located west of the ralliroad does not meet four of the six criteria from the problem definition. By focusing efforts on a new travel corridor, this proposal does not improve transit service, traffic safety, bicycle/pedestrian mobility or earthquake safety within the project area.

Proposal does not meet any of the six criteria
Yes
identified in the problem definition for the project area.

### 5.3.4 Components RC-14 through RC-19, RC-21, and RC-22 (New Corridor Components)

Most of these new corridor components were suggested during the NEPA scoping process and are conceptual in nature. Project staff has not developed detailed alignments or engineering designs for these components. That said, enough is known about their general location and intended function to substantiate the findings.

# 6 Options West of the <br> I-5 Interstate Bridge Studies and Status 

## INTERSTATE 5 WEST BYPASS

COLOR by VINTON

and issucjates
INTERSTATE 5
VEST BYPASS

## Decision: Do Not Study Further

## Overview:

This Option Package involves construction of a new westside freeway corridor. A specific alignment has not been established.

## Package Elements:

Baseline improvements, plus...
New Freeway Corridor:

- New freeway and bridge west of the existing I-5 bridge connecting Clark County, Washington and Washington County, Oregon


## I-5 Corridor:

- Potential improvements in the Special Analysis Areas:

1) Rose Quarter and 2) Lombard to SR 500

## Studied previously and ...

- Would do little to address congestion in l-5 corridor (most trips in I-5 corridor start or end near I-5)
- Very significant environmental impacts to Vancouver lowlands, Sauvie Island, Tualatin Mountains
- Conflicts with local, regional, and state land use policies

The following table summarizes the decisions of the l-5 Task Force regarding Option Packages for the l-5 Corridor. Those packages designated as "study further" will be evaluated over the summer and results will be available in the fall of 2001. Those packages designated as "do not study" will be dropped from further consideration by the I-5 Task Force.

| Package | Task Force Decision |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. Baseline (no new Columbia River Crossing) | Study further |
| 2. Express Bus on New Bridge, Without Additional Freeway Corridor Capacity | Study further |
| 3. Light Rail Transit on New Bridge Without Additional Freeway Corridor Capacity | Study further |
| 4. Commuter Rail Without Additional Freeway Corridor Capacity | No Decision by Task Force yet. Recommendation is to defer further study until results from Rail Capacity Analysis are available (Fall 2001) |
| 5. Planned Regional Bus With Additional Freeway Capacity | Do not study-refine as an option in Package 6 |
| 6. Express Bus to Downtown Portland With Corridor-Wide Freeway Capacity Increase (includes new Columbia River crossing) | Study further |
| 7. Light Rail Transit With Corridor-Wide Freeway Capacity increase (includes new Columbia River Crossing) | Study further |
| 8. New Arterial Road: Mill Plain to US 30, with Columbia River Crossing | Study further |
| 9. New Freeway Corridor | Do not study |

Washington and Oregon working together for the economy, jobs and quality communities

### 5.3.4.3 RC-16 New Western Highway (1-605)

## Description:

This component creates a new western bypass connecting suburban Clark and Multnomah Counties. Figure 5-18 shows this component.

Figure 5-18. New Western Highway (I-605)

\%

## Rationale for Not Advancing:

- This component fails Question \#1. Year 2020 I-5 peak traffic demands are projected to increase about 20 percent over 2005 conditions and without added capacity in the Bridge Influence Area, significant traffic congestion will result (e.g., 7 to 8 hours during the midday-evening period). Fouls pg 5-15 Same book Says
- This component fails Question \#2. This component would not improve transit service to the identified I-5 corridor transit markets, nor does it improve the performance of the existing transit system within the Bridge Influence Area.
- This component fails Question \#3. Year 2020 I-5 peak traffic demands are projected to increase about 20 percent over 2005 conditions and without added capacity in Bridge


## West Arterial

## New West Arterial Road



The major feature of this option is a new atterial road along the existing railroad corridor and N . Portland Rd .
between Mill Plain Blvd. in Vancouver and US 30 in Fortland.
$\qquad$

## Question 5: West Arterial Road?

## Description

* A new road along the existing railroad corridor and N. Portland Rd. between Mill Plain in Vancouver and US 30 in North Portland provides to access between Portland and Vancouver, particularly for freight between the ports of Vancouver and Portland, and to the Columbia Corridor, and the Northwest industrial are. This improvement is also targeted to reduce truck traffic in the St. Johns and North Portland neighborhoods and provides an alternative access to Hayden Island.


## Travel Time

* There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the [-5 corridor.


## Transportation Performance

- Improves travel times in the $1-5$ corridor by 6 minutes compared to today.
* Substantially reduces delay on truck routes compared to Baseline 2020 and prevents delay on truck routes from growing worse than it is today.
- Carries about 9600 vehicles over the Columbia River during the evening peak period.
* The West Arterial Road's four-lane bridge over the Columbia River is near capacity during the moming and afternoon peak periods.
- Traffic increases on key Vancouver roads compared to Baseline (data from pom. peak):

| th Plain Blvd | $25 \%$ increase in traffic |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mill Plain Blvd. | $84 \%$ increase in traffic |

- Traffic decreases on key Portland roads compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

Marine Drive 27\% decrease in traffic
Hayden Island Interchange
$6 \%$ decrease in traffic
St Johns Bridge $\quad 54 \%$ decrease in traffic

- Traffic increases slightly on US 30 in Portland compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

US $30 \quad 6 \%$ increase in traffic

## Transit Ridership

* There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the I-5 corridor.


## Environmental Impacts

* Major environmental impacts on Hayden Island that are difficult to avoid and will need to be mitigated.
- Improves the quality of life in the St. Johns neighborhood in Portland due to providing an attractive alternative route for trucks to get to and from industrial areas on the Peninsula.
- Because most of the roadway would be built over the railroad and in the railroad cut, there are fewer direct community impacts (egg. noise, air pollution, and visual) than if the alignment were elsewhere.


## Displacements

- Least amount of overall displacements compared to $1-5$ improvements ( 22 displacements for West Arterial Road vs. 24 for 3 lane and 42 for adding a $4^{\text {th }}$ lane).


## Other

- Requires agreement with the railroad


## Cost

* $\quad \$ 947 \mathrm{M}(2001 \mathrm{~S})$.


## Decision: Study Further

## Overview:

This Option Package involves a new arterial road between US 30 in Portland and Mill Plain Blvd. in Vancouver.

## Package Elements:

Baseline improvements, plus...

## Arterial System Improvements:

- Provide arterial linking US 30 in Portland to Mill Plain in Vancouver. Would involve a new crossing of the Willamette River and a new crossing of the Columbia River near existing rail corridor across Hayden Island


## I-5 Improvements:

- Potential freight and other improvements in the Special Analysis Areas: 1) Rose Quarter and 2) Lombard to SR 500

Option Package No. 1 Continued

## Arterial Road Improvements:

All Option Packages have a common set of arterial road improvements based on adopted regional transportation plans. meatsRTP is aerrently in RTP As idenifified

- Arterial improvements in all packages include: corridor
- Widen Marine Drive to 5 lanes from Terminal 6 to Portland Road
$\longrightarrow$ New 4 lane bridge to Hayden Island from Marine Drive
- Improve Columbia/Killingsworth intersection and connection to l-205
$\longrightarrow$. North Lombard overcrossing into Rivergate

The following table summarizes the decisions of the l-5 Task Force regarding Option Packages for the l-5 Corridor. Those packages designated as "study further" will be evaluated over the summer and results will be available in the fall of 2001. Those packages designated as "do not study" will be dropped from further consideration by the l-5 Task Force.

| Package | Task Force Decision |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. Baseline (no new Columbia River Crossing) | Study further |
| 2. Express Bus on New Bridge, Without Additional Freeway Corridor Capacity | Study further |
| 3. Light Rail Transit on New Bridge Without Additional Freeway Corridor Capacity | Study further |
| 4. Commuter Rail Without Additional Freeway Corridor Capacity | No Decision by Task Force yet. Recommendation is to defer further study until results from Rail Capacity Analysis are available (Fall 2001) |
| 5. Planned Regional Bus With Additional Freeway Capacity | Do not study - refine as an option in Package 6 |
| 6. Express Bus to Downtown Portland With Corridor-Wide Freeway Capacity Increase (includes new Columbia River crossing) | Study further |
| 7. Light Rail Transit With Corridor-Wide Freeway Capacity increase (includes new Columbia River Crossing) | Study further |
| 8. New Arterial Road: Mill Plain to US 30, with Columbia River Crossing | Study further |
| 9. New Freeway Corridor | Do not study |

Washington and Oregon working together for the economy, jobs and quality communities

## VIII. Freight and Passenger Rail

a. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):

1. Work is currently underway to identify the capital and operating needs of the freight and passenger rail system. This work is expected to be complete in April 2002.
2. As part of the freight and passenger rail analysis, the estimated cost, ridership, and viability of a commuter rail system will be completed, and following public input, discussed by the Task Force.
3.The Task Force will develop and recommend a plan for improving Corridor heavy rail in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.

## VIII. Environmental Justice and Community Enhancements

a. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):

1. The Task Force recognizes the need to address environmental justice and community concerns resulting from these working draft recommendations. The Task Force directs project staff to: a) continue conducting the environmental justice analysis, b) work with the affected communities to collaboratively explore potential community concerns regarding these working draft recommendations and c) develop measures to address those concern, such as neighborhood connectivity, a community foundation, air quality monitoring, etc. As a part of addressing environmental justice and community enhancements, a plan for addressing the needs of local streets will also be developed.
2. The Task Force will develop and recommend a plan based on the environmental justice analysis and community concerns in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.

## IX. Implementation and Financing Strategy

a. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):

1. An implementation strategy describing the phasing of improvements, TDM/TSM actions, and land use actions needs to be developed. The Task Force will develop and recommend an implementation strategy in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.
2. Capital and operating costs of the working draft recommended improvements, even for improvements already in regional transportation plans, will likely exceed expected revenues. The Task Force will develop and recommend a financing strategy in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.

## X. West Arterial Road

a. Draft Recommendation:

1. Further study of this option should be pursued and identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.
b. Notes:
2. This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system including: relieving traffic on I-5, providing an additional connection between Oregon and Washington, relieving the St. Johns neighborhood of through truck traffic, and providing an efficient south-north arterial for a) freight movement between key industrial areas in the Portland/Vancouver area and b) other traffic in North Portland.
3. However, the traffic impacts to Vancouver neighborhoods and the downtown Vancouver district are significant. It is very likely that arterial roads leading to this new connection would need to be widened to accommodate the traffic traveling between the West Arterial Road and the freeway. The widening of these arterial roads would need to be mitigated.

## XI. Additional Elements and Strategies Considered

1. As part of the Task Force's work it considered many potential elements and strategies that are not specifically commented upon in this draft document. They include: addressing the corridor's problems with land use actions and/or transportation demand management alone, a new freeway with bridge outside the I-5 corridor (East of I-205, West of I-5) to connect Oregon and Washington, monorail, personal rapid transit, hovercraft buses, people-movers, water taxi, ferry, helicopters, gondola, etc. The Task Force also considered various combinations of the elements and strategies noted.
2. If you would like more information about those topic or have additionat ideas, comments or concems, please visit the project web site at: www.I-5partnership.com or call us at 1-866-STUDYI-5.

## XII. Next Steps:

- Further Public Input and Task Force Work: February through June, 2002
- June 2002 - Task Force Adoption of Final Strategic Plan Recommendations



## IX. Additional Elements and Strategies Considered

## A1 Key Findings - West Arterial Road

(a) The West Arterial Road is a possible complement to, but does not substitute for I-5 improvements. While this potential improvement falls slightly behind on all measures of transportation performance it does provide significant benefits. Compared to Baseline 2020 time travel savings between downtown Portland and downtown Vancouver are approximately 6 minutes, delay is reduced by $20 \%$, and congestion is reduced by $17 \%$.
(b) This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system including: relieving traffic on I-5, providing an additional connection between Oregon and Washington, relieving the St. Johns neighborhood of through truck traffic, and providing an efficient south-north arterial for a) freight movement between key industrial areas in the Portland/Vancouver area and b) other traffic in North Portland.

## XI. Next Steps and Implementation

B1 Recommendations - Next Steps and Implementation:
(a) This Strategic Plan should be sent to the Oregon Transportation Commission, the Washington Department of Transportation, and to the metropolitan planning organizations in Portland and SW Washington for review and potential adoption into their transportation plans.
(b) Parallel with the adoption of the transportation recommendations into the regional transportation plans, the metropolitan planning organizations in Portland and SW Washington should adopt a Bi-State Coordination Agreement and establish the BiState Coordination Committee. Once established, the Bi-State Coordination Committee should proceed with all deliberate speed to:
i. Form the TDM/TSM Forum and begin its work on the I-5 TDM/TSM Corridor Plan,
ii. Begin discussions and planning for investing more in the 1-5 Corridor, including focused TDM/TSM actions that can be taken now, and
iii. Form the Rail Forum and begin its work.
(c) As to highway and transit capital investments in the corridor:
i. Oregon and Washington, and the Portland/Vancouver region, should work together to identify opportunities to fund the widening of I-5 to 3 lanes in each direction between Delta Park and Lombard. This project is anticipated to be ready for construction by September 04.
ii. As a first step towards making improvements, the bi-state region should undertake an Environmental Impact Study for a new river crossing and potential improvements in the Bridge Influence Area. That study and the implementation of these recommendations should be guided by the Task

3. Joint use or non-joint use Freeway/LRT Bridge;
4. 8-lane freeway with joint LRT/2-lane arterial; and
5. HOV throughout the I-5 Corridor.

In addition, a 6-lane freeway plus two 2-lane arterials, one in the vicinity of the I-5 corridor and one in the vicinity of the railroad bridge, should be evaluated to determine if it is a viable alternative for consideration in the EIS.

The following concepts do not show promise for addressing the Corridor's problems and should not be considered in an EIS:

1. Collector-Distributor bridge concepts;



## Recommendation: Defer Study Decision to Fall 2001

## Overview:

This Option Package focuses on development of commuter rail between downtown Portland and Clark County without an increase in corridor-wide freeway capacity.

## Package Elements:

Baseline improvements, plus...

## Transit Improvements:

- Establish commuter rail service on new rail alignment including tunnel under North Portland, new stations in Portland and Vancouver, and a new rail bridge across the Columbia River and North Portland Harbor
- Establish feeder bus service to rail stations g


## I-5 Improvements:

- Potential freight and other improvements in the Special Analysis Areas: 1) Rose Quarter and 2) Lombard to SR 500
* The Was Defer and the West Arterial never had the \#'s Add to Study-

Option Package No. 4: Key Factors Leading to Recommendation to Defer Decision to Study

- Existing freight rail facilities in the corridor are operating near full capacity and may require major improvements in the future
- Commuter rail as a stand-alone project will also require major investments in new facilities
- Options for commuter rail should be considered as part of a coordinated heavy rail (freight and passenger) investment strategy

West arterial was Tabled because of no pail pieft + com muter $\#$.

## Table 2-5. Performance Comparison

## RTC Simulation Studies

## Portland, Chicago, Northern California



[^0]${ }^{1}$ Delay ratio = Delay Time/Elapsed Time. In the Chicago Switching District RTC Base Case, the delay ratio was 20\%; 1,977 freight trains in 96 hours accumulated 813 hours of delay. In other words, Portland has $1 / 1$ the number of trains, but $1 / 2$ the delay of Chicago, which is frequently very congested.
cire heavy Rail is twice as congested a Chicago nasal yArd: Chilagols real yourd are consider very congested-

New third Bridge e BNSF rail line would add rail Capacity + make up grades to current Rail Bridge Crossing, in cluing y ard.


# Reduce Congestion on I-5 

## Proposed arterial would attract traffic off I-5 to a new expressway built over the railroad tracks in the exiting cut:

## THE NORTHWEST PASSAGE

What it does
Connects major regional industrial areas on one route.

- Creates a fast, direct route to downtown Portland and downtown Vancouver.
- Removes $25 \%$ of the traffic off of I-5 and $15 \%$ off of I-205. Also improves I-84.
- Reduces traffic on many local streets.
- Connects nine major arterials in less that six miles.
- Located away from I-5, so a single incident will not close all river crossings.
- Second way off of Swan Island.
- Second Bridge to Jantzen Beach and third bridge to Vancouver

What it is:

- Expressway over existing railroad in existing cut through North Portland.
- Double deck bridges over both the Willamette and Columbia rivers for trains (freight and commuter rail), trucks, cars, bikes and pedestrians.

Unlike construction on I-5, this can be built without interfering with traffic and destroys fewer homes than any other option - most required land is now vacant. But it may not remain vacant for long - this may be our last chance to solve this problem.

Sharon Nasset's Northwest Passage Proposal:
New bridges over the Columbia \& Willamette Rivers for:

Freight rail
Commuter rail
Express way
Vehicle
Bike
Pedestrian
Sharon Nasset $\quad 503.283 .9585$
Sharonnasset@aol.com
www.NewInterstateBridge.com brochure $\# 4 \mathrm{~b}-10 \mathrm{wpd}$ eo


The NW Passage o Booklet

## THE <br> BI-STATE INDUSTRIAL CORRIDOR

BIE and Boonlet


Reduce Congestion on I-5 and connect our $20^{\text {th }}$ century industrial areas with a $21^{\text {st }}$ century transportation system. The proposed arterial would attract traffic off I-5 to a new Bi-State Industrial Corridor. The "BIC" (Bi-State Industrial Corridor) expressway would be built next to the BNSF railroad tracks using mostly vacant and under utilized land. This arterial will connect all of the major regional industrial areas on one continuous corridor.

The current lack of direct access to I-5 from regional industrial areas costs business millions of dollars every year. These infrastructure deficiencies cause congestion, pollution, and discourages businesses from locating or expanding in the Portland Metropolitan Area.

The Economic Transportation Alliance (ETA) proposal is that: The corridor's north end would start at Fourth Plain and I-5 in Vancouver Washington and would have a multi-modal (train, truck, automobile, transit, bike, pedestrian and space for light rail) bridge from Vancouver through Hayden Island to Marine Dr. in Portland Oregon. The corridor would upgrade North Portland Rd. continuing to Columbia Blvd. Corridor. The North Willamette Bridge to HWY 30 will form the south end of the new corridor which would be reached using Marine Dr. Corridor or Columbia Blvd. Corridor. "BIC" will transform existing transportation corridors and arterials into one complete system.

## Bi-State Industrial Corridor

- Third bridge between Vancouver and Portland
- Port to Port connection
- Truck friendly direct access into regional industrial areas from I-5
- Reduces congestion on I-5 and in neighborhoods
- Possible light rail connection to Jantzen Beach and Downtown Vancouver
- Provide bike and pedestrian connection to Jantzen Beach, Vancouver and Portland's 40-mile loop
- No demolition of Jantzen Beach business district or residential area
- Lessens air pollution and removes truck traffic from St. Johns, Kenton and Vancouver Neighborhoods


## Key Highlights

Road

- Port to Port connection
- Truck friendly direct access into regional industrial areas from I-5
- Direct access from the NW industrial area, to Rivergate, Port of Portland and Vancouver's industrial area
- Direct access to Marine Dr. Corridor, Columbia Corridor, St. Helen's HWY. and Mill Plain Extension
- Upgrades North Portland road to four lanes
- Provides Columbia Corridor with a north I-5 freeway entrance
- Provides I-5 with an exit from the north to the Columbia Corridor


## Rail

- A new heavy rail bridge across the Columbia River removes inadequacies in the current system
- A new heavy rail bridge increases capacity for freight and commuter rail and possible high speed rail


## Transit

- New bus routes into industrial areas, retail, and entertainment centers
- Space for light rail connection to Jantzen Beach and downtown Vancouver
- Commuter rail


## Local connection

- Access to downtown Vancouver
- A second bridge to Jantzen Beach
- Bike access from Vancouver to Jantzen Beach, Portland and the 40 -mile loop
- Pedestrian access from Vancouver to Jantzen Beach, Portland and the 40-mile loop


## Environment

- Removes truck traffic from St. Johns, Kenton and Vancouver Neighborhoods
- Removes street level commuter \& freight traffic from Vancouver's Mill Plain Extension
- Lessens air pollution in St. John's, Kenton, Vancouver and I-5 Neighborhoods
- Built next to, not through, Jantzen Beach wet land
- No demolition of Jantzen Beach business' or residential areas
- No encroachment to Historic Fort Vancouver



## Area Character and Land Use

## Bistate Industrial

 CorridorKey Highlights
Road

- Port to Port connection
- Truck friendly direct access into regional industrial areas from I-5
- Direct access from the NW industrial area, to Rivergate, Port of Portland and Vancouver's industrial area
- Direct access to Marine Dr. Corridor, Columbia Corridor, St. Helen's HWY. and Mill Plain Extension
- Upgrades North Portland road to four lanes
- Provides Columbia Corridor with a north I-5 freeway entrance
- Provides I-5 with an exit from the north to the Columbia Corridor


## Rail

- A new heavy rail bridge across the Columbia River removes inadequacies in the current system
- A new heavy rail bridge increases capacity for freight and commuter rail and possible high speed rail


## Transit

- New bus routes into industrial areas, retail, and entertainment centers
- Space for light rail connection to Jantzen Beach and downtown Vancouver
- Commuter rail


## Local connection

- Access to downtown Vancouver
- A second bridge to Jantzen Beach
- Bike access from Vancouver to Jantzen Beach, Portland and the 40 -mile loop
- Pedestrian access from Vancouver to Jantzen Beach, Portland and the 40-mile loop


## Environment

- Removes truck traffic from St. Johns, Kenton and Vancouver Neighborhoods
- Removes street level commuter \& freight traffic from Vancouver's Mill Plain Extension
- Lessens air pollution in St. John's, Kenton, Vancouver and I-5 Neighborhoods
- Built next to, not through, Jantzen Beach wet land
- No demolition of Jantzen Beach business' or residential areas
- No encroachment to Historic Fort Vancouver



## Area Character and Land Use

## Bistate Industrial Corridor



## New Partnership Offers Real Solutions Oregon Initiative Partnership Program (OIPP)

Several studies have pointed out the damaging economic effects of congestion and pollution in the Portland/ Vancouver Metropolitan Area. Transportation deficiencies affect the economy of our state and several nearby states. New businesses are not locating here, existing businesses are not expanding, and some are leaving. Thirty years ago, studies found that a new bridge was needed to the north peninsula industrial area to maintain economic viability. Oregon is losing a billion dollars or more annually from transportation congestion. It does not have the funding to build a transportation system to meet the needs of existing businesses, let alone to build a stronger economy. The State of Oregon has decided to allow the creation of pri-vate-public partnerships to fund needed transport system improvements. (OIPP, SB772, ORS 367.800)

With business losing more in congestion cost than the money to correct the problem, private-public partnerships are a win-win process for the State of Oregon and its economy.

The Economic Transportation Alliance is proposing to raise funds to, design and build the Bi -State Industrial Corridor. This corridor includes multi-modal three tiered bridges with heavy rail on the bottom, truck friendly lanes on the second level and automobile, space for future light rail, bike and pedestrian lanes plus viewpoints on the top level.

Strategically placed new bridges and upgrading of North Portland Road will join the region's major industrials areas on one continuous corridor.

## BIC Features

A multi-modal bridge across the Columbia River

| Heavy rail | Automobile | Commuter rail |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrian | Bike | Space for Light rail |
| Truck | Look-out area |  |

North Portland Road upgraded to a four lane highway between Marine Dr. and Columbia Blvd.

A multi-modal bridge across the Willamette River

| Heavy rail | Bike | Transit |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Truck | Pedestrian |  |

## Bi-State Industrial Corridor

Upgrade Mill Plain Extension to below grade freeway
The proposal is to trench a deep new, below grade connection to I-5. This would remove the surface level truck route on Mill Plain Extension in downtown Vancouver. The addition of capacity to Mill Plain below grade, will prevent $4^{\text {th }}$ Plain from being expanded into a truck route. Trenching can provide an efficient transportation solution for our future needs.

## The Goal <br> Build and fund in 5 years

We can do it, you can help! Write, call or email the Governors of Washington and Oregon and ask them to stop the current task force's TWO YEAR search for a place to cross the Columbia River.


## Instead start building the BIC Now:

1. Governors of Oregon and Washington put out a notice to engineering companies interested in BIC concept.
2. Use the currently available $\$ 50$ million study funding money to fund EIS.
3. Create a dedicated account for the building of the BIC.
4. Start fund raising dedicated to building BIC, using private public partnership tools.
5. Pick engineering company
6. Build.

## Funding

With the funding for the EIS in place, the next step is to determine the cost of the new corridor. Much of the land is already in right of way, public land or owned by the ports. With land for the corridor being mostly vacant and under utilized the cost is less then other proposed routes through highly valued commercial properties. Using private public partnership tools, fund raising can begin soon. Consider a dime a gallon fuel tax for a five year period.

How can you help? Send a letter in support of ETA's Bi-State Industrial Corridor to:

Govemor Christine Gregoire Representative Brian Baird (D-WA 3rd)
Office of the Governor
PO Box 40002
Olympia, WA 98504-0002
(360) 902-4111, Fax (360) 753-4110

Governor Kulongoski
160 State Capitol
900 Court Street
Salem, Oregon 97301-4047
503.378.4582, FAX 503.378.6827

Representative Brian Baird (D-WA 3rd)
1421 Longworth House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515-4703
(202) 225-3536 Fax: (202) 225-3478

Local Office:
O.O. Howard House, 750 Anderson St., Ste. B
Vancouver, WA 98661
Phone: (360) 695-6292

Congressmen Blumenauer
2446 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-3703
Phone: (202) 225-4811
Fax: (202) 225-8941
Local Office:
729 N.E. Oregon St., Ste 115
Portland OR 97232
Phone (503) 231-2300 Fax: (503)230-5413

Washington Commissioners:


Washington Address c/o Washington Transportation Commission PO Box 4730, Olympia, Wa. 98504-7308 Phone: 360 705-7070 fax: 360 705-6802

OregonCommissioners:


Oregon Address clo OTC 355 Capital St.N.E., Salem, Or. 97301-3871
Phone: 503 986-3450
Fax: 503 986-3432

# Description of the BI-State Industrial Corridor for Placement in the Official Records of Columbia River Crossing 

includes<br>\title{ Description of the Northwest Passage and<br><br>Description of the West Arterial }

March 22, 2006<br>Sharon Nasset<br>Director, Economic Transportation Alliance

Phone: (503)283-9585
Email: sharonnasset@aol.com

## BI-State Industrial Corridor (BIC)

1. From highway 30 , 124 th to Oil Time Road in Oregon connects with existing arterial Marine Dr., N. Lombard St., Columbia Blvd. and North Portland Rd. to Vancouver Washington along the east side of the BNSF north alignment to perhaps Ridgefield Washington. P
2. BIC is a freeway corridor and would have nine or more complete ramps as entrance and exit access with NO stop lights.
3. A complete ramp is north and south access ( 18 or more). This would be in addition to and with no change of Fruit Valley Rd. There are several existing arterials in Vancouver that currently connect with the BNSF rail line.
*Due to grade issues the trenching of Mill Plain has been removed.

## Columbia River Bridge (BIC)

1. A high span bridge with 2 levels and no lift span.

The Lower Level Consistingonsisting of 8 lanes with 4 in each direction. Truck friendly lanes thirteen feet wide with emergency lanes in the center and on the sides. This level is to be built to accommodate high wide and needs to remain at about a 2 percent grade.
The Top lLevel Four lanes with 2 general purpose lanes in each direction general and an emergency lane on the side.
Three lanes transit only, 1 as a future reversible lane and 2 lanes for transit. Two lane width for sidewalk, bike and viewing.
2. New rail tracks lift span bridge with 4 tracks(lor 2 extra heavy for high speed and large loads.) Commuter rail to be established with the new additional capacity.
3. Remodel of the existing BNSF from a swing to a lift span, adding a second lift to line up with the current I-5 bridge.

## North Portland Road

North Portland Road to be upgraded to 4 lanes each in North/South direction. The upgrade from Marine Dr. to Columbia Blvd. As North Portland Rd. borders both Smith and Bybee lakes, this would provide both access and create a pedestrian friendly promenade.

## Willamette River Bridge (BIC)

1. A one level bridge with no lift span consisting of 5 lanes, 4 general purpose truck friendly lanes, thirteen feet wide with emergency lanes in the center and on the side.
2. To be built to accommodate high wide, it needs to remain at about a low percent ( $2 \%-3 \%$ ) grade.
3. One center lane to be used as a future reversible lane.
4. Two lane width right of way for bicycle and pedestrian traffic on east side of bridge.
5. New lift span bridge with 4 sets of heavy rail tracks, one or more set being for high speed or every heavy rail.

## *

Upgrade Mill Plain Extension to a below grade freeway connecting to I-5:
The Port of Vancouver and the Vancouver industrial areas surface level truck route through downtown on Mill Plain to I-5 is near capacity.

ETA is proposing to trench a deep new, below grade connection to I-5. This removes the surface level truck route on Mill Plain Extension in downtown Vancouver. The addition of capacity to Mill Plain below grade, will prevent $4^{\text {th }}$ Plain from being expanded into a truck route. Trenching can provide an efficient transportation solution for our future needs.


| Highway Type | Hourly Lane <br> Capacity |
| :--- | :---: |
| Freeway | $2,000-2,200$ |
| Principal Arterial | $900-1,200$ |
| Minor Arterial | $700-1,000$ |
| Major Collector | $600-800$ |
| Minor Collector | $450-650$ |
| Local | $300-500$ |

- Adapted from FHWA guidelines

ings. Further information $\partial_{n}$ these topics is available in several technical memoranda and reports. Source material for this report is cited in these documents, which are:
- "Development of Alternative Scenarios"
- "The Economic Benefits of Highway Improvements"
- "Economic Evaluation of Alternative Scenarios"
- "Factors Affecting Employment Growth in Southwest Washington"
- "Freight Rail Existing Conditions"
- "Transportation Assessment of Alternative Scenarios"
- "2020 Baseline Conditions"

These documents may be obtained from:

- Dan Layden, ODOT Region 1, 123 NW Flanders St., Portland, OR 97209 (503) 731-8565
- Brian McMullen, WSDOT, SW Region, 4200 Main St., Vancouver, WA 98668 (360) 905-2055


### 1.3 Study Area

Fig. 1 on page 5 is a map of the I-5 Trade Corridor Study area, which includes Interstate 5 and its vicinity from I-84 in Oregon to I-205 in Washington. The study corridor is important to the regional and national economy and includes many important community and economic assets:

- Interstate 5, the only continuous interstate highway on the West Coast between Canada and Mexico, linking the region with California, Canada and Mexico.
- The interchange of east-west and north-south mainline rail lines that connect the nation's agricultural heartland with major Pacific Rim ports. The east-west mainlines in particular are unique because they run at water level, making rail service on these rail lines among the most competitive in the United States.
- The Columbia River, second in trade volume only to the Mississippi River, linking the Pacific Rim and Portland/Vancouver to the nation's agricultural heartland. The Columbia River makes possible the deep-water ports of Portland and Vancouver, two major West Coast ports that connect this region with the Pacific Rim and the rest of world.
- The Rivergate, Columbia Corridor and Vancouver industrial areas, which provide high-wage jobs. The corridor includes Downtown Vancouver, the region's second largest city and neighborhoods in north-northeast Portland and Vancouver.

The convergenice of transportation, port, industrial and community resources in this area makes it a unique crossroads for trade, industry and transportation, which are critical to the health of the economies of Oregon and Washington.

## BRIDGE CISION CLOSER

2. 8 (x)

A proposal to modify the 1908 Vancouver railroad bridge is closer to a decision on whether the task would qualify for federal Truman-Hobbs maritime safèty dollars. The work would give the bridge a lift span closer to the center of the Columbia River, thus reducing risky maneuvering by towboat skippers trying to use the Interstate 5 bridge's hump area. The biggest beneficiaries would be rush-hour motorists on Interstate 5, but the Coast Guard says land traffic cannot be considered in the decision.

## Tugboat route options

Straight throughToday via wide spanIf new rail bridge span is installed
## Interstate Bridge facts

A: Lift span
Vertical clearance 38 ft .
to 174 ft., horizontal 270 ft .
B: Short span
Clearance 38 ft . by 265 ft .
C: Long span
Clearance 46 ft . to 68 ft . by 520 ft .
D-E: Hump spans
Clearance 72 ft . to 75 ft . by 265 ft .


# Transportation Documents from <br> Oregon, Washington, PDOT, and Metro Recommending Studies of Bridges And <br> Arterial on the Same Alignment as the <br> BI-State Industrial Corridor. 

## Things we know, from our millions of dollars in studies.

1. The US Coast Guard will not allow new lift span bridges over the Columbia River marine barge channel.
2. Lift span supplemental bridges, have the highest impacts increase marine navigation hazards in the ship channel. pg.27/4.6.3
3. Lift span bridges cause traffic stoppage, and accidents creating unreliable transportation times.
4. Collector-distributor bridge systems have design problems, therefore provide little transportation benefit; such design problems will be difficult to overcome. pg27/4.7.2
5. Collector-distributor systems show the least improvement in performance. pg.25/4.2.2
6. The arterial-only connection would only slightly improve the freeway performance by removing local trips. Users of the freeway system would continue to experience a significant increase in congestion and delay throughout the I-5 Trade Corridor. Pg.23/4.2.4
7. These concepts do not show promise for addressing the corridor's problems and should not be consider in an EIS. Pg.29/R4.9

Collector-distributor bridge concepts, arterial-only bridge concepts, tunnel concepts.
8. Marine Dr. Corridor and Columbia Corridor must both be in the mix??..
9. Heavy rail and commuter rail must be included as part of the solution..
10. The I-5 Corridor is to capacity, overflows adversely affect I-205 and I-84.

Recommendation BIA / R4.4
When adding river-crossing capacity and making improvements in the BIA. Every effort should be made to A. Avoid displacements and encroachments, B. Minimize the highway footprint in the corridor, and minimize use the freeway for local trips.
$\checkmark$ Pg26/4.5.2: Three of the four concepts encroach into Delta Park.
$\checkmark$ Pg26/4.5.4: All concepts have encroachments onto the Fr. Vancouver Historical Site.
$\checkmark$ Pg26/4.5.5: All concepts have encroachment on the Historic I-5 Columbia River Crossing Bridge

Recommendation BIA / R4.4
When adding river-crossing capacity and making improvements in the BIA. Every effort should be made to:
A. Avoid displacements and encroachments, .... $\checkmark$ majority vacant and under utilized land.
B. Minimize the highway footprint in the corridor, ........... $\checkmark$ Not one flaggers on I-5!
C. Minimize use of the freeway for local trips. ........... $\checkmark$ Complete local access between Vancouver, Hayden Island, North, and Northwest Portland without accessing I-5.

## Third Bridge Now!

In a new corridor, with direct link access to I-5!

## Portland /Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership <br> Information pages from Final Strategic Plan 2002

Why should a third bridge option be studied?
In the 1980's, the elected officials of Oregon and Washington declared the I-5 corridor to capacity. Studies have taken place on what how to deal with the magnitude of the problem since. The finding of these studies and other transportation studies in the area have made clear the deficiencies in the transportation infrastructure.

Finding of the 1999 Portland /Vancouver I-5 trade and Corridor Study.

1. The magnitude of the problem requires new freight and passenger capacity across the Columbia River.
2. The Portland / Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor is home to the region's largest industrial areas. This area includes the Port of Portland and Port of Vancouver. These ports combined means we are the second largest volume of exports on the West Coast Ports.
3. The complexity of problem requires that the new capacity multi-faceted. It should include highway, transit, heavy rail, and demand management, while also supporting the vitality of the river-based economy.
4. Increased spillover traffic from I-5 on parallel arterials such as Martin Luther King Blvd., and Interstate Ave. will adversely impact neighborhoods and will diminish the opportunities for more neighborhood business development in the areas.
5. Increased congestion on arterial roads through the industrial corridor leading to and from I-5 will dampen the region's ability to meet its job growth goals in the North Portland and Vancouver industrial areas
6. Without additional transportation investments, congestion on I-5 and corridors arterials will greatly increase. This will dramatically affect access to important port and industrial property, and access to jobs and housing in the bi-state regions.
7. *Recommend for further evaluation should be.
*Providing new highway and transit capacity across the Columbia River and in the I-5 Corridor. Improving critical freight arterials in the corridor such as Marine Drive and Columbia Boulevard. Improving the freight rail in the corridor, in cooperation with the private operators of the rails system.

The Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan 2002 On the West Arterial (which is a similar alignment as the Third Bridge Corridor.)

1. Recommend further study of this option should be pursued and identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.
2. This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system including: relieving traffic on I5, providing and additional connection between Oregon and Washington and providing an efficient south-north arterial for A) freight movement between key industrial areas in the Portland/ Vancouver area and B) other traffic in North Portland.
3. Provides significant benefits saving travel time between downtown Portland and downtown Vancouver approximately delay is reduced by $20 \%$ and congestion is reduced by $17 \%$.
4. Recommended for further study is an arterial in the vicinity of the railroad bridge, for freight, commuter rail capacity, and local access between the states without accessing I-5.

In the EIS, the following BIA elements should be studied :
"One in the vicinity of the railroad bridge, should be evaluated to determine if it is a viable alternative."


## Things we know, from our millions of dollars in studies.

1. The US Coast Guard will not allow new lift span bridges over the Columbia River marine barge channel.
2. Lift span supplemental bridges, have the highest impacts increase marine navigation hazards in the ship channel. pg.27/4.6.3
3. Lift span bridges cause traffic stoppage, and accidents creating unreliable transportation times.
4. Collector-distributor bridge systems have design problems, therefore provide little transportation benefit; such design problems will be difficult to overcome. pg27/4.7.2
5. Collector-distributor systems show the least improvement in performance. pg.25/4.2.2
6. The arterial-only connection would only slightly improve the freeway performance by removing local trips. Users of the freeway system would continue to experience a significant increase in congestion and delay throughout the I-5 Trade Corridor. Pg.23/4.2.4
7. These concepts do not show promise for addressing the corridor's problems and should not be consider in an EIS. Pg.29/R4.9

Collector-distributor bridge concepts, arterial-only bridge concepts, tunnel concepts.
8. Marine Dr. Corridor and Columbia Corridor must both be in the mix??..
9. Heavy rail and commuter rail must be included as part of the solution..
10. The I-5 Corridor is to capacity, overflows adversely affect I-205 and I-84.

## Recommendation BIA / R4.4

When adding river-crossing capacity and making improvements in the BIA. Every effort should be made to A. Avoid displacements and encroachments, B. Minimize the highway footprint in the corridor, and minimize use the freeway for local trips.
$\checkmark$ Pg26/4.5.2: Three of the four concepts encroach into Delta Park.
$\checkmark$ Pg26/4.5.4: All concepts have encroachments onto the Fr. Vancouver Historical Site.
$\checkmark \operatorname{Pg} 26 / 4.5 .5$ : All concepts have encroachment on the Historic I-5 Columbia River Crossing Bridge

## Recommendation BIA / R4.4

When adding river-crossing capacity and making improvements in the BIA. Every effort should be made to:
A. Avoid displacements and encroachments, ... $\checkmark$ majority vacant and under utilized land.
B. Minimize the highway footprint in the corridor, .......... $\checkmark$ Not one flaggers on I-5!
C. Minimize use of the freeway for local trips. ............ $\checkmark$ Complete local access between

Vancouver, Hayden Island, North, and Northwest Portland without accessing I-5.

## Third Bridge Now! <br> In a new corridor, with direct link access to I-5!

## Portland /Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership

Information pages from Final Strategic Plan 2002

Why should a third bridge option be studied?
In the 1980's, the elected officials of Oregon and Washington declared the I-5 corridor to capacity. Studies have taken place on what how to deal with the magnitude of the problem since. The finding of these studies and other transportation studies in the area have made clear the deficiencies in the transportation infrastructure.

Finding of the 1999 Portland /Vancouver I-5 trade and Corridor Study.

1. The magnitude of the problem requires new freight and passenger capacity across the Columbia River.
2. The Portland / Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor is home to the region's largest industrial areas. This area includes the Port of Portland and Port of Vancouver. These ports combined means we are the second largest volume of exports on the West Coast Ports.
3. The complexity of problem requires that the new capacity multi-faceted. It should include highway, transit, heavy rail, and demand management, while also supporting the vitality of the river-based economy.
4. Increased spillover traffic from I-5 on parallel arterials such as Martin Luther King Blvd., and Interstate Ave. will adversely impact neighborhoods and will diminish the opportunities for more neighborhood business development in the areas.
5. Increased congestion on arterial roads through the industrial corridor leading to and from I-5 will dampen the region's ability to meet its job growth goals in the North Portland and Vancouver industrial areas
6. Without additional transportation investments, congestion on I-5 and corridors arterials will greatly increase. This will dramatically affect access to important port and industrial property, and access to jobs and housing in the bi-state regions.
7. *Recommend for further evaluation should be.
*Providing new highway and transit capacity across the Columbia River and in the I-5 Corridor. Improving critical freight arterials in the corridor such as Marine Drive and Columbia Boulevard. Improving the freight rail in the corridor, in cooperation with the private operators of the rails system.

The Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan 2002
On the West Arterial (which is a similar alignment as the Third Bridge Corridor.)

1. Recommend further study of this option should be pursued and identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.
2. This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system including: relieving traffic on I5, providing and additional connection between Oregon and Washington and providing an efficient south-north arterial for A) freight movement between key industrial areas in the Portland/ Vancouver area and B) other traffic in North Portland.
3. Provides significant benefits saving travel time between downtown Portland and downtown Vancouver approximately delay is reduced by $20 \%$ and congestion is reduced by $17 \%$.
4. Recommended for further study is an arterial in the vicinity of the railroad bridge, for freight, commuter rail capacity, and local access between the states without accessing I-5.

In the EIS, the following BIA elements should be studied :

> "One in the vicinity of the railroad bridge, should be evaluated to determine if it is a viable alternative."

## Recommend for further study by transportation task forces

The Columbia River Crossing EIS is required by the Federal Government to study a range of viable options. Therefor options with the BNSF alignment have been accepted for study in the Columbia River Crossing EIS.

The Portland /Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor finding recommended further evaluation of a new highway and transit capacity across the Columbia River in the I-5 Corridor.

Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership recommended further evaluation of the West Arterial alignment at the BNSF Columbia River Crossing.

Columbia River Crossing Bi-state Task Force acknowledge these recommendation by accepting BIState Industrial Corridor. They knew of the corridor from the I-5 Partnership study recommendations and because it has been presented to the Regional Transportation Council, the Washington Transportation Commission, Oregon public private partnership, and several elected officials.
**CRC staff used maps directly from the newinterstatebridge.com web site. Staff renamed the project RC-14

## Once accepted to Oregon requires Context Sensitive Solution to take effect $s$ that all projects receive equal attention on all phases.

Draft Step A Screening Report pg. 5-14/ 5.3.4
Components RC-14 Through RC-19, RC-19 RC-21 and RC-22 (New Corridor Components)
Most of these new corridor components were suggested during the NEPA scoping process and are conceptual in nature. Project staff has not developed detailed alignments or engineering designs for the components. That said, enough is known in about their general location and intended function to substantiate the findings.

## Study a range of viable options required by FHWA

This statement right here says they did not study viable options.
That is not an equal modeling with all the option. Some options have been studied engineered and design including on and off ramps.

Here are a very few basic question that need to be study.
Does this option take traffic out of the I-5 corridor?
How much traffic taken out of the I-5 corridor will help the safety issue of close entrance and exit ramps?
Does this option help with access to the ports and industrial areas?
Does this option it help with spillover traffic problems in our neighborhoods?

Does this option help the congestion on the entire I-5 corridor?
Does this option help with the air pollution problem on I-5 and adjacent neighborhoods?
Does this option help contain urban sprawl?
What is the cost of the land?
What is the cost of building a project on I-5?
What project has the best time line for building?
What project has the least displacement of business, and residences for right of way?
The cost of displacement on different options?

## Corridor is recommended in other studies.

A new bridge crossing near the BNSF rail, and a North Willamette Crossing west of the St. Johns' Bridge have been identified in several transportation documents in Oregon and Washington. This alignment is in the Regional Transportation Plan, Metro Corridors of Significance, Portland Freight Master Plan, Portland Port studies, I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership study, and others.

This alignment connects the majority of our major regional industrial areas in Oregon and Washington as well as the ports of Portland and Vancouver on one continuous corridor. Strategically located bridges transform our existing transportation corridors and arterials into one complete system. This system will have vehicle access north, south, east, and west across the rivers without having to access I-5.

This third bridge corridor is inside the I-5 corridor with access to I-5. Traffic is diverted off of I-5, I-205, and I-84. A new third bridge will provide the first local access to Vancouver, Hayden Island, and Portland.

The deficiencies in our transportation infrastructure are well documented. The I-5 corridor has been considered to be at capacity since the 1980's with daily spill over into neighborhood arterial and air quality problems. The I-205 corridor is considered to be near capacity 9 years ahead of schedule. The need for a new north / south corridor is known and is identified in ODOT's Potential Strategic Capacity Enhancement Investments.

For this reason and many other reasons, it is important to have a full EIS. A new corridor is needed. If a new bridge on I-5 is the best answer, it will come out in a full EIS. Not comparing a range of viable option is inappropriate behavior towards the citizens of our two states and does not following the Federal Government EIS, requirements. The findings of the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnerships was for further study because of the new corridor's great merit and significance freight movement and economic benefits. Because we will need a new corridor, we must at the very least study it right now, while we have the money. This study to have integrity must answer these question and more.

## The Bi-State Industrial Corridor BIC and the Bridge Influence Area BIA

|  | BIC | BIA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economy: <br> - Port to Port connection <br> - Truck friendly, direct access into regional industrial areas from I-5. <br> - Connects the majority of the industrial areas on one continuous corridor in Vancouver / Portland. <br> - Provides new transportation capacity and infrastructure in the industrial areas. <br> - provides access to Vancouver Port's and Industrial areas has $1100+$ acres of buildable industrial land creating jobs and needing access. <br> - North peninsula has $x x x x$ acres of buildablex industrial land creating jobs and needing access. <br> - North Willamette Bridge provides access to US 30 and Scappoose's airport expanded for corporate on time delivery from regions industrial areas.. <br> - New bridges to carry communication utilities corridors. | YES | NO |
| Amount of displacements. | Less than 20 | More than 20 |
| Historic property encroachments. | Yes | Fort Vancouver grounds and Columbia River Crossing bridges. |
| Expensive land | No most vacant and under utilized land. | Yes <br> Highly densified, urbanized, high profile, and on I-5. |
| Takes traffic out of the I-5 Corridor | Yes | No |
| Takes traffic out of neighborhoods near I-5. | Yes | Adds traffic to neighborhoods near I-5 |
| Takes traffic off Marine Dr. exits and I-5 Identified as freight priority. | Yes | No |
| Takes traffic off Columbia Blvd. exit and I-5. Identified as freight priority. | Yes | No |
| Local bridge access to Jantzen Beach without accessing I5. | Yes | No and sometimes you must cross the Slough twice to get there. |
| Local bridge access between Vancouver and Portland without accessing I-5. | Yes | No |
| Provides new bridges for heavy rail adding capacity for freight and commuter. | Yes | No |
| Creates new third $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{s}$ corridor ODOT Connect Oregon: Potential Strategic Capacity Enhancement Investments goal one. | Yes | No |
| Build New Bridge near BNSF identified in RTP Freight Master Plan, I-5 baseline 2020. | Yes | No |
| No interruption of I-5 during construction. | Yes | Yes flaggers and lane loss for up to 5 years on I-5. |
| Takes air pollution off I-5 and out neighborhoods near I-5 | Yes | Adds pollution over 2002 rate in neighborhoods near I-5. |
| Moves bottleneck south of I-5 Columbia River Bridge | No | Yes |



Majority of BIC on Bare and vacant Land.

Island, construction costs, traffic staging, operating concerns, and potentially other concerns as well.
4.7.7 If subsequent studies indicate that the two modes can and should be considered separately, there is potential time savings for LRT, which may be implemented in a shorter time period given that substantial environmental and design work has already been completed in the South/North EIS.

## RECOMMENDATION 4: Bridge Influence Area

R4.1 New transit and vehicle capacity should be constructed across the Columbia River in the I-5 Trade Corridor.

R 4.2 For vehicles, there should be three through-lanes (and not more than three) in each direction and up to two auxiliary and/or arterial lanes in each direction across the Columbia River (total five lanes in each direction). For transit, there should be two light rail tracks across the Columbia River in the l-5 Trade Corridor.

R 4.3 In the Bridge Influence Area, SR 500 to Columbia Boulevard, the freeway needs to be designed to balance all of the on and off traffic, consistent with three through lane Corridor capacity and up to five lanes of bridge capacity, in each direction.
R 4.4 In adding river-crossing capacity and making improvements in the Bridge Influence Area, every effort should be made to (a) avoid displacements and encroachments, (b) minimize the highway footprint in the Corridor, and (c) minimize use of the freeway for local trips.
R 4.5 The proposed design should include safety considerations.
A 4.6 As a first step towards making improvements, the bi-state region should undertake an Environmental Impact Study for a new river crossing and potential improvements in the Bridge Influence Area.
R4.7 In the EIS, the following BIA elements should be studied:

- Eight- or ten-lane freeway concepts
- Replacement or supplemental bridge
- Joint use or non-joint use freeway/LRT bridge
- Eight-lane freeway with joint LRT/two-lane arterial
- HOV throughout the I-5 Trade Corridor

R 4.8 Evaluate whether or not a six-lane freeway plus two two-lane arterials, one in the vicinity of the l -5 Trade Corridor and one in the vicinity of the railroad bridge, is a viable alternative for consideration in the EIS.
R4.9 The following concepts do not show promise for addressing the Corridor's problems and should not beconsidered in an EIS:

- Collector-distributor bridge concepts
- Arterial-only bridge concepts
- Tunnel concepts

R4.10 Special consideration needs to be given to the architectural aesthetics of any new structures to be built, particularly any new bridge structures.

## ExECUTIVE Summary

# The Cost of Congestion to the Economy of the Portland Region 

Prepared for: Portland Business Alliance, Metro, Port of Portland and Oregon Department of Transportation

Prepared by: Economic Development Research Group, Inc., Boston, MA December 2005

## Conclusion

The region's economy is transportation-dependent. Despite Portland's excellent rail, marine, highway and air connections to national and international destinations, projected growth in freight and general traffic cannot be accommodated on the current system. Increasing congestion -- even with currently planned improvements -will significantly impact the region's ability to maintain and grow business, as well as our quality of life.

Action is needed to remain competitive with other regions that are planning large investments in their transportation infrastructure. This report finds that:

- Being a trade hub, Portland's competitiveness is largely dependent on efficient transportation, and congestion threatens the region's economic vitality.
- Businesses are reporting that traffic congestion is already costing them money.
- Failure to invest adequately in transportation improvements will result in a potential loss valued at of $\$ 844$ million annually by 2025 - that's $\$ 782 \mathrm{per}$ household -- and 6,500 jobs. It equates to 118,000 hours of vehicle travel per day - that's 28 hours of travel time per household annually;
- Additional Regional investment in transportation would generate a benefit of at least $\$ 2$ for each dollar spent.


## Background

As a first step to addressing the Portland region's rising congestion problem, public and private sector partners commissioned a study to provide base-line information about the relationship between investments in transportation and the economy.

This report does not recommend a level of funding for transportation improvements, nor does it endorse a specific package of improvements. Instead, it is intended as a
springboard for discussions about planning for and investing in the Portland metropolitan region's transportation system.

## Congestion and the Economy

## 1. The region's economy is transportation-dependent, especially on its roads and highways, for the movement of freight.

In comparison with other U.S. metropolitan areas of similar size, Portland's competitiveness is largely dependent on the region's role as a gateway and distribution center for domestic inland and international markets. Some other metropolitan areas have larger bases of research, venture capital, and higher education, or are surrounded by greater population centers that enable their economies to be competitive even with more congested highway conditions.

- "Traded" industries, which bring new money into the region and enable the rest of the economy to prosper, require an efficient transportation system.

Portland's economy depends on industries that could locate elsewhere, but have been attracted to the area because of its advantageous trading position. Those industries include: computer equipment, wood products, metal products, tourism, publishing, wholesale distribution activities and gateway port activities.

Because traded industries depend on the movement of freight, reasonably good transportation access must be maintained if those industries are to remain and grow in the Portland area in the years to come.

- All modes -- roads, transit, air, marine, and freight rail -- are important to an efficient transportation system, but few alternatives exist to a smoothly functioning road and highway system for on-the-clock business travel.

Portland is located at the confluence of two navigable rivers and is served by two intercontinental rail lines and an international airport. However, these modes commonly require a road system to get to and from a terminal or parking lot. While alternatives such as rail and bus transit help alleviate congestion for many commuters, these transit services do not meet the specialized needs of business travel for delivery of freight and other services. As many business-related trips are subject to schedule requirements, businesses become "prisoners of congestion," significantly increasing their cost of doing business.

- In addition to road congestion, there are limitations with rail, air, and
marine service and connections, which are critical to business needs as well.


## 2. Congestion is already impacting large and small businesses and hurting their competitiveness.

Interviews with local business leaders reveal how traffic congestion is affecting their operations. Many businesses have already made schedule changes to avoid peak afternoon traffic conditions. However, businesses have expressed a growing concern that the relatively few windows of time when congestion is not a problem are shrinking.

Businesses reported the following impacts of congestion:

- Costs for additional drivers and trucks due to longer travel times;
- Costly "rescue drivers" to avoid missed deliveries due to unexpected delays;
- Loss of productivity due to missed deliveries;
- Shift changes to allow earlier production cut off;
- Reduced market areas;
- Increased inventories;
- Costs for additional crews and decentralized operations to serve the same market area.

Specific examples of how businesses are being harmed by congestion:

- Intel has moved their last shipment departure time up two hours for outbound shipments through PDX because of increased p.m. peak congestion. A missed flight affects production across the globe and can result in costly operational changes.
- Sysco Foods opened a new regional distribution center in Spokane to better serve their market area, because it was taking too long to serve its market from the Portland area; others are following suit.
- Providence Health Systems reported medical deliveries, which have to be rapid and frequent, are getting very difficult on the west side, with routine runs requiring more than four hours. As a result, Providence is planning a relocation of warehousing and support operations at a cost (independent of construction) from $\$ 1-1.5$ million in 2006/7.
- OrePac has increased inventories by $7 \%$ to $8 \%$ to mitigate for congestion delays, which represents a lost opportunity for other investment.
- Other businesses have managed to restructure their operations to deal with congestion, but many have reached the point at which operational changes are resulting in real costs. As an example, PGE estimates that it spends approximately $\$ 500,000$ a year for additional travel time for maintenance crews.

As congestion continues to worsen, businesses in this region will be at a competitive
disadvantage. Businesses that serve local needs either absorb the added costs and reduce their profits, or pass these costs on to the region's consumers through higher prices. Trade-oriented businesses, however, can respond by moving their operations, and the jobs they provide, to locations outside the region.

Failure to address the negative impacts of congestion is likely to result in the loss of jobs as existing businesses expand elsewhere or relocate and the region attracts fewer new businesses. This also has a ripple effect on other businesses and suppliers throughout the region and the state.

## Overall Impacts of Congestion on the Economy

Transportation forecasting models show that currently planned transportation investments will not keep up with traffic growth, resulting in severe congestion delays.

This will affect how well the region can compete for new jobs and cost each household an additional 50 hours of lost time annually by 2025. Simply put, congestion reduces the advantage of location, which is particularly troubling for the Portland metropolitan region because its traded industries are dependent on transportation.

The study compares a Planned Investments Scenario, anticipated to be funded over the next twenty years, to an Improved System Scenario, which would double transportation investment over the next 20 years. The Improved System Scenario would result in significantly less congestion growth during morning and afternoon peaks, key times for businesses. It would also save 28 hours of travel time per household annually by 2025.

- Economic benefit: The total value of benefit from such an investment is $\mathbf{\$ 8 4 4}$ million annually by 2025. It also supports 6,500 additional permanent jobs as of 2025 , as well as $2,000-3,000$ construction jobs annually.

This total combines the value-added income generated in the region and the value of time savings to individuals. Under a higher investment scenario, businesses are able to convert travel time savings into additional sales, resulting in $\$ 426$ million a year of value-added benefit and 6,500 jobs. The benefit to businesses would also be complemented by significant time savings and higher quality of life for residents, valued at $\$ 418$ million a year. This scenario, while not eliminating congestion, will improve reliability, which is also critical to business travel.

## - Return on Investment: Under an Improved System Scenario, each dollar

## invested returns at least $\$ 2$ in value.

Some significant costs are incurred in the early years of the study period, and benefits continue to phase in over a longer time period. Looking at both the cost stream and the benefit stream in terms of their net present value, the analysis shows a potential benefit/cost ratio of about $\$ 2$ to every dollar invested.

## Next Steps

The stakes are high for the economy and quality of life in the Portland metropolitan region, representing thousands of jobs and billions of dollars.

Many other regions, including Chicago, Atlanta, LA, Houston, Seattle and Vancouver BC , have undertaken similar studies and are taking action to address congestion. Examples from around the country illustrate the range of policies and programs that can be adopted to mitigate future congestion growth. More importantly, these examples demonstrate the need for the Portland metropolitan region to act now to reduce the impacts of congestion and preserve our continued economic competitiveness.

This study is intended to provide useful information to the public, the business community and government decision-makers as they work to formulate transportation policy, projects and funding decisions. The study should be used as a springboard for future discussions about planning for and investing in the Portland metropolitan region's transportation system.

This report also outlined a number of potential tools, such as road and transit capacity enhancement, system management, and pricing strategies that are being considered in other cities, and should also be considered here as we look at solutions. Local business and government leaders should immediately have a discussion about the impacts of congestion and solutions in order to protect and enhance the local economy and quality of life.

# This page and the next are the detailed conclusions from the city of Portland's St. John's Truck Strategy Columbia Corridor Transportation Study. 

## LONG-RANGE ALTERNATIVES

The St. Johns Truck Strategy Advisory Committee notes that the short-term recommendations for projects address only improvement to the existing situation, which includes inherent conflicts. There is no short-term solution or easy fix that would separate the existing truck-street choices from the residential and retail-commercial areas of St. Johns, without a significant impact on freight movement. For many local as well as non-local truck trips, the St. Johns Bridge provides the most convenient, obvious, and efficient route between US 30 and the Rivergate Industrial District, Columbia Corridor and 1-5.

The conflicts created by the existing choices for truck routes across the peninsula will continue to worsen as truck trips increase. These conflicts are likely to be solved only through the creation of an alternative to the present route choices (Figure 5). Such an alternative would necessarily find a way to separate truck traffic from the St. Johns Pedestrian District. Such a separation, in turn, strongly implies the creation of an alternative to the use of the St. Johns Bridge for freight movement between US 30 and the Rivergate Industrial District, Columbia Corridor and l-5.

Directing trucks to use the l-5 Freeway and the Fremont or Marquam Bridges, as the only access to and from US 30 will create significant inefficiencies for the movement of both local and non-local truck-freight because of an increase in miles of vehicle travel and travel time. It also means only $1-205$ would provide a back up route to the use of l-5, resulting in even greater vehicle miles and travel time for access to US 30 .

To provide a complete solution to the conflicts between truck-freight and residential and retailcommercial uses, separating truck trips from the St. Johns Pedestrian District is essential. Three new routes have been identified as providing for the desired separation:

1. North Willamette Crossing. Build a bridge between the Rivergate Industrial District and US-30. This option is currently included in the Regional Transportation Plan Preferred List, for study. This option has a high potential in terms of capturing the cross-peninsula non-local truck movement on the peninsula. Travel time analysis indicates that this route would provide competitive trip times with possible alternatives (St. Johns Truck Strategy: Modeling Analysis, 2000).
2. Burlington Northern Rail Road Bridge. Rebuild and/or modify the Burlington Northern Rail Road Bridge and the N. Carey Boulevard right-of-way and Rail Road "cut" to accommodate trucks. This option has the highest potential to capture cross-peninsula non-local truck movement on the peninsula. Travel time analysis indicates that this route would provide competitive trip times with possible alternatives (St. Johns Truck Strategy: Modeling Analysis, 2000).

- Trucks passing through or around Cathedral Park
- Conflict with railroad and/or port operations
- Existing and proposed river-related development
- Several different ownerships (Port of Portland, Union Pacific, McCormick, EPA, Zidell, University of Portland. City of Portland, et. al.)
- Potentially conflicting plans for a riverbank greenway trail
- Environmental concerns created by the need for fills, retaining walls, or a bridge structure along significant portions of the identified riverbank
- Significant portions of the riverbank area are zoned to preserve natural features, discouraging or even prohibiting development

While the two bridge options include some potential for environmental conflicts, the river road option displays a low potential to capture any significant truck movement by itself. There is no significant movement of trucks between the Rivergate and Swan Island Industrial Districts (St. Johns Truck Strategy: Modeling Analysis, 2000). The potential to capture non-local truck movement is only significant for the third option when one of the two preceding alternatives is also in place, and a connection between the "River Road" option and one of these new river crossings is made.

All three of these options have been recommended and forwarded to Metro for consideration under the Regional Transportation Plan. The Regional Transportation Plan includes a recommended study to determine the need and/ or appropriate location for a bridge crossing near the mouth of the Willamette River (See: Appendix C).

Letters from the two affected neighborhoods accompanied this recommendation. The St. Johns Neighborhood Association has gone on record as rejecting all interim (short-term) actions as inadequate to the needs of the peninsula and, instead, have consistently promoted one or some combination of all the above long-term actions as necessary. The Friends of Cathedral Park have also expressed a preference for a long-term solution, eliminating the movement of non-local trucks through St. Johns. (See: Appendix C)

## FIGURE 5 LONG RANGE OPTIONS
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## FIGURE I

RECOMMENDED PROJECTS MAP


Taffic Calming and Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Projects
If Lombard St.
2z Fessenden St
-3. St. Louis Ave.
4. Columbia Blvd.

Truck Street Improvements
(5) Lombard/St. Louis/Ivanhoe Intersection
(3) Ivanhoe/Philadelphia Intersection
(7) Columbia Blvd/Portland Rd/Columbia Way Intersection
-8= Burgard/Lombard Street Segment

This map shows the recommendations of the St. John's Truck Study.
Do you consider this traffic pattern acceptable for regional freight movement? Does this look like a realistic solution for a modern $21^{\text {sh }}$ century transportation network?

FIGURE 4
TRANSPORTATION NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS


The year 2020 modeling done for this study (St. Johns Truck Strategy Modeling Analysis, City of Portland, Office of Transportation, 2000) shows that while the volume of trucks will increase by approximately one and one-half times, these patterns will remain essentially the same, unless significant changes are made.

-----Original Message-----
From: Cox, David [mailto:David.Cox@fhwa.dot.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2005 4:44 PM
To: pauloedgar@qwest.net
Subject: RE: Economic Development Research Group
Paul,
Thank you for your efforts to bring a regional perspective and a sense of accountability to the congestion problems in the Portland area. I agree with nearly everything you are trying to accomplish and I appreciate your efforts to "keep the pressure" on the leaders of the Region. In my opinion, we are on the same side...and we want the same things for Portland / Vancouver. If we differ at all, it's in the matters of scope and timing. Let me explain:

Scope: I think our goal should be, not to fix one corridor between Portland and Vancouver, but to fix them all. I don't want to just widen I-205, or build a new Columbia River Crossing at I-5 or to build a new third bridge connecting the Ports and better serving the western communities...I want all three, and, looking to the twenty year future, the metropolitan area will need all three. So what we are trying to do is to pursue a strategy that will give us the best chance of getting all three.

Timing: The question is...How to do this, and in what order??? Should we try for the easier (and less expensive) widening of $1-205$ first? Maybe, but if so, that might reduce the perceived need for an improved I-5 corridor? Should we try for the third bridge first to improve the connection between the Ports with a new "freight" corridor? Maybe, but that might be seen as a substitute for widening I-205 and for improving the I-5 corridor.

So, what we seem to be settling on is trying to get the most difficult project (the I-5 corridor) underway first. If we can get that project started (and funded) and prove to the public and the legislature our ability to make a positive difference at the I-5 crossing...then, it is not such a great leap to build public support for the other two, and ...there is no question that both other projects can still stand on their own as necessary and cost effective. The fear is, if we do I-205 or the third bridge between the Ports first, than these projects will be used by some as an excuse to not support the I-5 improvements and we will further delay the replacement of these critical bridges.

I hope that you can accept (or at least not object to) this strategy. In fact, my real hope is that you will use your considerable influence to support and help us find a way to build all three of these needed projects.

Thank you again for your active support of improved transportation in the Portland / Vancouver area.
David O. Cox
Division Administrator
FHWA - Oregon Division
503-399-5749



The study finds that failing to adequately invest in our transportation system will result in a potential loss to the regional economy of $\$ 844$ million annually by year 2025 - that's $\$ 782$ per household and 6,500 permanent jobs. Additional investment in the regional transportation system would provide a renurn of at least $\$ 2$ for every dollar spent.

The "Cost of Congestion" study highlights the importance of our transportation infrastructure to our region's businesses and overall competitiveness. Because this region is uniquely trade dependent, it is critical to our economy, and therefore our quality of life, that we adequately invest in improvements that ensure an efficient and reliable transportation system. With that as context, we offer the following comments on the DRAFT Evaluation Framework.

Comments/suggestions on Step B: Component Screening Criteria and Measures:

## 1. Community Livability

### 1.8 Support local comprehensive plans

Comment: We believe it would be beneficial to further define the word local. Our understanding is that some neighborhood plans are recognized by their respective city's comprehensive plans while others are not. While it is important to consider neighborhoods that are most heavily impacted within the bridge influence area, this project is regional in scope and should remain focused on our shared regional vision.

Suggested language change: 1.8 Support regional and local comprehensive plans
2. Mobility, Reliability, Accessibility, Congestion Reduction and Efficiency
2.5 Potential (on a qualitative scale) for component to increase the level of persons and vehicles crossing Columbia River via I-5 by mode during the peak period.

Comment: The majority of component screening measures gauge improvements during all periods, not just during the peak period or midday period. Many freight related businesses have made schedule changes to avoid peak traffic conditions. Therefore, it is important to increase throughput throughout the day not just during the peak period. We understand that CRC staff has been working from models with data limited to the peak period but in the near term may have access to models with more expanded data.

Suggested language: 2.5 Delete 'during the peak period'

## 3. Modal Choice

### 3.4 Decrease percentage of Single Occupancy Vehicle travel

Comment: Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips are typically thought of as discretionary or non-business based. However, many of these SOV trips are, in fact, business related. Utility maintenance crews or business people making regional sales calls are seldom in a vehicle defined as a medium or heavy truck (see the discussion below regarding Regional Economy; Freight Mobility) and are therefore classified as an SOV trip. We believe that decreasing the percentage of SOV travel by offering alternatives, such as bus rapid transit or light rail, is a worthy goal. However, it is equally important to recognize the percentage of SOV trips that cannot be accommodated by these altematives and that these business- $\leftarrow$ EXClusion related SOV trips are also critical to the regional economy. We hope that this point will be taken into consideration during the alternatives analysis.
5. Regional Economy; Freight Mobility
5.1 Potential (on a qualitative basis) for component to reduce delay for trucks on I-5 through the bridge influence area during midday periods Comment: We strongly support any component that will improve freight mobility within the bridge influence area. However, as described earlier, it is important to measure how each component will reduce delay throughout the day, not just during midday or peak hour periods.

Suggested language: 5.1 Delete 'during midday periods'
5.4 Improve freight truck throughput of the bridge influence area.

Comment: Freight truck, for the purposes of this project, is defined as medium (a commercial vehicle under $40,000 \mathrm{lbs}$ and under six tires) and heavy (over $40,000 \mathrm{Ibs}$. and over six tires) This definition excludes smaller delivery and maintenance trucks that also play a role moving freight in and through the I-5 bridge influence area. In addition, as discussed above, business-related SOV trips are also an important part of the regional economy. All of these business-related trips play a role in our regional economy and their role should be adequately taken into consideration during the development and screening of alternatives.

Suggested Addition; 5.5 Maintain or enhance road and rail freight access to Ports and associated transportation facilities

## 6. Stewardship of Natural Resources

We support the values reflected by each of these criteria. However, it may be unrealistic to expect that the transportation components will enhance wildlife habitat, endangered fish, plants, wetlands and water quality. We would suggest adding the language "avoid or minimize" to criteria $6.1,6.2,6.4,6.5$.

Suggested language:
6.1 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance endangered fish or wildlife habitat.
6.2 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance other fish or wildlife habitat.
6.4 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance wetlands.
6.5 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance water quality.

## 8. Cost Effectiveness and Financial Resources

To the extent possible, funding for various project components should be directly linked to related funding mechanisms.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on this important document.
Sincerely,


Christopher Kopca
Portland Business Alliance
Transportation Committee Chair
cc: Mike Baker, CRC Project Staff

### 4.2 CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS

Participants were asked their primary reason for using $1-5$. The responses are indicated in Table 3 below:

Table 3. l-5 Commuter Usage Percentages

|  | Type of Usage | Percent of <br> Usage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Commuting to and from work | $32 \%$ |  |
| To shop or visit friends | $29 \%$ |  |
| Other business reasons | $15 \%$ |  |
| Move freight | $2 \%$ |  |
| Commuting to and from school | $1 \%$ |  |
| Other | $12 \%$ |  |

## 

Participants were asked to rate whether they considered each of eight problems others have identified with the existing I-5 crossing at the Columbia River as a major problem, minor problem, or not a problem. The results are shown in Table 4:

Table 4. Problem Types and Percentages

| Spill over |  | Major Problem | Minor Problem | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not a } \\ \text { Problem } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The $1-5$ bridge cannot handle traffic during peak-use/rush hour periods | 87\% | 10\% | 3\% |
|  | The 1.5 bridge is not capable of meeting future traffic demands as the region's population grows | 87\% | 9\% | 4\% |
|  | Congestion in the $1-5$ bridge influence area decreases public transportation travel speed and service reliability | 75\% | 20\% | 5\% |
| $\rightarrow$ | Access roads, entrance ramps and merge lanes are unable to handle traffic leading to the $\mathrm{l}-5$ bridge | 73\% | 22\% | 5\% |
|  | The bridge does not meet standards to withşand earthquakes or natural disasters at the $1-5 /$ Columbia River Crossing | 70\% | 25\% | 5\% |
|  | Truck access to port and commercial facilities is inefficient in the l-5 Columbia River Crossing project area | 59\% | 33\% | 8\% |
|  | Bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the I-5 Columbia River Crossing area are inadequate or nonexistent | 41\% $\leftarrow$ | 40\% | 19\% |
|  | The I-5 bridge cannot handle traffic during non-peak/non-rush hour periods | 41\% | 37\% | 22\% |

Participants were asked to rate the importance of potential project issues. The results are indicated in Table 5:

Table 5. Priority of Project Issues

|  | Major Priority | Minor Priority | Not a Priority |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reduce commute time during peak use/rush hour periods | 77\% | 17\% | 6\% |
| Make sure there is a sound plan to pay for changes to the transportation facilities and services in the project area | 74\% | 23\% | 3\% |
| Improve public transportation services between Portland and Vancouver | 73\% | 28\% | 9\% |
| Improve transportation safety in the project area | 63\% | 32\% | 5\% |
|  | 54\% | 38\% | 8\% |
| Limit the environmental and economic impact that changes may have on residents and businesses in the project area | 51\% | 41\% | 9\% |
| Make sure benefits and negative impacts associated with the project area are equitably distributed | 50\% | 41\% | 10\% |
| Preserve fish and wildlife in the project area | 48\% | 39\% | 13\% |
| Preserve historic sites, and cultural and recreation resources in the project area | 48\% | 41\% | 10\% |

# Strategic Freight Initiative 

Portland Freight Commitiee

After nearly two years of discussion about the issues and opportunities facing Portland's business community, the Portland Freight Committee is pleased to present its multi-faceted Strategic Freight Initiative.
The context for this Initiative is the understanding that freight movement in the Portland region is anticipated to double by the year 2020, and how our approach to accommodating this growth can translate into the kind of compelling economic development that will have profound economic effects for our future prosperity. The Initiative is built on the following components:

- Leadership - establishing and executing the Plan
- Land Development - overcoming obstacles to development of our valuable industrial parcels
- Job Creation - training of the labor needed for this growth
- Transportation Connections - speeding the flow of goods increases productivity

The combination of these components will lead to sustained and continued economic growth. The application begins with a series of investments to more fully develop our valuable industrial sector coincidental with new transportation connections, both of which lead to job creation and productivity gains. The cycle reinforces itself.


Implementation of this Initiative will not only put us in a position to accommodate this growth, but will represent the City's dedication to economic development of those systems that touch all businesses, and send a message to companies seeking to relocate to Portland and/or considering expanding current operations within Portland, that the City is both a willing and strategic partner.
This Strategic Freight Initiative will require investment, planning, and most importantly, core participation by the City's most important leadership bodies: the Mayor, City Council, Port of Portland, and Business Leaders. Our regional partners - Oregon Department of Transportation and METRO - are essential to this discussion as well.

The following handout summarizes the elements of the Strategic Freight Initiative.

## Leadership - Initiating Economic Development in Freight Districts <br> Create a multi-agency/multi-disciplinary Economic Development Leadership Team

The Competitiveness Task Force would be charged with developing a strategic plan and an implementation approach to increasing our competitiveness for international and domestic trade. The Task Force would have a budget to hire staff, specialized technical services, hold workshops and forums, publications, and travel to communities which may provide a model for how to proceed. Following the example of the Chicago Metropolis non-profit group, local business leaders would be appointed to the team by Mayor Potter, and would provide ongoing status reports, press announcements, hearings and documents. Final findings would be presented to the City Council.

- The business of the Task Force could be a top priority of the Mayor's economic development agenda and could include participation from staff from the Mayor's Office, City Council members, Portland Business Alliance, Portland Freight Committee, Columbia River Container Service Committee, Port of Portland, and agency directors from the Portland Development Commission, Office of Transportation, Bureau of Planning, and others, as the Task Force deems necessary.
- Charge is to create a short- and long- range strategic plan for how to grow the economy over the next 12 months.
- Continuation of Economic Development Leadership Team will be considered after publication of Strategic Plan.


## Land Development in Industria! Districts

Establish an integrated approach to making available industrial land as marketable as possible.


In combination with the Committee's 'No Net Loss" policy for industrial lands, the elimination of development constraints (such as lack of roadway access, remediation of environmental conditions, etc.) combined with an even stronger marketing campaign to attract industrial companies to Portland needs to be integrated in order to make our available industrial land as attractive as possible. While the Portland Development Commission, Bureau of Planning and Office of Transportation collaborate to improve the marketability of our available industrial property, none of these agencies have a leadership role in overcoming the constraints to development of our available land.

Availability and Demand for Industrial Land in the City of Portland

| Availability of Industrial Land | \# of Acres |
| :--- | :---: |
| "Buildable Land" | 1,811 |
| "Landbanked" | 785 |
| "Infill" | 129 |
| "Underutilized" | 67 |
| "Other" | 687 |
| No Constraints" | 143 |
|  |  |
| Projected Need |  |
| Between 2000-2010 | $\mathbf{7 0 0}$ |
| Between 2000-2020 | $\mathbf{1 , 9 0 0}$ |

Source: Regional Industrial Lands Study Market Demand Analysis

Job Creation at the Airport


Aerial view of PDX Airport area looking north.

The Portland International Airport is one of the state's largest economic generators, generating $\$ 5.6$ billion in regional business revenues and $\$ 1.9$ billion in wages and salaries in 2003. Business revenues of $\$ 3.2$ billion are directly related to the airport, including $\$ 785$ million associated with air cargo activities. As many as 9,000 jobs are directly related to operations at the Portland Airport, while 65,000 other jobs are in some way related to the Portland Airport (most of which are within the regional visitor travel industry).

The 458 acres making up the Portland International Center at the Portland Airport contains a range of uses including mixed use business parks with office space, distribution and warehousing uses. At build-out, the Cascade Station/Portland International Center alone could generate as many as 7,000 jobs.

## Job Creation through Workforce Training/Recruitment for Freight Industry

A curent and growing impediment for freight mobility is the decreasing availability of candidates to fill jobs as truck drivers and railroad personnel. Carriers point out that these are family-wage jobs and provide a wide variety of benefits. The lack of employees is well known to carriers and shippers, alike, but is not as well known to educational institutions and employment agencies who are trying to match individuals with jobs.

Under this initiative, a relationship would be developed between members of the Competitiveness Task Force and a number of employment organizations such as Work Systems, Inc., County and State employment programs, technical schools and community colleges to provide innovative training programs and incentive programs that would serve the truck and rail carriers' industries.

## Columbia Corridor Truckway

Create an exclusive truck roadway in the Columbia Corridor connecting Rivergate to the Airport and east to the eastern City limit between Columbia Blvd and Marine Drive (possible extension to Reynolds site)

(Figure will be revised to show extension of corridor east to eastern Citv limit)
Characteristics:

- Use for trucks and emergency vehicles only
- Access to/from Truck Roadway limited to I-5, I-205, Rivergate, PDX, $181^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (and possible extension to Reynolds site)
- Approximately eight (8) miles long
- Provide for 50 mph
- Could be designed as an over-dimensional truck route
- May need to be tolled - self-financing
- Grade-separated, where appropriate
- At current projections, could serve between 800 to 1,000 trucks during the $4-6 \mathrm{PM}$ peak period
- Could reduce through traffic on Columbia Blvd, Lombard Blvd, Airport Way
- Would resolve anticipated traffic congestion anticipated at multiple locations along the Columbia Corridor.
- Requires further study


## Accelerating Construction of Truck Facilities

Accelerate significant needed infrastructure improvements (Figure will be revised-removing Sellwood Bridge and Rivergate-US 30 Bridge - which is a separate component.)


## Portland Freight Committee's Strategic Freight Initiative <br> Construct a bridge between US 30 and Rivergate

Provide a new connection for trucks only between US 30 and Rivergate to resolve congestion issues, expand freight capacity, and separate heavy truck volumes from heavy passenger vehicle volumes.

## Will insert new figure showing US 30-Rivergate Bridge Connection concept.

## Characteristics:

o Use for trucks and emergency vehicles only

- Access to/from Truck Roadway limited to US 30 and Rivergate
- Approximately, $3 / 4$ mile long
- Provide for 30 mph
- Attain vertical clearance needed for ships visiting Willamette River facilities and railroads or alternatively, create a span that opens for passing marine traffic.
- Could be designed as an over-dimensional truck route
- May need to be tolled - self-financing
- At current projections, could serve between 800 to 1,000 trucks during the 4-6PM peak period
o Could reduce truck traffic within St. Johns commercial district and residential neighborhood.
- Would resolve anticipated traffic congestion anticipated at multiple locations along the Columbia Corridor.
- Requires further study


## Impediment-free Truck Streets

Remove impediments to convenient truck flow on all regional truckways and priority truck streets in the city.


## Characteristics:

o Provide for 105,500 lbs rated bridges

- Provide minimum vertical clearance of $17.0^{\prime}$
- Provide +11.0 ' lanes
- Provide progressive signal system favoring movements on truck streets
- Provide on-street truck loading at appropriate locations
- Grade separate at RR crossings
- Provide ITS throughout the priority and regional truck street network
- Requires further study


Overview
The basclate option includes the regional transit and roadway improvetents and transportation demand management (TDM) measures in the adopted transportation plans for Clark County and the Parkland metropoliter area. This ligure shows the factions of the major improvements expected to affect transportation to, five, and along 1-5. Baseline features are common to all the options alescribed in this document.

Baseline transit endures
Baseline transit features include:

- expanding light rail transit (LRT) from the Expo Center to the Rose Quarter (Fig. B-1)
- adding express bus service Lion Clark County Park-and-Rides to the Expo Center LRT station, the express bu* will use existing lanes across the Coluntva River
- increasing transit service levels in Portland and Clark County according to regional plats

Baseline roadway features
The T-5 improvements include

- adding a Ind lane in each direction from 13 -th to 99h; the new SB lane would operate as HOV during the morning peak period (Figs. B-2 and B-3)
- opening a 3 rd lane in each direction from 9 故h to the $1-5$ Columbia River Bridges in the fall of 2001 : the aces SB lane only will operate
dos HOV danny the more peak period (Figs. B-2 and B-3)
- adding a 3 rd SB lane and improving shoulders Iran Delta Parl; to Lombard (Figs. B-2 ami B-4)
- adage a 3 nd lane in each direction and reconfiguring some exisung ramps in the Rose Quarter (from 1-405 to I-Ki4) (Figs. B-2 and B-5)
- adding ramp metering, freeway realer boards, and other measures to help maintain traffic flow

The arterial improvements include

- wheterng Marne Dr to 5 lanes from Termual 6 to Portland Rd.
- adding a new 4-lane bridge from west Hayden Island to Marine Dr.
- וmpusving the Columbia Blvil/Killingsworih St intersection and connection to l-205
- adding an overcrossing from N. Lombard St. into Rivergate

Baseline ibM mpasuices
Baseline TDM measures ate:

- increasing funding for carpool and vanpool programs
- mereasing funding for employer outreach to promote flies hours and telecommuting
- expanding employer-ipponvoral transit passes to reduce transit fares for commuters
- increasing mixed-use development to reduce vehicle trips
- macasing parking prosy and parking management


Metro

DATE: July 7, 2005
TO: $\quad$ JPACT Members and Interested Parties
FROM: Bridget Wieghart, Corridor and Freight Manager
SUBJECT: Corridor Priorities - Discussion

A subgroup of TPAC has been reviewing the status of the corridor refinement planning work program that was adopted as an amendment to the 2000 RTP. At the June 24 TPAC meeting, Metro staff reviewed, and obtained comments on, potential updates to the work program proposed by the TPAC subgroup. These updates reflect work that has been completed in the first planning period and identify priorities for the second planning period.

At the July 14 JPACT meeting, Metro staff will report on work program updates proposed by TPAC. The proposed updates are reflected in bold on the attached work program. As additional background, I have also attached a summary of the findings of the corridor initiative evaluation that was prepared in 2001.

This is an informational item for discussion. After obtaining feedback from JPACT and the Metro Council on the overall approach, a more detailed work program, which will reflect lead agency, funding status and next steps will be developed.

Work Program for Corridor Refinement Planning Through 2020 (with draft revisions in bold)

| Corridor and Key Facilities Corridor Planning On-Going | First Planning Period (2001-2005) | Second Planning Period $(2006-2010)$ | Third Planning Period $(2011-2020)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-5 (North) Corridor - 1-5 from I-84 to Vancouver | I - 5 Trade Corridor Study Completed | Financial Plan/EIS/Preliminary Engineering Study Initiated |  |
| Powell/Foster Corridor - Powell Blvd. from the west end of Ross Island Bridge to Gresham. Foster Road from Powell to Hwy. 212 Damascus. | Corridor Planning - Phase I Study Completed | Phase II Planning, Powell Street design, Environmental Impact Study and Preliminary Engineering of 1-205 Interchange |  |
| Highway 217 Corridor - Hwy. 217 from Sunset Hwy. To I-5 | Corridor Planning Study Initiated | Environmental Impact Study and Preliminary Engineering |  |
| Sunrise Corridor - Hwy. 212/224 from I-205 to US 26. | Complete Refinement Planning and EIS for Unit 1 Study Initiated | Begin Unit Two Environmental Study |  |
| Macadam/Highway 43 Corridor - Hwy. 43 from Ross Island Bridge to Oregon City. | Transit/Pedestrian/Bike Transportation Demand Management Study/South of the Sellwood Bridge Study Initiated | Environmental Assessment/DEIS and Preliminary Engineering |  |
| I-5 to Highway 99W Connector - Tualatn- Sherwood Road from I-5 to Hwy, 99W. Hwy. 99W from Tualatin-Sherwood Road to Bell Road. | Southern Alignment Study; Complete Exceptions; Right-ofWay Preservation Analysis; Corridor Planning Initiated | Complete Corridor Plan and Environmental Impact Study |  |
| New Major Corridor Refinements Recommended in the Second Period |  |  |  |
| I-84 to US 26 Connector Corridor - Identify major comection from I - 84 to LS 26 between 181st and 257 ti Avenues. | Freight Data Collection Study Initiated, North-South reconnaissance Completed. | Corridor Planning; National Highway and System Truck Designation | Preserve Right of Way; Environmental study \& design of arterial improvements |
| I-205 (South) Corridor from 1-5 to Johnson Cik. Blivd. | Corridor Reconnaissance Planning Initiated | Complete Corridor Planning; Possible Environmental Impact Study |  |
| I-5 (South) Corridor - 1.5 from Hwy. 99W in Tigard to Wilsonvile. | Boediman Road Interchange Study Study Completed | Corridor Planning | Environmental Impact Study |
| I-405 Loop | Corridor Reconnaissance Study Completed | Corndor Planning: Initata Envirormentai study of priority Improvements |  |
| Other Corridors |  |  |  |
| North Willamette Crossing Corridor - Sudy new crossing near St. Johns Bridge (Hwy. 30 from NW Newberry Road to EN Railroad Bridge). |  |  | Corridor Planning |
| Highway 213 Corridor - Hwy. 213 from I-205 to Leland Road. | Construct Southbound Turning lane on Highwy 213 Study Completed | Implement Funded Recommendations of Highway 213 Design Study | Refine Corridor Planning and Design |
| Barbur Blvd./I-5 Corridor - Hwy. 99W and I-5 from I - 405 to Tigard. | Implement Transit Service Improvements and Elements of the Barbur Streetscape Plan (not all streetscape) Study Initiated | 易 | Initiate Corridor Planning. Begin Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement Process |
| TV Highway Corridor - Tualatin Valley Hwy, from Hwy. 217 to downtown Hillsboro. |  | Refine scope of work in RTP update. | Corridor Planning (if required) |
| Sunset Highway Corridor - us 26 from I-405 to 185th Avenue. | Refinement and Environmental Assessment of Hwy. 26 Widening to Cornell. Barnes Road design/construction. Design Complete/Construction started | Engineering of US 26 Widening west of Murray Boulevard |  |
| NE Portiand Highway Corridor - Columbia Blvd. from Burgard to Killingsworth, Lombard from I-5 to KKllingsworth, and Killingsworth from Lombard to I - 205. | East End Connector Environmental Assessment; Begin Refinement Planning through I-5 Trade Corridor; Adopt St. Johns Truck Access Study Study Completed | Implement St Johns Truck Access Study Recommendations; Environmental Assessment and Engineering on I-5 Trade Corridor Recommendations Construction Commenced |  |
| I-205 (North) Corridor - I - 205 from Hwy. 224 to Vancouver. | South Transit Corridor Study and I-5 Trade Corridor Study (transit only) Comoleted | Reconnessance Planning Initiated | Corridor Planning for Roadway Widening |
| Banfield (1-84) Corridor-1-84 from 1-5 to Troutdale, | Light Rail Capacity Analysis Completed | Transit, Transportation System Management Corridor Plan | Transit Improvements and/or Transportation System management Projects |
| McLoughlin and Hwy. 224 Corridor - Hwy. 99 E from Hawthorne Blvd to Oregon City. Hwy. 224 from Mcloughlin Blvd. To I-205. | South Transit Corridor EIS and Preliminary Engineering Initiated |  | Corridor Planning for Highway Improvements |

## Corridor Initiative Findings

## Technical Evaluation Summary

Jurisdictional Interest
Corridors Proposed for Study

## Purpose

In conjunction with jurisdictional and community interest, the technical evaluation will help prioritize coridor planning studies described in the Regional Transportation Plan for lona-term transit, highway, pedestrian and bicycle improvements
Criterion Description
Support of Key Land Uses
Measures access to, and growth in, key land uses called out in the 2040 plan (regional centers, downtown and industrial areas).

## Congestion

Measures ability to get around in the region.
Support of 2040 Transit Goals
Assessment of future transit needs and deficiencies in each corridor.
Support of 2040 Freight Goals
Measures the importance of corridor to freight movement.
Safety and Reliability
Identified areas with more significant safety problems based on a
5 -year accident history

Key: Black $=$ High, Grey $=$ Medium, White $=$ Low


High
Low
High
High

Medium

Recommendation of \# Johns Truck strategy UAS promote a acceleration for study of anew Budge Accross tue Willameth. in 2001 Why Did PD of drop the Ball?

## BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

| FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING THE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| WORK PROGRAM FOR CORRIDOR | , $\quad$ RESOLUTION NO. $05-3616$ |
| REFINEMENT PLANNING THROUGH 2020. , |  |

WHEREAS, The Oregon Transportation Planning Rule requires metropolitan planning agencies to identify areas where refinement planning is required to develop needed transportation projects and programs not included in the Transportation System Plan; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 6 of the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), sections 6.7.5 and 6.7.6, identifies transportation corridors where multi-modal refinement planning is needed before specific projects and actions that meet the identified need can be adopted by the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and

WHEREAS, on July 26, 2001 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No 01-3089, for the purpose of endorsing the findings and recommendations of the Corridor Initiatives Project, which developed a work program that prioritized corridor refinement studies; and

WHEREAS, the Corridor Refinement Work Program was adopted as an amendment to the RTP in the fall of 2001 ; and

WHEREAS, the resolution called for monitoring and updating of Corridor Refinement Work Program as part of the Unified Work Program process; and

WHEREAS, significant work has been completed on a number of corridors. In addition, decisions regarding the urban growth boundary and other significant land use changes over the past several years make it timely to revisit the corridor planning priorities for future planning periods; and

WHEREAS, in the fall of 2004, Metro convened a working group of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) to update the work program for the 2006-2010 planning period; and

WHEREAS, there was involvement by the jurisdictions in the process. The TPAC working group consisted of representatives from the Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties, the Cities of Portland, Grestyam and Wilsonville, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the Port of Porlland and TriMet; and

WHEREAS, the TPAC working group reviewed the status of corridor planning throughout the region, considered the technical evaluation that was completed in 2001 and discussed changes that might affect corridor planning priorities for the 2006-2010 planning period; and

WHEREAS, the Exhibit "A" of this resolution contains the Updated Work Program for Corridor Refinement Planning through 2020; now therefore,

BE IT RESOL VED that the Metro Council,

1. That the Updated Work Program for Corridor Refinement Planning through 2020 (Exhibit "A") is hereby approved and adopted as a guideline for planning work in these corridors. It will be monitored and updated as part of the Unified Work Program. The work program also inetudes

| Issue | Southwest Washington (Vancouver and Clark County) | Metro <br> (Portland and Multnomah County) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | What are the impacts on SW Washington from Oregon land use policies? If there are adverse impacts what are they and what alternative outcomes would you recommend? What shape of the region would you recommend to the Metro area? | What are the impacts on the Metro area from Washington land use policies? If there are adverse impacts what are they and what alternative outcomes would you recommend? How should SW Washington participate in the New Look? |
|  | What assumptions will be used for the 50 year forecast for the Transportation Corridors Visioning process? What is the resulting projected growth in population/housing? Growth in jobs? (Clark County and the RTC forecast for Clark County and coordinate these forecasts with the State of Washington Office of Financial Management) | What assumptions will be used for the 50 year forecast for the New Look process? What is the resulting projected growth in population/housing? Growth in jobs? (Metro uses an economic driven model, that includes Clark County, and the Oregon portion must be coordinated with Oregon State forecasts) |
|  | What assumptions will be made for where new jobs and housing growth will locate? (How much buildable land is estimated within the current urban growth areas and how much expansion of urban growth areas and where?) | What assumptions will be made for where new jobs and housing growth will locate? (How much redevelopment and infill, how much urban growth boundary expansion and where?) |
|  | How do the above assumptions compare - are there significant differences? If they are significantly different, should the assumptions be reviewed and discussed by the Bi -State Coordination Committee? If not the Bi -State Committee then what other forum? |  |
| Transportation | How would you describe the desired transportation outcomes for SW Washington? Are there bi-state transportation needs besides those provided in the $\mathrm{I}-5$ and $\mathrm{I}-205$ corridors? If so, how would you describe them? (The RTC, as part of the Transportation Corridors Visioning is exploring: 1) a bridge or river crossing south of the Camas area; and, 2) the BSNF rail bridge could be replaced with a two level structure for rail and truck traffic.) <br> How should the Metro area coordinate with the High Capacity Transit and Transportation Corridors Visioning Projects? <br> Are there actions that could be taken to address Clark County's jobs/housing mix and reduce the demand on Oregon roads? | How would you describe the desired transportation outcomes for the Metro area? Are there bi-state transportation needs besides those provided in the I-5 and I-205 corridors? If so, how would you describe them? (The current 2004 RTP includes extension of light rail to Clark County as part of the Preferred Transportation System and improving the highway connection on $1-5$, but does not include any other river crossings.) <br> How should SW Washington coordinate with Metro's Regional Transportation Plan Update, especially analysis of possible Columbia River crossings in addition to $\mathrm{I}-5$ and $\mathrm{I}-205$ ? |
| Economic Development | What are the SW Washington economic development outcomes that could be advanced or hindered by bi-state transportation improvements (or lack of improvements)? What, if any, are they? <br> (The Economic Development Strategic Plan for Clark County states in part: "Integrate Clark County into the broader metropolitan economy by reducing barriers to regional growth and increasing metropolitan cooperation." Strategies include: <br> "Support the funding of transportation improvements in the interstate corridors to increase freight mobility and movement of the regional labor pool. Support the extension of the regional light rail system to Clark County as proposed by the Portland/Vancouver Transportation and Trade Partnership. Support continued cooperation between regional port authorities to increase investment that improves the transportation of goods and services to export markets. Implement cooperative programs targeted at metropolitan export trade promotion and business recruitment." | What are the Metro economic development outcomes that could be advanced or hindered by bi-state trânisportation improvements (or lack of improvements)? What, if any, are they? <br> (The Portland-Vancouver Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy calls for and adequate land supply (priority action 2) and as priority action 3 to: "Assure that the region's transportation and other infrastructure systems are adequate to efficiently meet the needs of the region's economy." |

7/20/06 B1 State meeting

## Potential Strategic Capacity Enhancement Investments

- Build a north-south highway and rail super corridor.
- Preserve and extend highway, public transportation and rail options in east-west and north-south corridors.
- Expand public transit services.
- Create second day rail freight service to Southern California.
- Expand regional air services, especially air freight services.


# Solution to truck traffic in St. Johns hits roadblocks 

The best nnswer, a new bridge, is too costly to be built now, and diverting trucks may be tricky

BY FRED LEESON
THF OREGONIAN
A long and sometimes divisive attempt to find ways of managing heavy truck traffic in St. Johns reached an impasse Wednesday at the Portiand City Council.
"We don't have a dime to do the capital work described in this report," said Charlie Hales, commissioner in charge of transportation matters. "We're not going to build anything for the foreseeable future."

However, Hales said he wanted
an advisory committee that has struggled for almost two years to keep working on temporary traffic plans during a sizable overhaul of the St. Johns Bridge scheduled to begin next year.

Hales said there is hope that temporary truck-control measures adopted during the 18 -month bridge restoration project could remain in place after the scenic, fourlane bridge reopens.

Until Wednesday, an advisory committee of citizens, truckers and government agencies had been laboring under the assumption that the city might spend as much as $\$ 10$ million in the next five years on measures aimed at keeping trucks out of the St. Johns town center.
Many trucks crossing the St . Johns Bridge use a shortcut along North Saint Louis Avenue and Fes-
senden Street to reach Interstate 5 and destinations along Columbia Boulevard and Marine Drive.
A majority of the committee favored a strategy of making trucks circumvent the town center by staying on Lombard and Ivanhoe streets north of the St. Johns Bridge to connect with North Burgard Street and Columbia Boulevard.
But a minority report contended that those changes would only speed up truck traffic along a route crossed by children and senior citizens.
All sides, including Hales and Mayor Vera Katz, agreed that a new bridge connecting Highway 30 with the Port of Portland north of the St. Johns Bridge was the best long-term solution.

That's going to take time and serious money we don't have to-
day," Hales said. He said a new bridge could cost $\$ 150$ million or more.

Residents who opposed the Ivanhoe-Lombard route suggested ways of pushing trucks to use the Fremont Bridge to connect with Interstate 5 instead of traversing the North Portland peninsula.

These suggestions included narrowing the St. Johns Bridge from four lanes to two or imposing an 18,000 -pound weight limit. The weight limit would eliminate double-axle trucks.

Hales said he was willing to consider weight limits, but he wasn't sure that 18,000 pounds was the right number. The Oregon Depart ment of Transportation, which is supervising the St. Johns Bridge renovation, earlier rejected a two lane suggestion. The department
said it is required to restore the bridge to its customary four-lane configuration.

Ron Hernandez, chairman of the advisory committee, urged the councll to consider a long-range solution. "We are destroying a landmark of this city by allowing trucks to pound the heck out of the St . Johns suspension bridge, he said.
Katz, who sits on a bistate commission studying highway needs said regional planriers know of North Portland's need for a new bridge, "It's not a given yet," she said, "but it's being looked at seriously."

You can reach Fred Leeson at 503-294-5946 or at fredleeson@news.oregonian.com.

# New Northwest Passage has traffic relief in mind 

An activist proposes a freeway to get truck traffic to bypass St. Johns, but it faces resistance

By BILL STEWART<br>THE OREGONIAN

A figurative pat on the head wasn't enough to get rid of Sharon Nasset - or her highway plan. Officials rejected her idea so she's taking it to the people,

And now it has a catchy name: The Northwest Passage Expressway.

Nasset is one of a bunch of St. Johns residents who are fed up with the nonstop parade of big trucks through the North Portland business district and residential area. Many of those truckers, she said, are trying to avoid neargridlock on Interstate 5.

But Nasset is taking action. A real estate agent who has worked on the truck problem for years, she wouldn't take no for an answer after being rebuffed recently when
the bi-state 1-5 Partnership decid- to speed freight, which doesn't ed to focus on light rail to Vancou- move by light rail.
ver, Wash., - and not on additional lanes for most of Interstate 5. So she fired back Thursday.
She paid for about two dozen people to take an Amtrak ride and a bus excursion to explain her idea and show how much property along her route is for sale. Her tour drew from neighborhood associations as well as Metro, Oregon and staffers from Washington's U.S. senators. The group included no elected officials, though.
Her idea is to run a freeway south from Vancouver, over Hayden Island to the Rivergate industrial area. Then the freeway would be stacked on two levels above the train tracks that pass through St . Johns in a deep land cut. A new bridge would then hop over the Willamette River to U.S. 30. Her plan also calls for connector roads to Swan Island and the west end of Rivergate.

## Recent studies seen as fauity

Nasset is pardy motivated by two recent I-5 studies, which she views as failures because they don't address the initial objective:

During the studies, someone beled the St. Johns project as the "West Arterial." The figurative pat on the head came when the West Arterial was ceremoniously put on a shelf with the notation that any future study could pick up where Nasset left off, eliminating the need for redoing basic research.
But Nasset did not drop her campaign.
First came a more distinctive and catchy name: The Northwest Passage Expressivay.

Then came a bound book, with maps and photos of routes and the vacant land along her chosen route.
Next was Thursday's tour.
Her proposal, though, faces criticism, especially from the Vancouver neighborhoods of Hough, Arnada and Esther Short, along the link between her Northwest Passage Expressway and 1-5. According to an analysis by the I-5 Partnership, her plan would displace 15 homes. That compares to as many as 49 homes for widening $1-5$ to four lanes, which the I-5 Partnership refused to do.

Actually, the St. Johns issue of the 1908 two-track rail bridge dates back 25 years. Nasset's plan across the Columbia River. Highbuilds on previous proposals, and speed rail and commuter rail - she says - can be adapted to tracks are to be added. Some solve other problems. According to drawings, though, show a separate the I-5 Partnership analysis, her highway bridge next to the downidea improves some areas, hurts stream side of the rail bridge.

## others:

- Benefits: Improves I-5 travel time by six minutes; reduces truck delays; would carry about 9,600 vehicles across the Columbia River in the evening rush; would cut Marine Drive evening traffic by 27 percent and reduce traffic on the St. Johns Bridge by 54 percent. Transit ridership would rise.
- Negatives: Traffic on West Mill Plain Boulevard in Vancouver would rise by 84 percent, while Fourth Plain Boulevard's count would go up by 25 percent. Portland traffic on U.S. 30 would rise by 6 percent. The analysis also notes that the four-lane Columbia River bridge would be near its aftemoon capacity as soon as it opens.

There are aspects of her plan that have raised eyebrows. For example, the initial proposal is to put the four highway lanes on top

You can reach Bill Stewart at 503-294-7670 or by e-mail at billstewart@netus.oregonian.com.

- A new Willamette River span even though it's in a different place.
- A bridge to the west side of Hayden Island, where plans for a complex of three marine terminals is on hold.
A truck bridge directly linking the Port of Vancouver with the Port of Portland.

NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY
A new freeway, with bridges across the Willamette and Columbia rivers and the Oregon Slough, is being proposed as a partial solution to truck problems in St. Johns.


MCHAEL GH.LENITHE OREGONAY

## Regional Water Providers Consortium Board Meeting Notice

The Regional Water Providers Consortium -- a collaborative, voluntary organization of 23 entities, including cities, districts and

# To ease road congestion, officials tackle rail tie-ups 

## A bi-state committee

 discusses ways to speed train traffic so that freight can be shifted to railwaysBY BILL STEWART<br>THE OREGONIAN

VANCOUVER - A group of Washington and Oregon officials, concerned about freeway congestion, turned its attention Thursday to railroad traffic jams.

The Bi-State Coordinating Committee, named to accelerate movement of freight, commerce and motorists in the Vancouver-North Portland area, discussed using taxpayer money to remove certain rail choke points.

If rrain traffic through the area could be accelerated, more cargo could be canried by trains rather than trucks, thereby eliminating some highway traffic.

The committee includes representatives of Metro, the regional govemment; Portland; Vancouver, Clark County; small area cities; Oregon and Washington's departments of transportation; and the ports of Portland and Vancouver.

The panel is advisory but its members represent cities and other agencies that deal with transportation grants.
The panel agreed Thursday to create a division to act as a Rail Forum to champion rail projects when state or federal money is available.

Two areas where trains are delayed for hours each day are the Port of Portland's Rivergate Industrial area and the single track that feeds more than 43,000 rail cars a year across the main north-south and east-west tracks to the Port of Vancouver.
One estimate puts a $\$ 170 \mathrm{mil}$ lion price tag on fixing PortlandVancouver rail bottlenecks. The fixes vary from additional tracks in key switching yards to a new rail spur west of Vancouver Lake
"That is a lot of money," said Don Wagner, regional administrator for the Washington Department of Transportation, "until you realize we have spent $\$ 100$ million to upgrade BNSF Railway tracks in Southwest Washington because our passenger trains use those tracks."
One solution to east-west railroad congestion, according to

Ann-Marie Lundberg of the Port of Portland, would double the traincarrying capacity of tracks in the Columbia River Gorge by making the tracks one way.
Today, with two-way traffic, a train heading through the gorge often has to wait for an oncoming train to get out of the way. With one-way traffic, trains wouldn't have to wait for opposite traffic.
"The BNSF Railway has tracks on the north side of the river, while the Union Pacific's tracks are in Oregon," Lundberg said. If the BNSF tracks carried only westbound trains and the UP tracks carried eastbound trains, the corridor's capacity would double overnight from 90 to 180 trains, she said.
"The problem," said Todd Coleman, facilities manager for the Port of Vancouver, "is that BNSF and UP don't see their congestion as a railroad issue.... They also are not accustomed to working together."

The Bi-State committee also was briefed on Oregon's efforts to widen Interstate 5 to three southbound lanes through Delta Park in North Portland. The Oregon Department of Transportation is conducting meetings and fonms to
collect public ideas on the project, with construction to start in 2008.
Kate Deane, project manager for ODOT, said the first phase will be the widening, but subsequent phases will involve surface streets that will affect some neighborhoods.
She said a number of Kenton residents fear that one option for surface streets related to the freeway widening will block future development on Argyle Street west of Denver Avenue. TriMet is working on a development proposal in the area.
Deane said the state is looking at a list of "community enhancement" ideas in connection with the Delta Park project. She said a list of potential improvements, such as trails, a canoe launching area, air quality monitors and sidewalks, "has resulted in a balancing act between the project and enhancements."
But she said the widening project has gotten unanimous support at the various public meetings and forums.
Matt Garrett, regional administrator for ODOT, responded to comments from several groups that want a commitee's report
calling for a new 10 -lane bridge across the Columbia River set aside in favor of other corridors across theriver.

Vancouver Mayor Royce E. Pol lard said he, too, has heard talk "of scrapping 18 months of work."
"I have heard fears that we would disregard or dilute" the report Garrett said. "What that report said was not lost on us. ... The (federal highway agency) recognized that report and gave us a positive reaction." No federal construction money has been awarded yet.

Pollard said his primary interest is improving the region's economic vitadity. "I am not interested in building a way for our people to go to Oregon to buy things."

Eric Holmes of the Battle Ground City Council said, "We need to get (the bridge) right or we will be in the same position in 40 years, and then we really won't be able to afford it."

Bill Stewart: $360-896-5722$ or 503-294 5900; billstemarrènews.oregoninn.com
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# North Portland group expresses own ideas and solutions for improving l-5 traffic 

Truck traffic through St. Jolhns, and the traffic along $1-5$ continue to be a main topic of discussion and concern. Millions of dollars has been spent, and continues to be spent, by working groups in hopes of finding the best solution to improve congestion and mobility. Everyone agrees the I5 corridor will face significant congestion by the year 2020, which will without doubt adversely affect the livability and economic potential of the Portland/Vancouver area.
Two active groups have come up with plans they feel would most benefit the North Portland area . . . there are however, no similarities between the two groups' participants or their ideas, but their goals are the same: to improve the $1-5$ commute made by citizens and trucks, which will improve the region's economy and livability and also make the area a safer place to drive.
The first is a government task force and has an impressive slate of members from Oregon and Washington. It's called the Columbia River Crossing Task Force (CRC). They have been
meeting since 1998 and are formed from three previous task forces.
The 2nd is a private, nonprofit group called The Economic Transportation Alliance (ETA). It is an informed and concerned group of community citizens.

Both groups have spent endess hours studying their proposals. Their studies are complex, but in the simplest terms possible, include the following results for improvement:
The CRC's recommendation is a new bridge in place of the current Interstate Bridges, widening sections of $1-5$ 's lanes and improving on/off ramps.
The ETA's plan includes two long bridges, a shorter bridge and a new freeway from the Port of Vancouver, across west Hayden Island to the Rivergate Industrial area, then across the Willamette River to U.S. 30 north of the St. Johns Bridge.

ETA members say their plan would not be cheaper than the CRC Task Force's, but it would better improve many bottlenecks between the Marquam Bridge and Columbia Boulevard by creating new routes that more efficiently move commuters and cargo. The group's proposal is creative with interesting designs and has the support of several area politicians and business leaders. Sharon Nasset is a well known North Portiand resident and real estate agent, and a member of the ETA. She said many previous decisions made by groups were


Two groups are searching the best way to improve traffic along I-5. The Columbia River Task Force would like to replace the I-5 bridge, create more lanes and improve some on-ramps, among other things; The Economic Transportation Alliance would like to put a three-deck bridge from the Part of Vancouver, across Hayden Island, and pass through the Rivergate
based on the fact they though the Interstate Bridge was in bad shape and needed major renovations or replacement. However, later reports said that its structure was sound and would be good for another 50 years. The ETA's plan would preserve the I-S Bridge but downriver from it, at the Port of Vancouver area, would be a triple deck bridge with six lanes for cars on the top deek, trucks using the center span, and rail, Amtrak and perhaps a light rail line, using the bottom deck.

The bridge would continue across West Hayden Island and connect to the mainland via a shorter bridge. The new route would then pass through the Rivergate Industrial area, and cross the Willamette River near Linnton. This bridge would be for cars and trucks only. The route would then use a new freeway paralleling the Old Portland Highway and Columbia Boulevard.

Oregon Department of Transportation is currently in the process of completing an Environmental Assessment document for the I-5 Delta Park to Lombard section which is expected to be released October 2005. There will be a 45 -day public comment period and a
public hearing at the end of October after which ODOT will select a final alternative. Federal Highway Administration approval is expected in the spring of 2006 and construction is anticipated to begin in 2008.
Time will tell if Nasset and her group will be heard by the Task Force. But North Portland's many dedicated, well informed citizens, who have won many important battles the last ten years, may dictate that it should at least be listened to and considered.


Sharan Nasset, North Portland rexident, is part of a group called The Economic Transportation Alliance. They have ant imaginative solution for improving $1-5$ traffic and ruck traffic firought St. Johns.
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In June planning for the future of 1.2 acre Patton Park on Interstate, just south of Killingsworth, began with a community survey, followed by a design workshop.
A survey was sent to addresses surrounding the park and asked opinions about the park's

[^2]
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## Group offers detour from plan for new l-5 bridge

A private alliance says Washington and Oregon should consider other routes to avoid bottlenecks Thursday, August 18, 2005

## BILL STEWART

The Oregonian
As teams from Washington and Oregon start to plan for a new $\$ 1$ billion Interstate 5 bridge, a private, nonprofit group is turning up the volume on its warning that the bridge is going in the wrong place.

The Economic Transportation Alliance, which is composed of concerned residents and which has no ties to government groups, says its plan wouldn't be cheaper, but it would eliminate bottlenecks on Interstate 5 by creating new routes that more efficiently move commuters and cargo. Its blueprint includes two long bridges, a shorter bridge and a new freeway from Vancouver's port area across west Hayden Island to Rivergate Industrial Area, then across the Willamette River to U.S. 30 north of the St. Johns Bridge.

Conversely, an l-5 proposal being prepared by officials from Oregon and Washington is in the wrong place, according to the alliance, because it does nothing to eliminate the bottleneck in Portland from Columbia Boulevard to the Marquam Bridge. That plan calls for 10 bridge lanes narrowing to six lanes at either end.

The bi-state team is following the directives of three consecutive task forces - dating to 1998 - on congestion and freight delays. The alliance, whose plan has drawn the support of several area politicians and business leaders, is using excerpts from the same reports to argue that a wider bridge in the same place solves nothing.
"Many of the earlier decisions were based on the expectation that the Interstate bridges were crumbling, in bad shape," said Sharon Nassett, a Portland resident who has been publicizing the alliance's highway route for several years. "And then the report came out saying the old bridges would last another 50 years, that they are structurally sound, but we are stuck with the incorrect assumptions" that the bridges are failing.

Austin Pratt, regional bridge permit supervisor for the U.S. Coast Guard in Seattle, said unresolved issues include limiting the height so the bridge is not a threat to planes using Pearson Field or Portland International Airport, deciding how much clearance is needed by boats, and lining up a boat channel so

He noted that one reason for all the studies was to eliminate the sole freeway lift span between Canada and Mexico. However, the bi-state team recently presented to regional transportation officials sketches of plans that included as many as four lift spans.
"I don't think the Federal Highway Administration will approve that," Pratt said. He said the lift spans can stay if the two old bridges remain.

The alliance proposal calls for preserving the $1-5$ bridge but adding a single-span, triple-deck bridge just west of Vancouver's Amtrak depot, where the Fort Vancouver Plywood mill once stood. Early drawings show a single arch with no in-stream piers for boaters to dodge, and no lift or turntable opening area.

The triple-level bridge would include six lanes for cars on the top deck and six lanes for trucks on the middle level. The bottom deck would include six rail tracks - four for freight trains and Amtrak, and two available for light rail. The plan also would need a shorter bridge south from Hayden Island across the Oregon Slough, and a high, long bridge over the Willamette River.

One supporter of the alliance plan is Tom Mielke, Republican candidate for Clark County commissioner. Mielke, a former Washington legislator, said those blindly rushing ahead on an I-5 corridor plan are not using common sense.
"It seems like everyone is too anxious to spend the money," Mielke said. "Some of the problems with building another Interstate Bridge are obvious."

Nassett, who is in real estate sales in Portland's St. Johns neighborhood, lost some supporters when she backed away from creating a Westside Bypass through Washington County. And more recently, she's erased a double-decked freeway above the railroad in what BNSF Railway calls the Willamette Cut through St. Johns, saying the old plan did little to get rid of large trucks in St. Johns' residential neighborhoods.

The new version calls for trucks and cars - but no trains - crossing the Willamette River near Linnton. That $\uparrow$
yestrains
vehicle traffic would use a new freeway paralleling the Old Portland Highway and Columbia Boulevard.
Another advocate for the industrial route is Portland businessman Paul Edgar, who says the official bi-state study team should be sidetracked before it runs through more than $\$ 50$ million in federal and state grants for environmental study -- of the wrong route.

While the official team is following directives set out in previous reports - three through lanes in each direction, two local access lanes in each direction, and some provision for mass transit -- the alliance is using those directives to say wrong place, waste of money.

For example, Don Wagner, regional administrator for the Washington State Department of Transportation, told his state commission, "There physically is no room for additional lanes in the (l-5) corridor."

Wagner, who previously held a similar job for the Oregon Department of Transportation, said l-5 cannot be widened between Lombard Street and the Fremont Bridge.

## Minutes of a Washington transportation meeting in 2004 cite Wagner as saying, "Enlarging the Columbia River Bridge will not add capacity to the $1-5$ corridor."

One controversial așpect of the alliance's plan is the northern link to l-5. It proposes putting trucks and cars in a deep trench along Mill Plain Boulevard and 15th Street. To build the trench, a 5-year-old stretch of concrete - which cost $\$ 36.5$ million in 2000 and 2001 - would be ripped out and overpasses built for surface traffic.

Wagner has speculated it could take 20 years to get the necessary permits and build a new l-5 span, but Nassett has been urging officials to use the work of previous studies. She thinks the alliance's version could be resolved in five years.

Bill Stewart: 360-896-5722 or 503-294-5900; billstewart@news. oregonian.com ©2005 The Oregonian
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Sharon Nasset, a Portland resident and real estate agent, is trying to sell members of the I-5 Task Force on linking the port areas of Vancouver and Portland by three new bridges.

# Selling the "Northwest Passace’ 

## Portlander promotes bridges linking west <br> Vancouver with U.S. 30 in Oregon

## Ry THOMAS RYL.

Celumbian staff urnter
Last November. Sharon Nasset bought 150 fortune cookies and delivered them to a meeting of the 1.5 Task Force, a 26 -member committee looking for answers to freeway congestion.
Instead of the usual post-prandial platitudes, the task force and audience got sales pitches cooked up by Nasset when they cracked their cookjes:
"Why debate when 8 is so great?"
"Your lucky number is 8 , pick i."
"You'll have happy truckers in
your future with the passage of Op tion 8."
Option R, now known as the West Arterial, is one of a string of conecpts the task force considered during a series of public meetings. most of them held last year. The idea - and it is no more than that at this point - would be to link west Vancouver, perhaps at the west end of the Mill Plain Extension, with U.S.

Highway 30 in Oregon.
The West Arterial would require three river bridges, two on the Columbia and one over the Willamette. And aithough the task force has set aside the idea for further study - a decision that could push construction off 20 or even 30 years - Nasset has continued to lobby the task force, transportation planners. elected officials, congressional staff members and anyone clse who will listen.
Task Force members have turned their attention instead to the $1-5$ corridor, recommending expanded bridge capacity and a Clark County light-rail systern, among ofher items. for further study. Meanwhile. Nasset is waging what is by far the most anbitious citizen effort to change the task force's mind.
As with the fortune conkies, Nasset, a North Portland resident, has let her methods roam from the con-


## West Arterial:

## From page C1

ventional to the offbeat In December, she handed out Christmas cards to everyone in the task force meeting room.
She has borne much of the expense. "My budget is $\$ 30$ a meeting," said Nasset, who paid $\$ 10.50$ for the fortune cookies.
Thursday, she blew a train-sized hole in that budget, spending nearly $\$ 900$ of her own cash on a rented tour bus and a pocketful of Amtrak tickets, treating participants to a three-hour visit to the West Arterial corridor.
To get things rolling, Nasset sent out invitations and set up posters, stacks of handouts and plates of doughnuts at Vancouver's Amtrak station.
At 25 , the turnout was less than she expected but included a near-perfect crosssection of people involved in the I-5 Task Force process. And there were some bonuses, including the Vancouver representatives of U.S. Sens. Maria Cantwell and Patty Murray.
Even while they explain why they don't like Nasset's ideas, public officials praise her for how she has gone about promoting the West Arterial: in a determined but upbeat and unfailingly polite way.
"Sharon is unique," said Kate Deane, an Oregon Department of Transportation project manager. "She is a marketing master."
"She would be a tremendous person to show citizens how to affect public policy," said Craig Pridemore, a Clark County commissioner and I-5 Task Force member. "I have nothing but respect for
what she has done."
That said, "I don't agree with her project," Pridemore added.
The idea behind the West Arterial is to provide an alternate route for freight traffic between the ports of Vancouver and Portland, and give workers on both sides of the river easier access to Swan Island and other west side industrial areas. For residents of those areas, the arterial's greatest benefit would be to strip truck traffic from the St. Johns Bridge, something community leaders see as crucial to restoring the neighborhood's business and residential districts.
Even though it would carve a new path through a relatively undeveloped area, the project would be expensive and, in one form, unique: a concept drawing for the West Arterial shows a highway system built atop the multiple railroad tracks in the "cut" south of Columbia Boulevard.
There would be other challenges, among them environmental issues with a new highway through the wetlands of western Hayden Island. Still, "Turtles are a lot easier to move than homes," said Cornelius Swart, an official of an agency working to revitalize the Portsmouth area just east of St. Johns.
Swart counts himself among those who were at first dubious of Nasset's work. Now he says the arterial "will put St. Johns in the center of the region. It has always been over the 'left shoulder' of the region, somewhere 'over there.'"
While Nasset claims much of the right-of-way is available at prices lower than any I-5 corridor property, with three river bridges the West Arterial "would be extremely expensive," said Pridemore.
At the same time, feeding the new cor-
ridor from the north would put thousands of additional cars and trucks on Vancouver's Mill Plain and Fourth Plain boulevards.
"There would be much more traffic than was ever anticipated when they built the Mill Plain Extension," said project manager Deane.

And that, said Pridemore, "is just not acceptable for west Vancouver neighborhoods."
All that doesn't appear to faze Nasset. She has coined a new name, "The Northwest Passage Expressway," as part of her effort to keep the idea at the forefront of discussion.
Nasset, 42, sells real estate for a living. and a cynic would say her goal is at least partly selfish: Revitalizing St. Johns would do nothing to harm real estate values or commissions for selling homes and businesses.
But Nasset, who also volunteers with her church and the Boy Scouts, says flatly, "If I was really into making a lot of money, this would not be it."
Nasset continues undaunted, enthralled with the public process and clearly enjoying the attention her effor have spawned.
And she finds encouragement in small ways.
At the November meeting where fortune cookies were her agenda, she cracked open her own dessert and found a slip of paper with a fortune that she hadn't written.
On it were words more likely to be seen after Chinese takcout than at a transportation planning meeting. Nasset was tickled: "A seed planted long ago is about to bloom."

## Displacement Comparison

- The west arterial has the least displacement of homes and businesses.
- The few displacements are lower cost.
- The documents presented to the task force gave each displacement the same weight, ignoring costs. Here are a few of the identified properties:


## West Arterial

Industrial Real Estate



Green's Transfer
10099 N. North Portland Rd
Value of Land and Structure
$\mathbf{\$ 2 , 3 8 5 , 3 9 0}$


North Portland Lumber Company 10101 N. North Portland Road
Value of Land and Structure $\quad \$ 118,770$


Shure Way Lumber N. North Road

Value of Land and Structure

## I-5 Bridge Improvement <br> Prime Commercial Real Estate



Double Tree
1401 N. Hayden Is. Dr.
Value of Land and Structure $\quad \$ 51,041,800$


Safeway
11901-11919 N. Jantzen Dr.
Value of Land and Structure

$$
\$ 6,326,110
$$



Waddles Restruant
11875 N. Jantzen Dr.
Value of Land and Structure

## Fatal Flaws in Our <br> Transportation Modeling

## Fatal flaws in our transportation modeling

Accurate planning for current and future transportation needs is important. Our road studies are so far off base because of our modeling. The 2040 plan transportation numbers are off by $50 \%$. When I- 84 opened, it was considered to be near capacity the same year. The I-205 Glen Jackson Bridge is near capacity 9 years ahead of schedule.

Our modeling and lack of depth in modeling is why we have some of the worst congestion in the nation. Here are some of the problems with our modeling that we continue making.

1. No base line to establish modeling. We have no base line modeling number showing how much each citizen needs in transportation lane miles.
Example: Infant- How many freight trucks for - food, diapers, toys, clothes, furniture, etc. How many trip to doctors, childcare, and visits......How many infants in Portland? How many miles of transportation per infant. List needs to include school age children, teenager, adults, and elderly?
2. No real, time data showing the counts of local delivery. How many trucks are needed for on time delivery and specialty items for stores?
Thinking that if people live closer to services there will be a less need for roads...... Same amount of goods.
Example: Grocery stores had between 5 to 20 deliveries a week in the 1970's. Now daily deliveries are $30-40$ a day. In the 1970's, you had 2 bread companies deliver once a week. Now stores might have 8 bakery companies bring bread, and 5 bakery might deliver daily. Citizen either drive to the goods or they deliver the goods to the neighborhoods. If citizen travel less for goods, the goods must travel further. Thinking that if people live closer to services there will be a less need for roads...... Same amount of goods.
3. Several categories of vehicles are from the data used to project the needs. Modeling used by the DOT's excludes several categories of vehicles. These vehicles are used mostly for commerce. $85 \%$ of business is small business and use several types of vehicles. The modeling exclusion affect our economy, service to the tax payer large and small business.
Examples:
A. The Freight Master Plan page 41-figure 17 "Typical Vehicles" and
B. Page 42 shows table 6 .
C. Page 21 list the seven classification categories used for modeling as " Traffic, transit, pedestrian, bicycles, freight, emergency response, and street design. Portland relies on a multimodal classification system to describe the design and function of a street or other transportation facilities." We have no categories to measure vehicles for business and commerce. The category "traffic" includes business, pleasure, and commuting cars. This modeling makes no differences in SOV and it excludes Step vans, cargo vans, vans, pick up trucks, and passager vans. This issue has been reported to the DOT from the Portland Business Alliance and put in letter form dated December 30, 2005. With no category for commerce and no vehicles between the car and large trucks, we do not provide arterial capacity that is adequate for these services.
CRC is using this same modeling.......
The following are users of our road system that are not counted:
Pleasure, commuter cars, step vans, cargo vans, pickup trucks, passenger vans, painter, plumbers, electricians, glass repair, roofers, contractors, medial equipment, medical care, yard care, repair vans snack wagons, moving vans, florist, and more.

- An easy fix. Yep every 2 years, vehicle registration asks make, model, and mileage of vehicles. Those questions need to be expanded. What type of vehicle? Is this a vehicle used for business
only? Do you use you vehicle for work? Sometimes, always or no. What is the zip code where you live and where you work?

4. The decision-makers are using data that is our dated and out of time. The CRC staff is using the congestion clock from Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Study ending in 1999. This clock shows congestion times of 2000 and 2020. The congestion clock is incorrect showing unrealistic times for present congestion. The 2020 time is more accurate for to day's congestion time. When this issue is pointed out staff and others laugh and say "well you got to use something" A person can stand on the overpass at I-5 and Lombard and it is obvious that current congestion is at the projected 2020 time clock now and sometimes worst. It is inappropriate and incompetent to continue using this 7 -year-old clock when data shows it is wrong or at least our dated. Several studies on population and land use have had to be revised because they where wrong. It is time to us real time data in all areas, starting with the congestion clock. It is time, make a correct congestion clock.

## 5. The Ports of Oregon and Washington as well as the industrial terminals and industrial lands

 are not directly connected. The Port of Vancouver is involved in developing 1,100 acre now and more in the future. The Port of Portland and the industrial area in Oregon and Washington must be connected together. The Ports and a majority of the industrial areas are on the west side and are land locked by the rivers they need and the neighborhoods that surround them. When the need for a Port to Port with direct access to I-5 and the industrial area is identified, the CRC staff has makes comments that the Ports commodities are different and therefore the really isn't a relationship between the Ports and industrial areas. "One is wheat and the other is automobiles, so connecting them will not help congestion or the working of the Ports." Is CRC staff standard answer. CRC staff does not understand the working transportation needs of the Ports and industrial areas. The biggest ticket item is different, the support and services that the Ports need are the same local companies that can not access the Ports and industrial areas because of inadequate infrastructure $\qquad$ support services such as sales people, uniforms, mechanics, oil, paper supplies, coffee, gutt-wagons, window washer, yard maintenance and other support services and supplies needed to operate 100's of large companies. Being unable to understand the basic transportation needs make it impossible for that same staff the evaluate other transportation issues that affect mobility and the economy. The saying the same level of think that got you into trouble is in capable of getting you out of trouble. We have had the same companies study and advise us on our transportation needs for 20 years and every year for over 10 years our congestion has gone worse.6. Real data is not available or being used to know where the traffic is coming from and going to. CRC modeling of the BIA influence area has several large errors... These are have been pointed out to CRC staff verbally and in writing .... Staff disagrees and or has not answered the questions.... Here are two of the issues pointed out:

Example: Function and Role of the I-5 Bridge Influence Area diagram. This diagram shows the percentage of bridge crossing and where traffic destination is. In this diagram of the BIA, it shows $10 \%$ Washington County traffic leaving I-5 at Marine Drive. This needs to go back into the I-5 count going over I-405 Bridge south of the BIA. Modeling regional traffic to use neighborhood arterials against City Policy 6.2-Regional and City Traffic Patterns: CRC modeling forcing Washington County to use neighborhood arterial instead of stating on I-5 is totally inappropriate and forces spill over from I-5 into neighborhoods one of the goals of the I-5 project is to address I-5 adverse affect on neighborhood streets. Clark County Washington and Washington County Oregon are what are being modeled. Policy 6.2- Regional and City Traffic Patterns: City policy advances the separation of traffic on different facilities according to the length of trip. Inter-regional traffic should use the Regional Transit and Traffic Way system. City streets should be designed to carry local traffic and NOT be DESIGNED or MANAGED to serve as alternative routes for regional trips. CRC staff is
aware of City Policy They are also a ware this same traffic was identified by PDOT in the St. Johns Truck Study as the linchpin that damages the economy, environment, and livability in the St. Johns and North Portland residential and retail centers. PDOT identified that $75 \%$ of the truck traffic in downtown St. Johns was traffic cutting through because of the congestion on I-5. The I-5 project is supposed to take care of this problem by keeping the traffic on I-5 and not in our neighborhoods. The new plan should no be based on this damaging practice continuing. Think about this that $10 \%$ of 180,000 is 18,000 vehicles with a large portion being 18 -wheelers. The entire population of St. Johns, every man, woman and child is 12,000 . Sick, CRC must follow City Policy. The written CRC statement "The CRC focus is on I-5 at the bottlenecks. Transportation alternatives must address the project's Purpose and Need. Even with freight improvements, it is unlikely that all the truck traffic will be removed from the St. Johns' neighborhood." Modeling that traffic count to go through our neighborhood makes sure we get no break and managing or designing this traffic is our area must stop...... A New third bridge adding capacity will enable St. Johns to require all non local (75\%) Freight of the damaging traffic to stay on the freeway where they prefer to be.

Example: Function and Role of the I-5 Bridge Influence Area diagram. This diagram shows the percentage of bridge crossing and where traffic destination is. In this diagram of the BIA, it is missing Swan Island. Swan Island provides 11,309 jobs in 265 establishments with over 100 acres of vacant land. Swan Island has a very important location less than 5 minutes from downtown Portland; it's a freight hub district with a working harbor, Albina rail yard, heavy industry, distribution, manufacturing facilities, and office complexes. Swan Island is adjacent to I-5 with freeway access north and south. The type of business on the Island have a heavy transportation needs. Distribution; Beer and wine, United Parcel Service, Federal Express, Roadway Express, warehousing and manufacturing bring parts in, build products, and transport them out. CRC staff modeling has no vehicle counts for Swan Island. With thousands of employees, and hundreds of trucks and vans with transportation needs. CRC knows they have not put Swan Island in the transportation modeling as previous transportation studies have and will not add this important industrial area in there modeling of The I-5 corridor / BIA
6. High Occupant Vehicles lane classified as temporary after 8 years. Oregon's only HOV lane is still temporary after 8 years and must be analyzed annually for renewal. The HOV lane on I-5 between Going St. ramps and Hayden Island is the only HOV in the state of Oregon. It raises pollution, carries less vehicles and citizens than the general purpose lanes, and causes traffic calming, congestion. The HOV lane on I-84 was removed. A study on putting HOV on HWY. 26 found it would cause more congestion and pollution and therefore was not place on HWY.26. South of Marquam Bridge I-5 has no HOV.
The state of Washington had a short HOV lane too. It was the only HOV lane outside of Seattle. It was found that it did not met the federal guidelines and instead of continuing to keep HOV after finding out that it raised the air pollution, carried less vehicles and citizens than the general purpose lanes, and caused congestion it was REMOVED.
Personally, after 5 years of being at transportation meetings when the annual review of the HOV takes place comments like "citizens often don't understand what's really best for them and something they need to be force into making the right decisions. Why not let trucks and commercial business that are traveling to use it, it could easy the problem to much leading citizens to believe the problem is solve. I believe the only HOV lane in Portland going North is keep to force light rail into Vancouver and because the drivers most affect pay taxes here but can't vote and are being used to force social engineering. The neighborhoods adjacent to I-5 and the business community are not being considered at all.

## INTRODUCTION

Uuccessful implementation of the freight mobility improvements and policies for trucks described in this document are based on the expectation thar appropriate and consistent design practices are used for safe and convenient truck travel on ciry streets. Planning and designing for truck circulation and access is essential for all environments and districts in the city.

Streets within industrial areas as well as those that provide direct connections between industrial areas and the regional freeway system need to fully accommodate truck movements without impeding their mobility. In mixed-use areas, lane widths and corner radii may be narrowed to compel trucks to travel more slowly in order to provide a streetscape that supports significant pedestrian travel. In residential areas, all vehicle cravel is limited to slower speeds, and streets in these areas are intended for local truck deliveries. Accommodating truck travel in these and other environments requires careful design practices that balance the needs of all users of the street.

This chapter provides a general overview of street design for trucks. The Portland Design Guidelines for Trucks, a companion document to the Freight Master Plan, is an in depth look at street design and trucks.

## PLANNING FOR TRUCKS IN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY

Trucks come in many shapes and sizes, dictated by the goods or materials being hauled and the distance that the goods travel. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) have developed a classification system that identifies trucks by their approximate overall vehicle height, width, and length. This classification ranges from the SU-30 Single Unit truck (e.g., cement trucks, large rental trucks, local delivery trucks) up to the WB-67 Interstate truck (large semi-trailer with sleeper cab equipped tractor; this class also includes double and triple trailer combinations). Figure 15 shows the typical dimensions of the AASHTO standard vehicles referenced in these guidelines, and Table 6 lists the specific characteristics of each vehicle type. Additional information on these and other design vehicles can be found in the ${ }^{2}$ ASHTO "Policy on Geomerric Design of Highways and Streers". ${ }^{19}$

While procedural guidance can be developed to provide general direction for design of intersections for trucks, the final configuration and best

## Figure 17

Dimensions of Typical Design Vehides


Policy 6.15 Transportation System Management, Objective B directs the City to give preference to projects that add system capacity through operational improvements such as signal upgrades, ITS, and intersection design that benefit all modes of transportation.

Policy 6.29 Multimodal Freight System, Objectives A-E supports the development of a safe, reliable, and efficient freight system that includes truck, rail, air, marine, and pipeline transport modes. The objectives emphasize public-private coordination and partnership in planning, prioritizing and funding freight infrastructure improvements. They also stress the need to work cooperatively to minimize adverse impacts cause by freight movement.

Policy 6.30 Truck Mobility, Objectives A-G provides guidance for developing, maintaining and managing the street nerwork that supports truck movement. The objectives guide investment priorities, design for legal and over-dimensional loads, appropriate use of streets by trucks, and operational improvements to reduce delay.
Policy 6.31 Truck Accessibility, Objective A-F addresses truck access and circulation needs through objectives that focus on such actions as eliminating bridge weight and height restrictions, improving at-grade rail crossing to limit delay and increase safety, managing on-street loading zones for efficient loading and unloading, and considering truck needs in street design. Policies 6.34-6.40, Transportation District Policies and Objectives detail and clarify issues and needs specific to a Transportation District. There are eight transportation district in Portland-North, Northeast, Far Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, Far Southeast, Southwest, and Central City-many of which have policy and objectives that address freight mobility.

## Goal 11B Public Rights-of Way

Goal 11B policies and objectives are intended to improve the quality of Portland's transportation system by guiding project development to implement the 2040 Growth Concept, preserve public rights-of-way, implement street plans, continue high-quality maintenance and improvement programs, and allocate limited resources to identified needs of neighborhoods, commerce and industry.
Policy 11.10 Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements, Objective E directs the City to use che collection of right-of-way design resources including the Design Guide for Trucks when developing and designing streer improvements.

## THE FREIGHT SYSTEM

Pordand relies on a multimodal classification system to describe the design and function of a street or other transportation facility. There are seven classification categories: Traffic, Transit, Pedestrian, Bicycle, Freight, Emergency Response, and Street Design. When funding, designing, or operating a facility all modal classifications are considered.

Pordand's frefght system is comprised of streets, rail lines, and freight facilities including marine terminals, intermodal rail yards, airports, and pipeline terminals. Policy 6.9 describes each of the freight system classifications in the hierarchy. The classifications correspond to the land use activities. For classifying network features, freight movement is divided into two broad caregories: industrial-serving and commercial delivery of goods and services.

## ГRUCK CHARACTERISTICS

$\dagger$ common question when discussing truck-freight issues is what are these policies and/or regulations ddressing? The Columbia CorridorTransportation Study defines freight movement, in terms of trucks, $s$ the movement of heavy and medium trucks. Light commercial trucks cannot be distinguished from rivate vehicle, so are excluded. Medium trucks include trucks with 2 to 4 axles, and two-axle trucks vith six tires. Heavy trucks include all articulated trucks, trucks with one to three trailer, and/or 3 to 9 xles. This review assumes private vehicle and small truck access should be maintained on all streets, in eeping with neighborhood needs.

## rRUCK EXAMPLES


.arge Dump, Heavy Truck



Short Container, Heavy Truck



7-axle, Heavy Truck


2-axle, Medium Truck


Garbage Container, Heavy Truck


2-axle, Medium Truck



## 3. Modal Choice

### 3.4 Decrease percentage of Single Occupancy Vehicle travel

Comment: Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips are typically thought of as discretionary or non-business based. However, many of these SOV trips are, in fact, business related. Utility maintenance crews or business people making regional sales calls are seldom in a vehicle defined as a medium or heavy truck (see the discussion below regarding Regional Economy; Freight Mobility) and are therefore classified as an SOV trip. We believe that decreasing the percentage of SOV travel by offering alternatives, such as bus rapid transit or light rail, is a worthy goal. However, it is equally important to recognize the percentage of SOV trips that cannot be accommodated by these alternatives and that these businessrelated SOV trips are also critical to the regional economy. We hope that this point will be taken into consideration during the alternatives analysis.

## 5. Regional Economy, Freight Mobility

5.1 Potential (on a qualitative basis) for component to reduce delay for trucks on I-5 through the bridge influence area during midday periods

Comment: We strongly support any component that will improve freight mobility within the bridge influence area. However, as described earlier, it is important to measure how each component will reduce delay throughout the day, not just during midday or peak hour periods.

Suggested language: 5.1 Delete 'during midday periods'
5.4 Improve freight truck throughput of the bridge influence area.

Comment: Freight truck, for the purposes of this project, is defined as medium (a commercial vehicle under $40,000 \mathrm{lbs}$ and under six tires) and heavy (over $40,000 \mathrm{lbs}$. and over six tires) This definition excludes smaller delivery and $\varepsilon \mathrm{XClu}$ odes maintenance trucks that also play a role moving freight in and through the I-5 bridge influence area. In addition, as discussed above, business-related SOV trips are also an important part of the regional economy. All of these business-related trips play a role in our regional economy and their role should be adequately taken into consideration during the development and screening of alternatives.

Suggested Addition: 5.5 Maintain or enhance road and rail freight access to Ports and associated transportation facilities

## SOV Business <br> 

Smaller trucks + pick Trucks show

 1. is 8590 of business of have Lethe ore No

It is expected that the transit riders of the future will have origins and destinations within and/or near the I-5 corridor itself, making 1-5 the most direct means of accommodating future transit trips.

### 3.2.3 Projected Transit Problems

Transit travel times from downtown Portland to downtown Vancouver in the afternoon peak period are projected to double by the year 2020 if no improvements are made to the I-5 bridge or bi-state transit service. In the year 2000, this transit trip took an average of 27 minutes to complete, and in 2020 it is expected to take 55 minutes. A major cause of the increased travel times is expected growth in trips (by all modes) that use the I-5 bridge.

Previous analysis also highlighted the importance of operating transit in exclusive or semiexclusive lanes or guideways. In the I-5 Partnership study, the only alternatives that reduced I-5 corridor transit travel times between 2000 and 2020 were alternatives that either a) included light rail operating in exclusive ROW, or b) included buses operating in HOV (i.e., managed) lanes.

### 3.2.4 2020 Transit Market Analysis

Transit riders comprise only a segment of the future market, as future transit services should also appeal to current SOV and HOV drivers who have similar origin and destination points.
Figure 3-1, shown previously, depicts the specific origins and destinations for all modes in the year 2020 PM peak period. As illustrated in the figure, the future travel market for all modes is highly complimentary and shares the same geography as the future transit riders.

To better understand the projected growth in I-5 bridge demand, and which markets transit services should serve in the future, a more detailed analysis of 2020 person trips during the afternoon peak period was completed ${ }^{\text {d }}$. Person trips are defined as the sum of one-way, afternoon, 4-hour peak period trips made by all persons for all purposes in single occupancy $\not \nsim$ vehicles (SOV), high occupancy vehicles (HOV), and transit. Potential transit markets are defined as geographic concentrations of person trips, from either Oregon or Washington, that use I-5 to travel between the states. Year 2020 data developed for the I-5 Partnership Study was analyzed, and assumes that no I-5 bridge improvements would be built. Figure 3-7 shows the results of this analysis.

For trips expected to use the I-5 bridge during the afternoon 4-hour peak travel period in 2020:

1. Sixty-six percent $(66 \%)$ of all person trips will be traveling northbound on I-5 from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County. The remaining $34 \%$ will be traveling southbound from Clark County to the Portland metropolitan area.
2. Over $80 \%$ of all northbound person trips will originate in five " $I-5$ corridor" districts: Hayden Island, Delta Park, Rivergate, North Portland, and Portland Central City. These
[^3]PORT OF PORTLAND
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## Port of Vancouver

 Economic Development \& Conservation PlanPut simply, the Economic Development and Conservation Plan (EDCP) is a "to do list" for doubling the industrial land and jobs base at the Port of Vancouver. It includes ensuring critical pieces are in place to support 5,000 new jobs.

Businesses that will create these new jobs on port land require efficient road, rail and river access -all accomplished in an environmentally responsible way. This can only be achieved by involving our community and collaborating with our agency partners.

The key elements of the Economic Development and Conservation Plan are:

## Developing Industrial Land for a Healthy Economy

Columbia Gateway - This 534-acre maritime and light industrialzoned land (called Parcel 3) west of the current port is designated for new maritime and industrial use and natural habitat mitigation. About 50 acres of additional industrial land to the north of Columbia Gateway (Parcel 7) is also included in the development.


Click to download a larger Preferred Alternative map( 662 KB pdf)

Parcel 8, a 50-acre site that was formerly part of the former Rufener farm property located north of Lower River Road, will generate new jobs for Clark County workers within the next 2 years. This parcel is a part of the EDCP, but is following an expedited development process that is separate from the environmental evaluation of Columbia Gateway.

PORT of VANCC 3103 Lower Rive Vancouver, WA ! phone: (360) 69 fax: (360) 735-1 email: POVinforPortV:

## Get Invo

The Port of Vanc Port. We encour: keep informed a involved. There, of upcoming opp participate as we forward.
For more inform: community invol including the Pro Team, citizen for speaking engage well as backgrou information plea:

To contact us ca 360.693.3611 or info@PortVanUs


## Creating Jobs for Our Community



Up to 5,000 new jobs will be generated from the Port's development of Columbia Gateway and Parcel 8.

## Getting People \& Freight to the Port

Development of industrial properties is reliant on strong rail, road, and water access. Rail and road systems are reaching capacity and can constrain existing business, future development, and new economic prospects. The Port is working with the community on plans to eliminate gridlock by expanding and improving rail and road access. Maritime access to waterfront land will also be included in the project.

Click here for more information on road and rail projects at the Port ( 285 Kb pdf)

Click to download a larger Rail \& Road Alternatives map (252 Kb pdf)


## Collaborating with Partner Agencies

The Port is committed to working with local, state, and federal agencies to develop efficient transportation systems and to ensure consistency with local and regional land use goals. The City of Vancouver and the Port have partnered to jointly manage the 26th Avenue extension environmental analysis. The Port is also collaborating with the Washington Department of Transportation on the 39th Street/Vancouver Rail Bypass project.

## Involving the Community

Vancouver and Clark County residents, businesses and community organizations are essential in to successfully bringing about development that will create new jobs. Your participation is encouraged and appreciated. Watch our Web site for meeting announcements, or contact us directly at 360.693 .3611 or info@PortVanUSA.com.

For more information on community involvement, including the Project Partners Team, citizen forums and speaking engagements, please click here.

## Protecting Natural Areas

The Port is committed to ensuring that its industrial lands co-exist with respect to our neighbors as well as natural habitat and the environment.

As part of the permitting process, the Port has set aside over 600 acres for environmental mitigation and
 habitat creation -at a minimum, equal to or more than the acreage the Port plans to develop.

Mitigation will include improved wildlife habitat and buffer zones between developed and natural areas.

In order for the Port to move forward with its development plans, a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis is currently underway. This process includes permitting for all components of the EDCP, with the exception of Parcel 8.

For more information on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), please click here.

To view an overall aerial of the Port please click here.

## Get Involved

The Port of Vancouver is your Port. We encourage you to keep informed and get involved. There will be plenty of upcoming opportunities to participate as we move forward.


## Creating Jobs for Our Community



Up to 5,000 new jobs will be generated from the Port's development of Columbia Gateway and Parcel 8.

## Getting People \& Freight to the Port

Development of industrial properties is reliant on strong rail, road, and water access. Rail and road systems are reaching capacity and can constrain existing business, future development, and new economic prospects. The Port is working with the community on plans to eliminate gridlock by expanding and improving rail and road access. Maritime access to waterfront land will also be included in the project.

Click here for more information on road and rail projects at the Port ( 285 Kb pdf)

Click to download a larger Rail \& Road Alternatives map (252 Kb pdf)
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## Industrial property Port Tenants



## Type of Business

Welding

Auto Processor

Paper Manufacturing

Building Products Distribution

Steel Distribution

Emergency Response Vessel

Sand \& Gravel Operations

Office Space \& Services

Bulk Food-grade Dist.
Lead Oxide Mfr.
Bulk Transportation

Non-profit Organization

Concrete Batch Plant

Malting Company

Bulk Cargo Exporter

Raise Heifers

Plumbing, RV \& Small
Appliance Distribution

Marine Terminal Operator

PORT of VANCOUVER, USA 3103 Lower River Road Vancouver, WA 98660 phone: (360) 693-3611 fax: (360) 735-1565 ernail: POVinfoePortVanUSA.com

## Available Properties-

Port of Vancouver, USA, is strategically located to engage in international trade. The Port offers an extensive and diverse range of industrial and development opportunities for today's global marketplace. CLICK HERE>>

$\leftarrow$ more than

Majestic Appliances/
Flair-it Plumbing Services

|  | Processing |
| :---: | :---: |
| Olympic Pipeline | Meter Station |
| Pacific Coast Shredding | Steel Recycler |
| Panasonic Shikoku Electronics Co, Ltd. | Electronics Mfr. |
| Plastics Northwest, Inc. | Plastic Injection Molding |
| Red Lion Hotel at the Quay | Restaurant/Hotel |
| Rest-A-Phone Corp./ ABC Plastics | Injection Molding Dist. |
| Scope Services, Inc. | Natural Gas Meter Storage \& Installation |
| Sound Delivery Service, Inc. | Transloader |
| Subaru of America | Auto Importer |
| Star Shipping | Shipping Company |
| Stevedoring Services of America | Stevedoring Services |
| Valero, LP | Bulk Liquid/Dry Bulk Storage and Handling |
| Tesoro Refining and Marketing Company | Bulk Petroleum Importer |
| Trimac Panel Products | Panel Products Mfr. |
| TriStar Transload PNW | Lumber Transloading |
| United Grain Corporation | Grain Exporter |
| United Harvest, LLC | Grain Exporter/Administrative Offices |
| United Road Service | Automobile Distribution |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Equipment Storage |
| Vancouver CFS, Inc. | Reload/Container Freight Service |
| Vanport Trucking | Trucking Co. and Warehousing |
| Verizon Wireless | Microwave Station |
| Williams Pipeline | Pipeline Right-of-Way |

We built a bridge or more each decade, now it's been two decades since we built a bridge.

1910 Hawthorne Bridge
1912 Steel Bridge
1913 Broadway Bridge
1917 Interstate Bridge *
1925 Sellwood Bridge
1926 Burnside Bridge
1926 Ross Island Bridge
1931 St. Johns Bridge

1958 Morrison Street Bridge
1958 Interstate Bridge *
1966 Marquam Bridge
1973 Fremont Bridge
1983 Glen Jackson Bridge

$$
1990
$$

$\underline{2000}$
$\underline{2010}$
2010 BI-State Industrial Corridor (completion goal) $\underline{2020}$

## Concerning the Interstate Bridge I-5 Columbia River Crossing

* "BOTH of the bridges are STRUCTURALLY SUFFICIENT and meet ALL OF the REQUIREMENTS" "There were several elements to recommendations that include moving forward with enhancement projects, capacity addition projects on I-5 both north and south of the bridge. The best that can be done on the I5 corridor is to remove the bottlenecks. In order to allow for traffic free flow it would require that additional lanes be added. There is physically no room for additional lanes in the corridor." Don Wagner, administrator, Southwest Region, WADOT Presentation 10/20\&21/2004 Washington Transportation Commission.

Time line Economic Transportation Alliance
$\underset{2005}{\text { Start BIC }} \quad \underset{2008}{\text { Finish Willamette bridge, North Portland Rd. }} \underset{2010}{\text { Open BI-State Corridor }}$

Time line state transportation departments
$\underset{2005}{\text { Start talks }} \underset{2008}{\text { Narrow down ideas }} \quad \underset{2010}{\text { Look for money, law suits, mitigation }}$ Start project

When you come to the Columbia River you'll find a bridge not a barrier. We're open for business!

## Third Bridge Now!

*Both of the bridges that make up the current Columbia River Crossing are structurally sufficient and meet all Federal requirements with approximately 50 years of life left.

* None of the bridges in our area fully comply with new the Federal standard for earthquake retrofit.


# The area has fewer crossings than river cities of similar size across the United States. 

| Metro Area | Population | Body of Water | Highway <br> Crossings | Rail <br> Crossings |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Norfolk | 1.57 million | Hampton Roads/Chesapeake Bay | 4 | 0 |
| Cincinnati | 1.65 million | Ohio River | 7 | 2 |
| Kansas City | 1.78 million | Missouri River | 10 | 3 |
| Portland-Vancouver | $\mathbf{1 . 9 2}$ million | Columbia River | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| Pittsburgh | 2.36 million | Three Rivers | $>30$ | 3 |
| St. Louis | 2.60 million | Mississippi River | 8 | 2 |

Comparison of River Crossings in Selected U.S. Metropolitan Areas of Similar Size Proposal:
Keep the existing bridges and build entirely new capacity to the West near the railroad bridge. www.NewInterstateBridge.com


## Comparison of River Crossings in Selected U.S. Metropolitan Areas of Similar Size

| Metro Area | Population | Body of Water | Hwy Xings | Rail Xings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Norfolk | 1.57 million | Hampton Roads/ <br> Chesapeake Bay | 4 | 0 |
| Cincinnati | 1.65 million | Ohio River | 7 | 2 |
| Kansas City | 1.78 million | Missouri River | 10 | 3 |
| Portland- <br> Vancouver | 1.92 million | Columbia River | 2 | 1 |
| Pittsburgh | 2.36 million | Three Rivers | $>30$ | 3 |
| St. Louis | 2.60 million | Mississippi River | 8 | 2 |

Policy 6.2-Regional and City Traffic Patterns: City policy advances the separation of traffic on different facilities according to the length of trip. Inter-regional traffic should use the Regional Transitand Traffic Way system. City streets should be designed to carry local traffic and not be designed or managed to serve as alternative routes for regional trips.

All of the proposed Task Force concepts support this policy by encouraging inter-regional traffic to use the Regional Traffic Way system and not local city streets. Concept 7 further separates local and regional traffic by providing an arterial connection for local traffic between Portland and Vancouver. The proposed concepts also include light rail, which provides a transit connection to the Regional Transit system.

-Today, about $9 \%$ of the traffic volume in the I-5 Corridor is truck traffic.
-In the future, truck traffic is expected to grow to $11-14 \%$, depending on the location in the corridor.
-Growth of truck traffic will be highest around Swan Island and the Columbia Corridor. Yet StAff with Not include Sty Pa 28 in modeling
Policy 8.15 Wetlands/Riparian/Water Bodies Protection: City Policy stresses the importance of protecting significant wetlands, riparian areas, and water bodies that have significant function

"Bridge Influence Area"
"The original BIA modeling has errors in the traffic counts. These errors where pointed out in the May 2005 meeting. A now model showing the adjustments in the "old modeling" have still not been provided to the task force members or the public."

The CRC Project staff disagrees that there are errors of the magnitude asserted in paragraphs labeled 1 through 3 below. The CRC staff is available to meet to review how the data was developed and to clear up misunderstandings related to the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership's modeling effort.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K_{\text {so }} \text { what } \\
& \text { sore } \\
& \text { mun ar is? }
\end{aligned}
$$



For the Step A Screening of proposed components, CRC project staff updated and refined the data used in the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership model. Those refinements have provided the project with more current data with which to assess the effectiveness of components in addressing the problems identified in the project problem definition. Furthermore, a fully updated model with a 2030 analysis horizon will be developed and will be used to assess the packaged alternatives that will be developed this spring and summer with the components that survive Step A screening.
ni. The BIA shows 11\% Washington County traffic leaving I-5 at Marine Drive. Thole This 11\% modeling needs to go back into the I-5 count going over the I-405 Bridge south of the BIA. This same traffic was identified by PDOT in the St. Johns Truck Study as the linchpin that damages the econcruy, environment, and lIvability in the St . Johns and North Portland residential and retail centers. PDOT identified 75\% of the truck traffic in downtown St. Johns as traffic cutting through because of the congestion on I-5. The I-5 project is supposed to take care of this problem by keeping the traffic on I-5 and not in our neighborhoods. The now plan should not be based on this damaging practice continuing."

See above. The CRC focus is on I-5 at the bottleneck. Transportation alternatives must address the project's Purpose and Need. Even with freight improvements, it is unlikely that all of the truck traffic will be removed from the St. John's neighborhood.
nh $_{2}$. The original modeling by the BIA left out the Swan Island traffic, which accounts for approximately $22 \%$ of the traffic over the Columbia River Bridge."
(1) Thee above. Ane the number for SwAn Islavel-
(1) Where Ane the number
(2) There is a differente between
is Room on I-5 for All I-
swan Island is not in St. John's.
(2)


## The Swan Isand/LowerAbina District



Union Pacific's Albina railyard.

## Main Features

- The core location for one of the region's largest traded sectors in transportation equipment manufacturing
- A regional freight hub location with harbor access and Union Pacific's busiest metro area rail yard
- A mix of distinct areas with industrial park, heavy industrial, office headquarters, or small-lot urban character.

The Swan Island/Lower Albina District is the southeast quarter of Portland's working harbor. This freight hub district is a cluster location for the region's transportation equipment manufacturing le.g., Freightliner, Cascade General) and freight courier (e.g., United Parcel Service, Fedex) industries.

Additional specialty industries relative to Portland's other industrial districts and the region are management of companies (e.g., Freightliner), nondurable goods wholesalers (e.g., Columbia Distributing), and trucking (e.g., Roadway Express). Distribution is the leading employment sector, providing 40 percent of the district's 11,300 jobs.

Site conditions in the 1,060 -acre district reflect its function as a distribution hub. Heavy industrial facilities use 51 percent of the district's occupied developed land. Harbor access is available to 38 percent of the district acreage, and rail access to 57 percent.

The district has five distinct sections. The Mock's Bottom area consists primarily of distribution and manufacturing facilities in an industrial park setting. The heavy industrial shipyard area at the end of Swan Island is characterized by the 115 -acre Cascade General ship-repair facility. The southern part of Swan Island is an office complex, anchored by the headquarter facilities of Freightliner, the largest employer among Portland's cluster of transportation equipment manufacturers. The Albina Yard area and adjacent Lower Albina riverfront are heavy industrial, distinguished by Union Pacific's 200-acre rail yard. And the upland portion of Lower Albina area is an urban, small-block industrial area with a prominent cluster of public maintenance facilities.

The district has 75 acres of vacant, buildable private land and another 54 acres of partly buildable vacant land affected by floodplain or habitat constraints.

## LARGEST EMPLOYERS

|  | INDUSTRY | JOBS |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Freightliner Corp. | Motor Vehicles And Car Bodies | $500+$ |
| United Parcel Service | Local Trucking Without Storage | $500+$ |
| Columbia Distributing Co. | Beer And Ale | $500+$ |
| Tiffany Food Service Inc. | Merchandising Machine Operators | $500+$ |
| Portland School District 1 | Elementary And Secondary Schools | $500+$ |
| Roadway Express | Trucking Except Local | $250-499$ |
| Cascade General Inc. | Ship Building And Repairing | $250-499$ |
| Andersen Construction | Industrial Buildings And Warehouses | $250-499$ |
| Imperial Vending Co. | Merchandising Machine Operators | $250-499$ |
| DSU Peterbilt \& GMC Inc. | New And Used Car Dealers | $250-499$ |

## LOCATION

The Swan Island and adjacent Lower Albina areas are situated along the east bank of the Portland Harbor, north of the Central City.


## SIZE

- 258 sites on 1,063 acres
- 7 percent of the city's industrial land
- 11,309 jobs in 265 establishments (2002)


Ship repair at Cascade General Inc.


Truck manufacturing at Freightiner Corporation.

## Truck Origins and Destinations

- Trucks will continue to originate from the same zones as in the year 2000 .
- In 2020, there will be more "heavy" trucks originating from
し" Swan Island, Airport, and Brooklyn Yard areas.
- In 2020, there will be more "medium" trucks originating from the Happy Valley and Pleasant Valley areas.

* SWAn ISland need to be in mrodelig

Distribution is the Leading employ ment Sector with Heavy transportation
nests.

## Availability of "Buildable" Industrial Land

| TAla trabic of 155 heyps whan. 7 | District | $\begin{gathered} \text { "Vacant" } \\ \text { acres } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { "Buildable" } \\ \text { acres } \end{gathered}$ | "No Constraints" acres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Airport District | 1,440 | 748 | 16 |
|  | Rivergate Industrial District | 1,093 | 545 | 30 |
|  | Northwest Industrial District | 313 | 137 | 2 |
|  | Columbia Corridor East | 730 | 259 | 94 |
|  | Swan Island/Albina Ind. District | 152 | 78 | 0 |
|  | Inner Eastside Industrial District | 14 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Outer Southeast Industrial District | 105 | 19 | 0 |
|  | Banfield Industrial District | 29 | 22 | 0 |
|  | Total | 3,876 | 1,810 | 142 |

Source: Industrial Districts Atlas (in progress), Portland Bureau of Planning, 1/2005 Swan Island need to be cim Modeling to
PORTLAND
TRANSPORTATION

## Opening Remarks

Co-chair Henry Hewitt announced that the next Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Task Force meeting will be held on March 22, 2006, from 4-8:00 p.m.; dinner will be provided. Task Force members will discuss component screening results in detail and the public outreach plan.

- Action - No action required.


## Meeting Minutes

- Action - The January 4, 2006, meeting minutes were adopted with no discussion.


## Public Comments

Comment received from six citizens: Lenny Anderson, Paul Edgar, Travis Huennekens, Tom Mielke, Sharon Nasset, and Michael Powell. Written comments are included in Appendix A. Summaries of verbal comments follow.

- Paul Edgar provided Task Force members with a possible Preliminary Evaluation/Screening Criteria list. He stated that the rail bridge should be replaced with a west side bypass and combination bridge.
- Tom Mielke, former Washington State Representative, stated that he does not want Task Force members to make the same mistakes other states have made when they start looking at replacing the $\mathrm{l}-5$ bridge. He emphasized the need to look at all solutions, including the western corridor and l-205. He also stated that the rail bridge should be replaced with a swing bridge.
E. Michael Powell, owner of Powell's Books, stated that his company moves a lot of books and freight by truck. Traffic congestion results in increased costs for his business. Congestion also discourages businesses from opening in North Portland. He emphasized that traffic is a current problem and needs to be solved soon.
- Sharon Nasset noticed that 11 percent of traffic traveling to Washington County gets off Interstate 5 in North Portiand. The truck traffic causes health issues. She stated that, while trips to Swan Island make up 22 percent of traffic traveling across the l-5 bridge, that traffic is not part of the maps. She suggested that this traffic be put back on I-5. She asked why so much money is being spent on the Task Force per month. She also stated that the project should include expanded areas in the 2040 plan.
- Travis Huennekens expressed his concern regarding the west side bypass not being a part of the study. He cited a recent article in which Doug Ficco stated there would be no money for a west side bypass and requested that the article be entered as part of the record.
Note: The full text of public comments is available in the meeting transcript posted on the project Web site. ${ }^{1}$


## Evaluation Framework

Mike Baker introduced the Evaluation Criteria, which included input from the January 4, 2006, Task Force meeting and additional feedback. Henry noted that the Evaluation Criteria are the factors by which alternatives will be measured.

Note: Task Force questions and comments are in italics, staff responses are in (parentheses), and passed amendments are in bold.

[^4]and value related to flood protection, sediment and erosion control, water quality, groundwater recharge and discharge, education, vegetation, and fish and wildlife habitat.

All Concepts have some impact on wetlands, open space and/or parks lands between Portland Harbor and Columbia Blvd. and would be in conflict with this policy. Concept 4 , the Replacement Bridge, minimizes impacts in this area. Additional work is needed to assess how BLA improvements would impact water bodies, their significant functions and values.

Policy 12.1 Portland's Character: City policy advances the need to enhance and extend Portland's attractive identity. New public projects should enhance Portland's appearance and character through innovative design. This includes creating a "built environment" that is attractive and inviting to the pedestrian.

Concepts designed to minimize visual and physical impacts on the surrounding area would support this policy. Bridge concepts 1 and 6 , which significantly widen the freeway corridor on Hayden Island and in Marine Drive interchange, would conflict with this policy.

## A.16. Overall I-5 Land Use Findings : The Effect of Investments on Growth

(a) The analysis of the transportation options in the I-5 Partnership study assumed that the population and employment allocations in 2020 would be the same in all scenarios. Further, the analysis that the level and nature of the investment would change the modal choice, the route and the trip choice, but would not alter the number or locations of employment and households. History tells us otherwise. Transportation investments do change the location and number of jobs and households.
(b) The I-5 Partnership analyzed the potential effects on changes to households and employment with the I-5 investments of an additional freeway lane in the Corridor and across the Columbia River, plus a light rail loop in Clark County. The findings of analysis are found below in C-G.
(c) Without changes in land use policy, the following land use development trends can be expected, regardless of the transportation actions taken in the I-5 Corridor:
i. Population and employment growth in the Portland/Vancouver region are developing in a dispersed pattern. A significant share of households and employment are locating at the urban fringe, within adopted zoning.

Ii There will be more job growth in Clark County than anticipated in our current adopted plans. Even with a reduced percentage of commuters crossing the river, I-5 will be congested.
iii. Industrial areas are at risk of being converted to commercial uses, threatening the availability of industrial land in the Portland/Vancouver region and increasing traffic congestion in the I-5 corridor.

## Are We On The Right Path?

Millions of dollars have been spent on studies of the I-5 Corridor, since the 1980s, with no resolution to the fact that the corridor is at or beyond capacity. Don Wagner stated, in his minutes from the October 20, 2004 Transportation Commission Hearings, "There is physically no room for additional lanes in the corridor"
(See:http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/commission/AgendaMinutes/minutes/2004/Oct20.pdf)
Stated below are important facts gathered from several Transportation Studies and Hearings related to the condition of the I-5 Corridor:

* Both of the bridges that make up the Columbia River Crossing are structurally sufficient and meet all Federal requirements with approximately 50 years of life left.
* None of the bridges in our area fully comply with new Federal standards for earthquake seismograph retrofit. (Jeff Graham FHWA.)
* The U.S. Coast Guard has stated that they do not want any more lift spans over the Columbia River because of shipping hazards and lift problems. Three of the options now presented by the previous I-5 task force include a lift span.
* USDOT has identified our I-5 Corridor as the most congested in the nation. (See pg. 21 Final Strategic Plan: 2002)
* The Glen Jackson I-205 Bridge is near full capacity now, approximately nine to eleven years earlier than originally estimated. The Glen Jackson Bridge is not built to carry light rail.
* Our area has fewer crossings than river cities of similar size across the United States. The closest bridge to I-5 and I-205 is 53 miles up stream in Longview Washington.
* The Corridor's overflow affects I-205, I-84, and diverts traffic into neighborhood streets, blocking intersections adjacent to the I-5 Corridor.

In 1999, a bi-state leadership committee considered the growing congestion on the highway and rail system in the I-5 Corridor. The committee recommended that the Portland/Vancouver region initiate a public process to develop a plan for the I-5 Corridor.

In 2001 the Governor's of Oregon and Washington appointed a bi-state Task Force to develop a strategic plan for the I-5 Corridor. The primary goal of the task force was to determine the level of investment needed in the I-5 Corridor for highway, transit, and heavy rail improvements. They were also to determine how the transportation and land use systems should protect investments.

The 28 member bi-state Task Force meetings ended before it was known that both existing I-5 bridges are structurally sound. The Task Force ended by making the recommendation to narrow down the scope of their study to the Bridge Influence Area based on the belief that the current I- 5 bridges were in "poor shape" and that we would need a replacement bridge. The report stating that the Columbia River Crossing Bridges were in good shape, with approximately 50 years more of use left, came out later.

The Oregonian reported that:
Matt Garrett responded to comments from several groups that wanted a committee 's report calling for a new 10-lane bridge across the Columbia River set aside, in favor of other corridors across the river. (Oregonian July 1,2005 Bill Stewart)

Minutes of a Washington Transportation meeting in 2004 cite Wagner as stating: "Enlarging the Columbia River Bridge will not add capacity to the I-5 Corridor. "(Oregonian August 24, 2005 Bill Stewart)

The alliance, whose plan has drawn the support from several area politicians and business leaders, is using the excerpts from the same reports to argue that a wider bridge in the same place solves nothing. (Oregonian August 24, 2005 Bill Stewart)

Another advocate for the industrial route is Portland businessman Paul Edgar, who says the official bi-state study team should be sidetracked before it runs through more than $\$ 50$ million in federal and state grants for environmental study-of the wrong route. (Oregonian August 24, 2005 Bill Stewart)

The Historic Columbia River Crossing Bridge, the Highway 26 Corridor and the I-5 Corridor, from Terwilliger to the I-5 Bridge are considered obsolete because the traffic infrastructure was built for slower speed, lower capacity and with entrances and exits that are too close to each other. That said, the I5 Corridor has not lost its value. We must respect the limitations of the I-5 Corridor, realizing this was our first corridor. It must not be our last. We need to have a $21^{\text {st }}$ century infrastructure in order to build a $21^{\text {st }}$ century economic base.

## In conclusion

An independent non-local panel of transportation experts needs to be appointed to answer this question:

* Do we continue to study options that will not add needed capacity to the I-5 Corridor?


## Or

* Do we look at a new Corridor that will add capacity, help the economy and remove freight traffic from our neighborhoods?

Realistically, after almost 20 yrs. of studies there are only two places to put a new bridge, which must be a high, non-lift span bridge:

* Rip up our sound historic bridge, to put up another bridge, in the same old place. This does not add capacity, and demolishes homes, businesses, bridges, and in some of I-5's most congested and urbanized areas.


## Or

* Create a new corridor that will remove traffic from the I-5 Corridor, using mostly under utilized and vacant land, a majority of it publicly owned. This new corridor would provide port to port connection, local access without using I-5, direct access to I-5 from our industrial areas taking freight traffic out of neighborhoods in Oregon and Washington. This Corridor does not interfere with I-5, during construction.

Thank you,
Sharon Nasset
Economic Transportation Alliance
www. newinterstatebridge.com

## Why do we have roads?

F-zds come from the Romans and are part of creating and maintaining an orderly society. Romans where -. Ious for their roads, military and commerce. We have established roads and a transportation system for the same reasons.

Roads are strategically located and must have capacity for:

1. Military and security which is the basis for the US highway system.
2. Emergency evacuation for safety
3. Commerce, the transportation of goods and services to support the economy.

Roads or transportation corridors are not about what is currently traveling on these corridors, fossil fuel propelled vehicles, but their location and capacity level. Roads keep civilization functioning. First people walked on these corridors, then came horse, wagon, steam engines, and currently fossil-fueled vehicles. Limiting our transportation corridors is damaging to our environment, economy, military and safety. It is short sighted and shows a lack of basic understanding of roads to limit them because of what is currently using the road system. Presently we must create fuels that are more acceptable to the environment. At the same time we must continue to design good strategically located transportation corridors to meet the capacity needs now and into the future. This is especially important as we work on our land use planning. Roads that go to our industrial areas and centers of commerce but not through our residential area must be developed now. Roads are a large part of our economy and help our good, services and people remain diverse.

When many of our current roads where built the environment and citizens where not a real part of the cess. In the last 25 years that has changed and we involve both. A problem has developed with some in the environmental movement who think it is their responsibility to stop roads. Instead of helping with the most appropriate placements, they have stood in the way of creating a healthy transportation system. This has given us some of the worse congestion in the United States, damaged our environment, and lessened our quality of life. Balance is important, the lack of understanding of why we have roads needs to be cleared up. It is not about what currently travels on our transportation corridors, it is about these corridors being strategically located and their capacity

Back One Page

## Why haven't we built the North Willamette Crossing?

In the 1960's with the growth of Rivergate and the port on the North Peninsula, there was a loud outcry from the industrial business community, retail, and residence. The deficiency and the inadequacy of transportation system were costing business a great deal of time and money. The retail and residents area had 18 -wheeler running muck and ruining their lives.
The Cry was "For the economic viability of the region a new bridge to the north industrial area must be built." Unfortunately, city leaders with poverty conscience and lack of belief in their abilities to provide for our infrastructure attempted a short-term fix. It was decided that they didn't have the money for a new bridge across the Willamette River and instead they ripped down building in historic St. Johns' to widen streets and help speed up the truck traffic through downtown St. Johns'. Because I84 had not open yet truck traffic went east and west on Lombard.

The destruction of Historic building in downtown St. Johns and the ruining of our city center was a waste. Within less than a decade, complaints and problems with traffic conflicts made city hall act again. This time they decide to tear down more buildings diverted traffic, widen streets and put up signs. Because they didn't have money for a bridge and could only afford a "short-term" fix. This killed the business center and half the business some decades old, closed their doors forever. With the short-term fix in place, plans for a new bridge where put on hold because of 1980's recession.

In 1992, city council put together a citizen adviser group to deal with traffic conflict and the economic cost of traffic conflict on the North Peninsula due to inadequate transportation infrastructure. The findings of the St. Johns' Truck Study "This recommendation encourages and promotes the acceleration and prioritization of a listed Regional Transportation Plan feasibility study for a new bridge crossing the Willamette River from the north Portland peninsula to US 30 and the northwest industrial districts." Accelerate the Willamette River bridge currently listed in RTP.
"All sides agree a new bridge is needed." Why? Well short-term solutions haven't work and will not work. Abundant freight traffic and family traffic have conflict. Their objectives are too different to blend and get a good mix. Both sides are losers and have been losing more and more. Every year money and the quality of life for both business and residents has deteriorated. It is the responsibility of our local government to work out our problems.
In the 1960's when city leaders acknowledged "For the economic viability of the region a new bridge to the north industrial area must be built.", had they built a new bridge our economy would be attracting and keeping business. We would have an engineering feat to marvel at. The largest part of our economy is based on trade and transportation. You can get anywhere in the world from our "Port" land has been our slogan for a very long time. Now we are known for having some of the worst congestion in the nation. Our reputation is on the line. True leadership is thankful when they know what is needed to take care of a problem and they set forth come hell or high water to get what is needed for a healthy community. That is how we built an empire out of the wilderness. Not the current poverty conscience "we just don't have the money so I guess we will just have do with out." One belief built an empire the other can't even build a bridge.

A testimony to poverty conscience

## Congestion Relief

Congestion comes from not enough capacity in our transportation corridors and transit system. The larger the population the more capacity is needed. Roads or transportation corridors are not about what is currently traveling on these corridors, fossil fuel propelled vehicles, but their location and capacity levels. Roads keep civilization functioning. At one time people walked on these corridors, then horse, wagon, steam engines, and currently fossil-fueled vehicles. Limiting our transportation corridors is damaging to our environment, economy, military and safety. Transportation is a system with a variety of options to help create a healthy balance. Here are some basic beginning steps to ease congestion.

1. We must establish a 24 -hour bus system. Portland is a 24 -hour town with an employment and entertainment transportation need. The traffic increase at 1:30 PM every day starts with employees who were not offered the opportunity to take mass transit to work. Employees working swing shift, graveyard and early morning shifts do not have transit service to and from work. The employer pays for mass transit services and so do many employees. They deserve and need the services they have paid for
2. Bus transit service must be increased to include adequate service into the industrial areas.
3. All bus stops need to have a bench and cover to attract clients and for comfort. Benches with advertisement can raise revenue. These funds can maintain bus stops and up grade pedestrian sidewalk access to transits stops. 25\% of the transit stops in Portland are considered inaccessible to the physically challenged, elderly and young due to lack of sidewalks and unsafe walking conditions.
4. Create a network of Limited Motorized Corridors to help separate different modes of transportation for safety, reliability, and less congestion on major streets of commerce. These corridors would be for pedestrians, bikes, and small motorized vehicles, up to 20 MPH. Limited Motorized Corridors would parallel main streets of commerce for business access and transit opportunities. Please see Limited Motorized Corridor on my web-site.
5. Build a new third North/South corridor to the west of the current l-5. By building a new Columbia River crossing connecting our industrial areas together it will create direct access. This will relieve congestion on the I-5 Corridor and take truck traffic out of several neighbors. Please see Bi-State Industrial Corridor www.newinterstatebridge.com. This must to be started right away. Because of the drain on the economy the current l-5 study monies must be dedicated to solve congestion.
6. Heavy Rail is the backbone of our transportation system. It is the most cost effective, least polluting, environmentally friendly, and safest way to transport goods. It is one of the least expensive infrastructures to build and brings the largest amount of freight into an area. It supports our trucking industry and brings good family wage jobs into hubs all across the United States. Rail is friendly to all commodities it carries from goods and services to people. Besides providing jobs, railroads put a majority of their money back into their infrastructure. They provide stability for the economy by building into the land and are an industry that cannot just pick up and leave. To relieve congestion and strengthen our economy we need to double and triple track our existing rail system. Rail tends to be less intrusive to land use policy, due to the right of way generally being set aside and owned. With the increase of rail capacity by the adding of additional tracks you have the ability to relieve congestion and pressure on our road system. Rail already serves many of our centers of employment, commerce, and entertainment. Rail has the ability to make small towns and coastal towns year around destinations. There are many ways of creatively financing multi track rail capacity. Because rail tends to be less expensive than highway and road infrastructure you get way more bang for your buck. Encouraging resort areas, casinos, shipping suppliers, commuters, and tourism to purchase advance, future options to use the rail similar to time share for future is one financing option. A rail lottery

## The Third Bridge Bi-State Industrial Corridor



The Historic Columbia River Crossing is Structurally Sound
The Historic Columbia River Crossing will be celebrating their 50th and 100th birthdays soon with pride of constructions. This good report on the I-5 bridges translates into removing bottlenecks only, leaving the Historic Columbia River Crossing a lone. It is a great relief not having to deal with rebuilding the bridges. Now we can turn our direction towards a new corridor and a futuristic transportation system to complement our 21 st century communities.

The fact is that the I-5 is an international highway. I-5 is over 1,300 miles long and the only freeway stretching om Canada to Mexico in the U.S. With billions of freight tonnage traveling the corridor our economy hinges on it's continuing to flow, especially as we head into an on time demand economy. I-5 travels through dozens of towns and belongs to none of them including us. Vancouver WA. and Portland, OR. have been sister cities for over 150 years yet have not built one local access bridge.

I- 5 international highway was build for long distance travel. I-5 is not meant to be used for short distances of less than 50 miles nor as a local commuter route. The one stretch of I-5 crossing the Columbia river is less than seven miles long .



We buitt a ôridge or more each decade, now it's been two decades since we iuiit a obridige.


* "Both of the bridges are structurally sufficient and meet all of the requirements." "The best that can be done on the I-5 corridor is to remove the bottlenecks. In order to allow for traffic free flow it would require that additional lanes be added. There is physically no room for additional lanes in the corridor."

Don Wagner, administrator, Southwest Region, WADOT, as reported in the official minutes of the October 20 \& 212004 Washington Transportation Commission. (page 17 of http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/commission/AgendasMimutes/mimutes/2004/Oct20.pdf)

## The previous studies have made very clear findings.

1. The Columbia River Crossing I-5 Bridge recently under went a complete inspection which found that "(b)oth of the bridges are structurally sufficient and meets all requirements" The Columbia River Crossing received an upgrade from two to three lanes in each directions, a new 17 million dollar paint job and is currently being upgraded electrically.
2. The I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership finding were that we need more capacity, not that we need to remove a structurally sound and efficient historic bridge that carry more traffic than originally built for.
3. The Columbia River Crossing is to capacity. I-5 is at capacity from I-84 all the way into Washington. "There is physically no room for additional lanes in the corridor. (I-5)" Enlarging the Columbia River bridge will not add capacity to the $\mathrm{I}-5$ corridor.
4. Enlarging the current Columbia River Crossing will encroach on the Fort Vancouver Historic Reserve. It will
demolish Jantzen Beach businesses, residences, and floating residences. Paying to remove successful businesses, on premium land is extremely expensive.
5. The environmental damage of demolishing and removing structurally sound buildings, homes and bridges is also extremely expensive.
6. The construction my not start for 10,15 , or 20 years and may take 5 to 7 years for removal and rebuilding the bridge. With I-5 under construction and I-205 being the only other crossing, we can look forward to many years of increasing congestion costs both in dollars, reputation, and time wasted.

As the newest i-5 BI-State task force gets underway for another multimillion doliar study, this one lasting 3-5 years, many in our communities say don't study again -- BUILD!

## Screening A Conflicting Data on BI-State Industrial Corridor (RC-14)

## All modes of transportation are important but they are not all equal. <br> All the evaluation topics are important but they are not equal.

When the task for member where setting up the screening and evaluation process they pointed out to staff that order of important was important. Staff assured them that this was a brain storming process and they where not listing them in order of important at that stage.

On the list
Lack of safety from only having two bridges.
Add capacity for freight and commerce.
Add capacity for vehicles for business, commuting, and pleasure.
Taking traffic out of the I-5 corridor
Spill over traffic in neighborhood adjacent to I-5 currently a serious problem.
Providing direct access from I-5 into our industrial areas.
Air pollution, noise, and congestion on I-5 and in adjacent neighborhoods.
Displacement and demolishing of property
Cost of land, right of way, and construction on current I-5.
Historic buildings.
Moving the bottleneck further south instead of ending it.
Time of construction and logistic of not providing a third bridge before construction on I-5
Etc. (DVD either January, February meetings)
Task force member in March 2006 as that seismic needed to be taken off of the screen process list. Task force member where asked to make that part of a baseline need of all projects.
(March DVD)
How did transit, bike, and pedestrian when they provide the least in capacity across the Columbia River make it to A screening and why wasn't seismic moved to baseline of any project?

Transit is very important. I have been encouraging elected officials to reestablish a 24 -hour bus service we have a 24-hour workforce. Four years ago as transportation chair for the North Portland Business Association we had meeting with representative for North and NW business. The number one reason why an employee was fired from a family wage job was not conduct performance, or drugs it was lack adequate of transportation private and public to our industrial areas. I know the importance of a good transit system. However, we are looking at capacity, the economy, and freight. Transit is less $10 \%$ of capacity across the bridge and there for must be treated as only a small solution, needed but small.

Bike and pedestrian is less than $1 \%$ now and is projected in 2020 to be $1.5 \%$
The screening process is not being used fair.... Different options start on $135^{\text {th }}$ in Washington and downtown Portland outside the bridge influence areas.
Parking and rides in downtown Vancouver not for jobs in Vancouver but to bring transit rider to Oregon. CRC staff counts the distance and origin as start from these park and ride and not from where the vehicles being park came from. CRC staff is also not count the congestion on city arterial to get to the parking lots or time traveled added to trip by having to park and get transit.

There are several other discrepancies
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## Conflicting Data

Conflicting Data put forth from CRC causing confusion. CRC staff has four different descriptions of the BI-State Industrial Corridor. Each description has missing, wrong and different information.

RC-14 Missing information from the official description
The north end of the corridor connects to I-5.
The construction of a new multi-lane trench from I-5 to the BNSF and the Port of Vancouver* Upgrades North Portland Road to a freeway.
Freeway continues to Columbia Corridor providing new direct access to I-5 north.
Provides direct access to HWY 30 and NW industrial area
Accommodates commuter rail.
Provide access to wet land and Smith and By bee lakes

## Misinformation

A trench from I-5 and Mill Plain to BNSF alignment NOT a tunnel (405 is a trench in NW Portland). A tunnel into an industrial corridor is inappropriate and creates a fatal flaw. Federal law prohibits over sizes, high/ wide loads, and hazard material from using a tunnel. A tunnel is much more expensive than a trench. This issue has been pointed out to staff and staff continues to use the misinformation.

The BIC is inside the I-5 corridor.
The BIC DOES provide a new multi-use pathway across the Columbia River in the I- 5 corridor and provides bike/pedestrian connections.

States the BIC does not upgrade seismic risks on the I-5 Bridges and State they are unsure if seismic risk can be address through upgrades on other options.

States that the BIC is 30,000 vehicles arterial. Needs reads that BIC is 300,000 plus vehicles freeway.

The CRC staff uses information given them on BIC including maps from the web-site and refuses to us the name of the project. The name of the project will let citizens and elected official know what BIC does and where it goes. The staff will not acknowledge that it connects the ports, and major industrial areas in both states with hold information.
5.3.4.1 RC-14 New Corridor Crossing

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Description: } \\
& \text { This component creates a multi-modal bi-state industrial corridor next to the BNSF rail crossing } \\
& \text { west of the existing 1-5 bridges. The north end would start near Mill Plain and Fourth Plain } \\
& \text { Boulevards in Vancouver and it would travel through Hayden Island connecting to Marine Drive } \\
& \text { near North Portland Road. This crossing would accommodate freight trains, trucks, autos, bus } \\
& \text { transit, bikes/pedestrians and potentially light rail. Figure 5-16 shows this component shows } \\
& \text { this component }
\end{aligned}
$$ this component.



Thisone does connect to I-5 uses turnel Fot TRench


### 3.2.4 2020 Transit Market Analysis

2. Over $80 \%$ of all northbound person trips will originate in five " $1-5$ corridor" districts: Hayden Island, Delta Park, Rivergate, North Portland, and Portland Central City. These five districts will account for approximately 25,200 trips in the 4-hour PM peak travel period.

Q5. Bike/Ped Fail Provides new Columbia River crossing with modern bike/ped pathways). With a location approximately one mile west of I-5, it is out of direction for users with trip origins and destinations within the I-5 Bridge Influence Area.

Q5. Bike/Ped Fail Provides new Columbia River crossing with modern bike/ped pathway(s). With a location approximately one mile west of $1-5$, it is out of direction for users with trip origins and destinations within the I-5 Bridge Influence Area.

|  |  | Area. |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Q5. Bike/Ped | Fail | Provides new Columbia River crossing with modern bike/ped pathways). <br> With a location approximately one mile west of I-5, it is out of direction for <br> users with trip origins and destinations within the I-5 Bridge Influence Area. |

$41 \%$ goto the above area o near Delta Park added males it 55.590
5. North Portland will be the next largest trip producer to Clark County ( 5,300 trips), followed by Rivergate with 4,500 trips, Delta Park with 4,000 trips, and Hayden Island with 2,900 trips to Clark County.
6. The Bridge Influence Area will be a significant trip origin for trips to Clark County. Of the 30,264 total person trips from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County, approximately $6,900(23 \%)$ of the trips will originate in either Hayden Island or Delta Park. Both of these districts are within the Bridge Influence Area.
only 2390 on in BIA
by $R-14$ iR Delta Park is Accessible
Q5. Bike/Ped Pass Provides new Columbia River crossing with modern bike/ped pathways).


Con Flicting Data + Results.
Q6. Seismic Unknown $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Provides new } 1-5 \text { crossing built to current seismic standards. } \\ \text { However, depending on the use of the existing } 1-5 \text { bridges, they } \\ \text { may need to be seismically upgraded to meet the new seismic }\end{array}\right\} \begin{aligned} & \text { Unknown } \begin{array}{l}\text { criteria. It is not known at this point whether the existing bridges } \\ \text { can be retrofitted to meet current seismic design standards. }\end{array}\end{aligned}$
(1) Provides New crossing. (2) Does not up grade but may.
(3) un know If bridges can be Retrobbitted to meet current Standards

| Q6. Seismic | Unknown | Provides new Columbia River crossing built to current seismic <br> standards for arterial roadway and upgrades the existing l-5 <br> bridges serving Interstate traffic, if feasible. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

(1) Provide new crossing. (2) seismic if feasible

Q6. Seismic $\xrightarrow{\text { Fail }}$| Provides new Columbia River crossing built to current seismic standards, |
| :---: |
| but does not upgrade the existing $1-5$ bridges serving Interstate traffic and |
| therefore the seismic risk of the $1-5$ bridges would not be reduced. |

(1) Provides new bridge crossing. (2) unknow ore Feasibly Fail because of not Fixing Seismic CAn it be FiXED? is it feasible by Not a Unknown Rating

| Q6. Seismic | Fail $\quad$Provides new Columbia River crossing built to current seismic <br> standards, but does not upgrade the existing $I-5$ bridges serving <br> Interstate traffic and therefore the seismic risk of the I-5 bridges <br> would not be reduced. |
| :--- | :--- |

(1) Provide New crossing (2) How can it tail if Retro bitting is unknown

\#23 \#13 fie Advanced and States it un know if Retroffit can be done. Rated unknown $19,19,15,16=$ Fail be cause they don't did what un know - conflicting data!

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Conflict Data } \\
& \text { CRC "A"screening } \\
& \text { Q1. Traffic Pass increases vehicular capacity along l-5 in the Bridge influence Area } \\
& \text { by adding new travel lanes. Serves an express function within the } \angle R-13 \\
& \text { Bridge Influence Area with Vancouver access limited to the SR } \\
& 500 \text { interchange and points north and Portland access limited to } \\
& \text { Interstate Avenue and points south. Serves projected year } 2020 \\
& \text { traffic levels, expected to increase by at least } 40 \% \text { (by over } 50,000 \\
& \text { daily vehicles) over } 2005 \text { levis, at similar or (ewer hours of } \\
& \text { congestion compared to } 2005 \text { conditions (ide., } 4 \text { hours during the } \\
& \text { afternoon/evening peak along } l-5 \text { within the Bridge Influence Area). } \\
& \text { what is the Capacity } \\
& \text { of this crossing? } \rightarrow \\
& \text { Projected } 2020 \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { traffic } 4090 \\
50,000
\end{array} \\
& \text { Projectedzozo below' } \\
& 1590-20,000 \\
& \text { Projected } 2020 \\
& 1590-20,000 \\
& \text { Q1. Traffic See Provides new Columbia River crossing that would serve about } 25,000 \\
& \text { Projected zorabeol } \\
& \text { 2090-25,000 } \\
& \text { daily vehicles, with most of these vehicles diverted from i-5. Some l-205 } \\
& \text { traffic shifts to } 1-5 \text {. By 2020, } 1-5 \text { traffic demands still increase by about } \\
& 20 \% \text { ( } 25,000 \text { vehicles) over } 2005 \text { levels, resulting in 7-8 hours of } \\
& \text { afternoon/evening peak period congestion. } \\
& \text { < } R 14 \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Assuming construction of a new multilane tunnel under will Plain Blvd. } \\
\text { and construction of high capacity interchange ramps between I-5 and Mill }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Plain Blvd., provides new Columbia River crossing that would serve up to }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{1-205} \text { traffic shifts to } 1-5 \text {. By 2020, } 1-5 \text { traffic demands still increase by at } \\
& \text { least } 15 \% \text { (by over } 20,000 \text { vehicles) over } 2005 \text { levels, resulting in 6-7 } \\
& \text { hours of afternoon/evening peak period congestion. } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Assuming construction of a new muli-lane iumnei under xviii Plain Bird. and } \\
\text { construction of high capacity interchange ramps between } 1-5 \text { and Mill Plain }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Blvd., provides new Columbia River crossing that would serve up to } 30,000 \\
& \text { daily velicies with most of these vehicles diverted iron } 1-5 \text {. Some } 1 \text {-205 } \\
& \text { traffic shifts to } 1-5 \text {. By 2020, } 1-5 \text { traffic demands still increase by at least } \\
& 15 \% \text { (by over 20,000 vehicles) over } 2005 \text { levels, resulting in 6-7 hours of } \\
& \text { afternoon/evening peak period congestion. } \\
& \text { Vancouver City Center and Hayden Island- resulting in substantial } \\
& \text { No Advance } \\
& \downarrow \text { Passes } \\
& \text { Provides new Columbia River arterial crossing to supplement 1-5. } \\
& \text { By 2020, } 1-5 \text { traffic demands still increase by at least 15\% (by over } \\
& 20,000 \text { vehicles) over } 2005 \text { levels, resulting in 6-7 hours of } \\
& \text { afternoon/evening peak period congestion. }
\end{aligned}
$$

RC-14, RC-15, RC-19, and RC-22 do not make an investment in I-5 to substantially address existing non-standard design and safety features and therefore do not satisfy Question \#4. As mentioned earlier, the congestion relief/demand reduction they provide falls in the marginal range.

Only RC-23 substantially addresses existing non-standard design and safety features within the l-5 Bridge Influence Area and therefore satisfies Question \#4.

## Question \#5: Bicycle/Pedestrian Mobility

As with transit improvements, in order for an arterial river crossing to improve bicycle and pedestrian mobility within the l-5 Bridge Influence Area, its bicycle and pedestrian facilities need to be physically proximate to the current l-5 corridor and provide improved connections to the bicycle and pedestrian network.

RC-19, RC-22 and RC-23 are all physically proximate to the current I-5 corridor and could improve network connectivity, thereby satisfying Question \#5. RC-14, RC-15 and RC-21 are located one mile or more east or west of the current l-5 corridor, imposing out of direction travel demands on cyclists and pedestrians seeking to move between points in the Bridge Influence Area and thus, do not satisfy Question \#5.

## Question \#6: Seismic Vulnerability

In order for an arterial river crossing to reduce the seismic risk of the Columbia River Crossing, it must be designed to nationally accepted bridge standards and the existing $1-5$ bridges would need to be seismically retrofit. Note, however that it is not currently known whether the existing l-5 bridges can be retrofitted.

All arterial river crossing bridges would be designed to current seismic standards, however, only RC-23 proposes to seismically retrofit the existing l-5 bridges (if feasible), and therefore only RC23 could potentially satisfy Question \#6.

## Summary

In summary, an arterial crossing can satisfy each of the six Step A screening questions so long as it provides:
> an acceptable level of congestion relief on I-5 to serve commuters and freight (Q1 \& Q3);
$>$ proximity to the $1-5$ corridor to both meet transit performance criteria and improve bike/pedestrian mobility in the l-5 corridor (Q2 \& Q5);
> solutions to critical non-standard safety/design features in the BIA and avoids airport airspace (Q4);
> design upgrades to address the seismic vulnerability of the current facility (Q6).
Based on staff review of the six arterial components, RC-23 satisfies each of the Step A questions and is recommended to advance for further consideration during alternative packaging. Where appropriate, promising design features from the other five arterial components not recommended to advance could be integrated to further improve RC-23.

## RC-1: Replacement Bridge Downstream/ Low Level/Moveable

RC-2: Replacement Bridge Upstream/
Low Level/Moveable
$\longrightarrow$


RC-3: Replacement Bridge Downstream/Mid-level


RC-4: Replacement Bridge Upstream/Mid-level


## Staff Recommendation: Advance RC-1 through RC-4

| Step A <br> Question | Pass/ <br> Fail | Reasons: RC-1 through RC-4 each: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Q1. Traffic | Pass | Increases vehicular capacity along I-5 in the Bridge Influence Area <br> by adding new travel lanes. Serves projected year 2020 traffic <br> levels, which is expected to increase by at least 40\% (over 50,000 <br> daily vehicles) over 2005 levels, at similar or fewer hours of <br> congestion compared to 2005 conditions (i.e., 4 hours during the <br> afternoon/evening peak along l-5 within the Bridge Influence Area). |
| Q2. Transit | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity to accommodate transit within the <br> l-5 Bridge Influence Area serving the identified travel markets. |
| Q3. Freight | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity for truck-hauled freight along I-5. <br> Would be compatible with improvements to interchanges within the <br> Bridge Influence Area that would support improved truck operations. |
| Q4. Safety | Pass | Provides I-5 crossing that addresses many non-standard design <br> features and would be compatible with substantially upgrading I-5 <br> within the Bridge Influence Area to current standards. Would not <br> encroach into Pearson Airpark airspace and would satisfy U.S. Coast <br> Guard navigational interests. |
| Q5. Bike/Ped | Pass | Provides new Columbia River crossing with modern bike/ped <br> pathway(s). |
| Q6. Seismic | Pass | Provides new l-5 crossing built to current seismic standards. |

RC-7: Supplemental Bridge Downstream/Low Level/Moveable


RC-8: Supplemental Bridge Upstream Low Level/Moveable

RC-9: Supplemental Bridge Downstream Mid-level


Staff Recommendation: Advance RC-7 through RC-9



## RC-10: Supplemental

 Bridge Upstream/Mid-level
## Staff Recommendation: Not Advance

| Step A <br> Question | Pass/ <br> Fail | Reasons |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Q1. Traffic | Pass | Increases vehicular capacity along I-5 in the Bridge Influence Area <br> by adding new travel lanes. Serves projected year 2020 traffic <br> levels, which is expected to increase by at least 40\% (over 50,000 <br> daily vehicles) over 2005 levels, at similar or fewer hours of <br> congestion compared to 2005 conditions (ie., 4 hours during the <br> afternoon/evening peak along l-5 within the Bridge Influence Area). |
| Q2. Transit | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity to accommodate transit within <br> the l-5 Bridge Influence Area serving the identified travel markets. |
| Q3. Freight | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity for truck-hauled freight along I-5. <br> Would be compatible with improvements to interchanges within the <br> Bridge Influence Area that would support improved truck <br> operations. |
| Q4. Safety | Fail | Retains the existing l-5 bridges, and therefore the opening for the <br> supplemental bridge would need to line up with the existing lift span <br> opening. This places the high point of the new bridge on the north <br> side of the Columbia River channel. In addition, the new bridge's <br> upstream location places it closer to Pearson Airpark. Due to the <br> upstream and high point locations for the new bridge, this crossing |
| unacceptably encroaches into the Pearson Airpark airspace. |  |  |




## RC-11: Supplemental Bridge Downstream/High Level

## Staff Recommendation: Not Advance

| Step A | Pass/ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Question | Reasons |



## RC-12: Supplemental <br> Bridge Upstream/High Level

## Staff Recommendation: Not Advance

| Step A <br> Question | Pass/ <br> Fail | Reasons |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Q1. Traffic | Pass | Increases vehicular capacity along I-5 in the Bridge Influence Area <br> by adding new travel lanes. Serves projected year 2020 traffic <br> levels, which is expected to increase by at least 40\% (over 50,000 <br> daily vehicles) over 2005 levels, at similar or fewer hours of <br> congestion compared to 2005 conditions (i.e., 4 hours during the <br> afternoon/evening peak along I-5 within the Bridge Influence Area). |
| Q2. Transit | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity to accommodate transit within <br> the I-5 Bridge Influence Area serving the identified travel markets. |
| Q3. Freight | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity for truck-hauled freight along I-5. <br> Would be compatible with improvements to interchanges within the <br> Bridge Influence Area that would support improved truck <br> operations. |
| Q4. Safety | Fail | Provides I-5 crossing that, while addressing many non-standard <br> design features and substantially upgrading l-5 within the Bridge <br> Influence Area to current standards, would be built at a height that <br> unacceptably encroaches into Pearson Airpark airspace. |
| Q5. Bike/Ped | Pass | Provides new Columbia River crossing with modern bike/ped <br> pathway(s). |
| Q6. Seismic | UnknownProvides new I-5 crossing built to current seismic standards. <br> However, depending on the use of the existing I-5 bridges, they <br> may need to be seismically upgraded to meet the new seismic <br> criteria. It is not known at this point whether the existing bridges can <br> be retrofitted to meet current seismic design standards. |  |

## RC-5: Replacement Bridge Downstream High Level

RC-6: Replacement Bridge Upstream High level

$\qquad$


## Staff Recommendation: Not Advance RC-5 and RC-6

| Step A <br> Question | Pass/ <br> Fail | Reasons: RC-5 and RC-6 each: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Q1. Traffic | Pass | Increases vehicular capacity along I-5 in the Bridge Influence Area <br> by adding new travel lanes. Serves projected year 2020 traffic <br> levels, which is expected to increase by at least 40\% (over 50,000 <br> daily vehicles) over 2005 levels, at similar or fewer hours of <br> congestion compared to 2005 conditions (i.e., 4 hours during the <br> afternoon/evening peak along I-5 within the Bridge Influence Area). |
| Q2. Transit | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity to accommodate transit within the <br> I-5 Bridge Influence Area serving the identified travel markets. |
| Q3. Freight | Pass | Provides increased travel capacity for truck-hauled freight along I-5. <br> Would be compatible with improvements to interchanges within the <br> Bridge Influence Area that would support improved truck operations. |
| Q4. Safety | Fail | Provides I-5 crossing that, while addressing many non-standard <br> design features and substantially upgrading I-5 within the Bridge <br> Influence Area to current standards, would be built at a height that <br> unacceptably encroaches into Pearson Airpark airspace- presenting <br> a critical safety flaw. |
| Q5. Bike/Ped | Pass | Provides new Columbia River crossing with modern bike/ped <br> pathway(s). |
| Q6. Seismic | Pass | Provides new I-5 crossing built to current seismic standards. |

## A Screening CR14 O. 1 Traffic

FHWA guideline for freeway hourly lane capacity is 2,000-2,200
CRC modeled the new corridor as up to 30,000 vehicles a day crossing is 1,250 an hour bridge. This model is approximately same results as the 4-lane bridge model in the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership. The staff did say that it was modeling 15-lane bridge ( 12 general purpose and 3 transit only, with freight and commuter rail.) Staff modeled only 104 cars an hour in the 12 general purpose lanes.

CRC Alternative Package \#3
Alternative Package \#3 is the only Build Alternative that would depend on an arterial roadway instead of added freeway capacity across the river to address congestion. (The same as new corridor) The arterial roadway would need to provide convenient connections and adequate capacity - up 6 through lanes.

So, why did the CRC model 4-lanes or less? After stating it would take "up 6 through for adequate capacity" and the BIC is 12 plus? Modeling of less than 6 through insured it had to fail modeling.

The 1966 Marquam Bridge is 8 lanes
The 1973 Freemont Bridge is 8 Ianes
The 1983 Glen Jackson's Bridge is 8 lane
The 1931 St. Johns' Bridge is the last 4 lanes bridge built in the area.
The I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership West Arterial a small bridge serving approximately 30,000 vehicles in 24 hours. This 4 lane only arterial reduced I- 5 \& I-205 congestion by $25 \%$. The West arterial was a road with a lift span; stop lights and was near capacity upon opening.

BI-State Industrial Corridor is a freeway with a high span bridge serving up to $18,000-24,000$ vehicles an hour at 1500-2000 vehicles an hour per lane. It is approximately twice the size of the 1970 Fremont Bridge. The new corridor connects our $20^{\text {th }}$ century industrial areas with a $21^{\text {st }}$ century transportation system to support our economy through the next century. This number does not include transit, bike, and commuter rail capacity.

If the 2020 modeling shows the I- 5 bridges has 180,000 vehicles daily, and the goal is $40 \%$ of the traffic on a new crossing it would be at least 72,00 vehicles a day.

Why did CRC Staff model a bridge serving only up to 30,000 ?
Why did CRC Staff say that BIC (a 12-lane +3 transit only, and 2 lane size bike/ped lookout bridge) received $10 \%$ less the West Arterial (a 4 lane bridge) a much smaller bridge?
Why did CRC Staff model a bridge $1 / 8$ the size of the BIC?
Why did CRC Staff model BIC at 30,000 which is less than $1 / 2$ the goal they are trying to meet?
CRC Staff models a 10-lane bridge at I-5, so why did they model BIC less than 10-lanes?
That was not fair, honest, or balanced and lacks integrity.
West Arterial provides significant, benefits between downtown Portland and downtown Vancouver delay is reduced by $20 \%$. This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system. Provides an additional connection between Oregon and Washington, providing an efficient south-north arterial. Provides freight movement between key industrial areas in Portland/Vancouver area, lessens emissions directly at freeway.

Please the following pages showing conflicting data and information on the same subject. Please be aware the same company provided the information for both studies.


## RC-14: New Corridor Crossing ivear BiNSF Raii Crossing

## Staff Recommendation: Not Advance

| Step A <br> Question | Pass/ <br> Fail | Reasons |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Question 5: West Arterial Road?

## Description

## I. 5 Partnership

- A new road along the existing railroad corridor and N. Portland Rd. berween Mill Plain in Vancouver and US 30 in North Portland provides to access between Portland and Vancouver, particularly for freight between the ports of Vancouver and Portland, and to the Golumbia Corridor, and the Northwest industrial area. This improvement is also targeted to reduce truck traffic in the St. Johns and North Portland neighborhoods and provides an alternative access to Hayden Island.


## Travel Time

- There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the I-5 corridor.


## Transportation Performance

- Improves travel times in the $1-5$ corridor by 6 minutes compared to today.
- Substantially reduces delay on truck routes compared to Baseline 2020 and prevents delay on truck routes from growing worse than it is today.
- Carries about 9600 vehicles over the Columbia River during the evening peak period.
- The West Arterial Road's four-lane bridge over the Columbia River is near capacity during the moming and afternoon peak periods.
- Traffic increases on key Vancouver roads compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

| 4th Plain Blvd | $25 \%$ increase in traffic |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mill Plain Blvd. | $84 \%$ increase in traffic |

- Traffic decreases on key Portland roads compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

| Marine Drive | 27\% decrease in traffic | Helping these exit sug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hayden Island Interchange | $6 \%$ decrease in traffic | studies. |
| St Johns Bridge | 54\% decrease in traffic |  |

(b) This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system including: relieving traffic on I-5, providing an additional connection between Oregon and Washington, relieving the St. Johns neighborhood of through truck traffic, and providing an efficient south-north arterial for a) freight movement between kev industrial areas in the Portland/Vancouver area and b) other traffic in North Portland.

## B1 Recommendation - West Arterial Road:

(a) Further study of this option should be pursued and identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.

 necessarily reflet the mativalual vews of the Task Force, umy Task Force member or the governmental sgenctes mwalied in hic provect

## West Arterial Road?

|  | Measure | Baseline 2020 | West Arterial Road |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reduce auto travel times <br> (Downtown Portland to Salmon Creek in p.m. peak period) | $\begin{gathered} \square \\ 40 \mathrm{~min} . \end{gathered}$ | 34 min . |
|  | Reduce I-5 \& I-205 Congestion (\% of congested lane-miles on I-5 \& I205 during the p.m. peak period) | $\frac{\square}{39 \%}$ | 㷅 |
|  | Reduce Truck Route Congestion (\% of congested lane-miles on truck routes in the study area during the p.m. peak period) | $\square$ |  |
|  | Reduce Spillover Traffic |  | Portland $=\mathrm{Yes}$ Vancouver $=\mathrm{No}$ |
|  | Minimize Environmental Impacts (Bridge) <br> (impacts to natural resources such as fish. wildlife, plants, wetlands) | Moderate |  |
|  | Minimize Displacements (number of residential and business displacements given conceptual design) |  | $+22$ |
|  | Cost (2001 dollars) | $\square_{\$ 291 \mathrm{M}}$ | $\square_{\$ 947 \mathrm{MI}}^{\square}$ |

Rating Scale


## IX. Additional Elements and Strategies Considered

## A1 Key Findings - West Arterial Road

(a) The West Arterial Road is a possible complement to, but does not substitute for I-5 improvements. While this potential improvement falls slightly behind on all measures of transportation performance it does provide significant benefits. Compared to Baseline 2020 time travel savings between downtown Portland and downtown Vancouver are approximately 6 minutes, delay is reduced by $20 \%$, and congestion is reduced by $17 \%$.
(b) This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system including: relieving traffic on I-5, providing an additional connection between Oregon and Washington, relieving the St. Johns neighborhood of through truck traffic, and providing an efficient south-north arterial for a) freight movement between key, industrial areas in the Portland/Vancouver area and b) other traffic in North Portland.
(c) However, the traffic impacts to Vancouver neighborhoods and the downtown Vancouver district are significant. It is very likely that arterial roads leading to this new connection would need to be widened to accommodate the traffic traveling between the West Arterial Road and the freeway. The widening of these arterial roads would need to be mitigated.
(d) The West Arterial Road, as currently conceived, would have similar property impacts as improvements in the I-5 corridor. This does not account for property impacts that would occur if arterial roads need to be widened to accommodate traffic access to this new road.
(e) Due to the fact that the West Arterial road crosses Hayden Island, home to a variety of wildlife species and a high quality wetland, it has the greatest potential for impacts to natural resources of all the option packages with moderate to major impacts likely.
(f) While the West Arterial Road appears to result in less emissions directly at the freeway, emissions would increase on arterial roads. in industrait Area's
(g) The estimated cost of West Arterial Road is $\$ 947$ million ( $\$ 2001$ )

B1 Recommendation - West Arterial Road:
(a) Further study of this option should be pursued and identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.

## A2 Key Findings -Additional Elements and Strategies:

(a) As part of the Task Force's work it considered many potential elements and strategies that are not specifically commented upon in this draft document. They include:
i. Addressing the Corridor's problems with land use actions and/or transportation demand management alone;
ii. A new freeway with bridge outside the I-5 Corridor
(East of I-205, West of I-5) to connect Oregon and Washington;

## Question 5: West Arterial Road?

## Description

- A new road along the existing railroad corridor and N. Portland Rd. between Mill Plain in Vancouver and US 30 in North Portand provides to access between Portland and Vancouver, particularly for freight between the ports of Vancouver and Portland, and to the Columbia Corridor, and the Northwest industrial area. This improvement is also targeted to reduce truck traffic in the St. Johns and North Portland neighborhoods and provides an alternative access to Hayden Island.


## Travel Time

* There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the $1-5$ corridor.


## Transportation Performance

- Improves travel times in the l-j corridor by 6 minutes compared to today.
- Substantially reduces delay on truck routes compared to Baseline 2020 and prevents delay on truck routes from growing worse than it is today.
- Carries about 9600 vehicles over the Columbia River during the evening peak period.
* The West Arterial Road's four-lane bridge over the Columbia River is near capacity during the morning and afternoon peak periods.
- Traffic increases on key Vancouver roads compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

4th Plain Blvd
$25 \%$ increase in traffic
Mill Plain Blvd.
$84 \%$ increase in traffic

- Traffic decreases on key Portland roads compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

Marine Drive $\quad 27 \%$ decrease in traffic
Hayden Island Interchange $6 \%$ decrease in traffic
St Johns Bridge $\quad 54 \%$ decrease in traffic

* Traffic increases slightly on US 30 in Portland compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak): US $30 \quad 6 \%$ increase in traffic


## Transit Ridership

* There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the I-5 corridor.


## Environmental Impacts

* Major environmental impacrs on Hayden Island that are difficult to avoid and will need to be mitigated.
- Improves the quality of life in the St. Johns neighborhood in Portland due to providing an attractive altermative foute for trucks to get to and from industrial areas on the Peninsula.
- Because most of the roadway would be built over the railroad and in the railroad cut, there are fewer direct community impacts (e.g. noise, air pollution, and visual) than if the alignment were elsewhere.


## Displacements

- Least amount of overall displacements compared to $1-5$ improvements ( 22 displacements for West Arterial Road vs. 24 for 3 lane and +2 for adding a $4^{\text {th }}$ lane).


## Other

- Requires agreement with the railroad.

Cost

* $5947 \mathrm{Ml}(2001 \mathrm{~S})$.

3. Step A Context and Considerations

This section describes the transportation deficiencies and issues that project staff considered and assessed in developing answers to the Step A questions.

Note to reader - key points appear in italicized text.
3.1 Question 1: Does the Component Increase Vehicular Capacity or Decrease Vehicular Demand Within the Bridge Influence Area?
3.1.1 Travel Markets Using the I-5 Bridge Influence Area

Interstate 5 is one of two major highways in the Vancouver-Portland area that provide interstate connectivity and mobility. I-5 directly connects the central cities of Vancouver and Portland. Interstate 205 (I-205), the other major highway, is a 37-mile long freeway that extends from its connection with I-5 at Salmon Creek to its terminus at I-5 near Tualatin. It provides a more suburban access and bypass function and serves travel demand between east Clark County, east Multnomah County, and Clackamas County.

Travel demand across I-5 Interstate Bridge has steadily increased over the years. Recent traffic counts indicate that over 130,000 vehicles per day cross the bridge. By the year 2020, about 175,000 vehicles are estimated to use the crossing each day.

Current and future land uses on both sides of the Columbia River play a significant role in attracting traffic to the I-5 corridor. As an example, Figure 3-1 shows the origins and destinations for person-trips expected to use I-5 Interstate Bridge in the year 2020. This figure highlights the locations of trips originating south of the Columbia River and the destinations of trips north of the Columbia River during a four-hour afternoon/evening commute period.

It is evident that most trips using the I-5 Interstate Bridge, today and into the future, have origins and/or destinations within or near the I-5 corridor itself, making the I-5 crossing the most direct means to accommodate these trips.

For a bridge in those areas
connecting 2 I- 5 .
An analysis of potential transit markets and transit's role in reducing vehicular demand is discussed in section 3.2.3, which pertains to Question \#2.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Most trip using I-5 BIA..... origin, Destinations } \\
& \text { within or near I-5 corridor. } \\
& \text { * New third Bridge corridor is In Side } \\
& \text { I-5 Corridor and therefore alsle to } \\
& \text { Accommodate current + Future thabbic } \\
& \text { PAHerns- }
\end{aligned}
$$



### 1.3 Study Area

Fig. 1 on page 5 is a map of the I-5 Trade Corridor Study area, which includes Interstate 5 and its vicinity from I-84 in Oregon to I-205 in Washington. The study corridor is important to the regional and national economy and includes many important community and economic assets:

- Interstate 5, the only continuous interstate highway on the West Coast between Canada and Mexico, linking the region with California, Canada and Mexico.
- The interchange of east-west and north-south mainline rail lines that connect the nation's agricultural heartland with major Pacific Rim ports. The east-west mainlines in particular are unique because they run at water level, making rail service on these rail lines among the most competitive in the United States.
- The Columbia River, second in trade volume only to the Mississippi River, linking the Pacific Rim and Portland/Vancouver to the nation's agricultural heartland. The Columbia River makes possible the deep-water ports of Portland and Vancouver, two major West Coast ports that connect this region with the Pacific Rim and the rest of world.
- The Rivergate, Columbia Corridor and Vancouver industrial areas, which provide high-wage jobs. The corridor includes Downtown Vancouver, the region's second largest city and neighborhoods in north-northeast Portland and Vancouver.

The convergence of transportation, port, industrial and community resources in this area makes it a unique crossroads for trade, industry and transportation, which are critical to the health of the economies of Oregon and Washington.


For trips expected to use the I-5 bridge during the afternoon 4-hour peak travel period in 2020:

1. Sixty-six percent ( $66 \%$ ) of all person trips will be traveling northbound on I-5 from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County. The remaining $34 \%$ will be traveling southbound from Clark County to the Portland metropolitan area.
2. Over $80 \%$ of all northbound person trips will originate in five " $I-5$ corridor" districts: Hayden Island, Delta Park, Rivergate, North Portland, and Portland Central City. These


- The Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor is home to the region's largest industrial areas, including the Ports of Portland and Vancouver, which together export the second largest volume of

Transit Market
CAntier $\sqrt{2}$
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two to four new bored tunnels. Activity centers in the Bridge Influence Area would instead have to be accessed by a complex system of frontage roads that would increase out-of-direction travel.

- This component fails Question \#2. This component does not improve transit service to the identified I-5 corridor transit markets, nor does it improve the performance of the existing transit system within the Bridge Influence Area.
- This component fails Question \#3 related to freight movement because connections to major state highways and freight centers within the Bridge Influence Area (e.g., Marine Drive, SR 14) would either be removed or would, at best, require significant out-ofdirection travel.
- This component fails Question \#5 because it would not include bike and pedestrian routes in the tunnel.


### 5.3.4 Components RC-14 through RC-19, RC-21, and RC-22 (New Corridor Components)

Most of these new corridor components were suggested during the NEPA scoping process and are conceptual in nature. Project staff has not developed detailed alignments or engineering designs for these components. That said, enough is known about their general location and intended function to substantiate the findings.

### 5.3.4.1 RC-14 New Corridor Crossing

## Description:

This component creates a multi-modal bi-state industrial corridor next to the BNSF rail crossing west of the existing I-5 bridges. The north end would start near Mill Plain and Fourth Plain Boulevards in Vancouver and it would travel through Hayden Island connecting to Marine Drive near North Portland Road. This crossing would accommodate freight trains, trucks, autos, bus transit, bikes/pedestrians and potentially light rail. Figure 5-16 shows this component. shows this component.

## A Screening CR14 O.2 Transit

## Change to Pass

This alignment study in Transportation and Trade Partnership finings where; " There is an increase in transit ridership." "The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the I-5 Corridor."

CRC Draft Components Step A Screening Report Page 3-10 item 3.2.4 2020 Transit Market Analysis reads as follows.
\# 2. Over $80 \%$ of all northbound person trips will originate in the "I-5 corridor" districts: Hayden Island, Delta Park, Rivergate, North Portland, and Portland Central City.
\#5 North Portland will be the next largest trip producer to Clark County $(5,300)$, followed by Rivergate, with 4,500, Delta Park with 4,000, and Hayden Island with 2,900 trips to Clark County.

Therefore
The New Third bridge corridor alignment goes through Hayden Island, Rivergate and North Portland these areas which is way the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan - June 2002 stated. "The option packages also included a substantial increase in basic transit service levels in Portland and Clark County and the implementation of a strong transportation demand management program on both side of the river.

CRC
RC-14 question \#2
Does not improve transit service to identified I-5 corridor markets is Faults
*I-5 corridor markets identified in \#5 as ;
Hayden Island, Rivergate and North Portland
Provides transit service along new corridor locate approximately one mile west of I-5 potential non- I-5 travel market, but is out of direction for I-5 origins and destinations. Faults
*******REALLY FAULTS********
CRC Draft Components Step A Screening Report Page 3-10 item 3.2.4 2020 Transit Market Analysis reads as follows.
\#3 In comparison, trip from the west of this corridor (e.g., Washington County and WEST PORTLAND)
There is NO west Portland !!!
This is implying that the corridor west of I-5 is in a fictional "west Portland" and there fore does not help transit.

The statement should have read goes to a majority of markets identified in the origins and destination study for I-5 transit users.

## Transit Ridership

* There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the I-5 corridor.

RC-14: New Corridor Crossing ivear BiNS Rail Crossing

## Staff Recommendation: Not Advance



### 3.2.4 2020 Transit Market Analysis

1. Sixty-six percent $(66 \%)$ of all person trips will be traveling northbound on I-5 from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County. The remaining $34 \%$ will be traveling southbound from Clark County to the Portland metropolitan area.
2. Over $80 \%$ of all northbound person trips will originate in five " $I-5$ corridor" districts: Hayden Island, Delta Park, Rivergate, North Portland, and Portland Central City. These five districts will account for approximately 25,200 trips in the 4 -hour PM peak travel period.

3. In comparison, trips from the west of this corridor (e.g., Washington County, West Portland) and to the east (generally east of NE $33^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue) will collectively account for less than $20 \%$ of the northbound afternoon trips that cross the I- 5 bridge.
4. The Portland Central City, which includes downtown Portland, the Lloyd District, and Central Eastside Industrial District, will be the largest generator of person trips to Clark County (approximately 8,500 person trips). The Salmon Creek district will be the primary destination for these trips ( 3,900 trips).
5. North Portland will be the next largest trip producer to Clark County ( 5,300 trips), followed by Rivergate with 4,500 trips, Delta Park with 4,000 trips, and Hayden Island with 2,900 trips to Clark County.
6. The Bridge Influence Area will be a significant trip origin for trips to Clark County. Of the 30,264 total person trips from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County, approximately $6,900(23 \%)$ of the trips will originate in either Hayden Island or Delta Park. Both of these districts are within the Bridge Influence Area.

It is expected that the transit riders of the future will have origins and destinations within and/or near the I-5 corridor itself, making I-5 the most direct means of accommodating future transit trips.

### 3.2.3 Projected Transit Problems

Transit travel times from downtown Portland to downtown Vancouver in the afternoon peak period are projected to double by the year 2020 if no improvements are made to the I-5 bridge or bi-state transit service. In the year 2000, this transit trip took an average of 27 minutes to complete, and in 2020 it is expected to take 55 minutes. A major cause of the increased travel times is expected growth in trips (by all modes) that use the I-5 bridge.

Previous analysis also highlighted the importance of operating transit in exclusive or semiexclusive lanes or guideways. In the I-5 Partnership study, the only alternatives that reduced I-5 corridor transit travel times between 2000 and 2020 were alternatives that either a) included light rail operating in exclusive ROW, or b) included buses operating in HOV (ie., managed) lanes.

### 3.2.4 2020 Transit Market Analysis

Transit riders comprise only a segment of the future market, as future transit services should also appeal to current SOV and HOV drivers who have similar origin and destination points.
Figure 3-1, shown previously, depicts the specific origins and destinations for all modes in the year 2020 PM peak period. As illustrated in the figure, the future travel market for all modes is highly complimentary and shares the same geography as the future transit riders.

To better understand the projected growth in I-5 bridge demand, and which markets transit services should serve in the future, a more detailed analysis of 2020 person trips during the afternoon peak period was completed ${ }^{1}$. Person trips are defined as the sum of one-way, afternoon, 4-hour peak period trips made by all persons for all purposes in single occupancy vehicles (SOV), high occupancy vehicles (HOV), and transit. Potential transit markets are defined as geographic concentrations of person trips, from either Oregon or Washington, that use I-5 to travel between the states. Year 2020 data developed for the I-5 Partnership Study was analyzed, and assumes that no I-5 bridge improvements would be built. Figure 3-7 shows the results of this analysis.

For trips expected to use the I-5 bridge during the afternoon 4-hour peak travel period in 2020:

1. Sixty-six percent $(66 \%)$ of all person trips will be traveling northbound on I-5 from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County. The remaining $34 \%$ will be traveling southbound from Clark County to the Portland metropolitan area.
2. Over $80 \%$ of all northbound person trips will originate in five " $I-5$ corridor" districts: Hayden Island, Delta Park, Rivergate, North Portland, and Portland Central City. These


[^5]five districts will account for approximately 25,200 trips in the 4-hour PM peak travel period. Bad modeling there is no west Portland
3. In comparison, trips from the west of this corridor (e.g., Washington County West Portland) and to the east (generally east of NE $33^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue) will collectively account for less than $20 \%$ of the northbound afternoon trips that cross the 1-5 bridge.
4. The Portland Central City, which includes downtown Portland, the Lloyd District, and Central Eastside Industrial District, will be the largest generator of person trips to Clark County (approximately 8,500 person trips). The Salmon Creek district will be the primary destination for these trips ( 3,900 trips).
5. North Portland will be the next largest trip producer to Clark County (5,300 trips), followed by Rivergate with 4,500 trips, Delta Park with 4,000 trips, and Hayden Island with 2,900 trips to Clark County. Please Sign Map be low.
6. The Bridge Influence Area will be a significant trip origin for trips to Clark County. Of the 30,264 total person trips from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County, approximately $6,900(23 \%)$ of the trips will originate in either Hayden Island or Delta Park. Both of these districts are within the Bridge Influence Area.
7.

FIGURE 3
AREA CHARACTER AND LAND USE



### 3.2.5 Attributes of Components Satisfying Question \#2

Transit and river crossing components that serve multiple I-5 corridor travel markets will attract greater transit ridership. Conversely, components that serve fewer markets due to out-ofdirection alignments, unique transit operating characteristics and/or station spacing that would not match projected ridership patterns will attract less transit ridership, and have less of an impact on vehicular demand.

Transit components that operate in an exclusive or managed right-of-way will improve transit travel times and reliability because the risk of delay and accidents would decrease. Alternatively, adding significant new general purpose capacity could also reduce congestion levels, and improve transit travel times and reliability if congestion were sufficiently reduced. Conversely, components that subject transit to the same congested and unpredictable traffic conditions as SOVs do not improve transit operations.
In order for a component to satisfy Question \#2, the component must: New bridge inside I-5 Corridor Does ale thu e things.
$\rightarrow$ Be able to serve a significant portion of the I-5 corridor transit markets, and
$\rightarrow$ - Provide an exclusive or managed transit right-of-way to improve operations and reliability, or TRansit only Lane are $3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{s}+$ Reversible
$\rightarrow$ - Provide enough highway capacity to reduce general congestion levels significantly, thereby improving transit performance. New Corridor has signi gicant Capacity fore up to 300,000 vehicles daily.

### 3.3 Question 3: Does the Component Improve Freight Mobility Within the Bridge Influence Area?

### 3.3.1 Freight Mobility

I-5 is the primary freight corridor for goods moving into and out of the Vancouver-Portland region and the Pacific Northwest. Access to significant industrial and commercial districts, including the Ports of Vancouver and Portland, and connections to marine, rail and air freight facilities, is adversely affected by congestion in the I-5 Bridge Influence Area.

Sixty-seven percent ( $67 \%$ ) of all freight in the region travels by truck, and this is expected to grow to $73 \%$ by 2030. The increasing use of trucks is a reflection of the growing, diversifying and more demanding regional economy, which is leading to shipping practices becoming more tailored to the region's needs. There will continue to be a significant movement of bulk commodities in the region - which rely on non-truck modes - but their growth will occur at a slower rate than the smaller shipments of higher value products such as machinery, electronic components, prepared meat and seafood products, and mail and express traffic (principally moved by truck), which will represent a larger segment of the region's future economy. A corresponding phenomenon is that smaller shipments (under 1,000 pounds) have been, and will continue to be, the highest area of freight growth traffic.

Recent forecasts indicate that truck traffic in the region will double, and the logistics requirements for freight delivery time will become increasingly "just-in-time" - placing even more pressure on travel time reliability.

## Question 5: West Arterial Road?

## Description

- A new road along the existing railroad corridor and N. Portland Rd. berween Mill Plain in Vancouver and US 30 in North Portand provides to access between Portland and Vancouver, particularly for freight berween the ports of Vancouver and Portland, and to the Columbia Corridor. and the Northwest industrial area. This improvement is also targeted to reduce truck tratfic in the St. Johns and North Portland neighborhoods and provides an alternative access to Hayden Island.


## Travel Time

* There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the $[-5$ corridor. Transportation Performance
- Improves travel times in the $1-5$ cortidor by 6 minutes compared to today.
- Substantially reduces delay on truck routes compared to Baseline 2020 and prevents delay on truck routes from growing worse than it is today.
- Carries about 9600 vehicles over the Columbia River during the evening peak period.
- The West Arterial Road's four-lane bridge over the Columbia River is near capacity during the moming and afternoon peak periods.
- Traffic increases on key Vancouver roads compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

| 4th Plain Blvd | $25 \%$ increase in traffic |
| :--- | :--- |
| Miill Plain Blvd. | $84 \%$ increase in traffic |

- Traffic decreases on key Portland roads compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak):

| Marine Drive | $27 \%$ decrease in traffic |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hayden Island Interchange | $6 \%$ decrease in traffic |
| St Johns Bridge | $54 \%$ decrease in traffic |

- Traffic increases slightly on US 30 in Portland compared to Baseline (data from p.m. peak): US $30 \quad 6 \%$ increase in traffic


## Transit Ridership

- There is an increase in transit ridership. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the I-5 cortidor.


## Environmental Impacts

- Major environmental impogicts on Hayden Island that are difficult to avoid and will need to be mitigated.
- Improves the quality of life in the St. Johns neighborhood in Portland due to providing an attractive alternative route for trucks to get to and from industrial areas on the Peninsula.
- Because most of the roadway would be built over the railroad and in the railroad cut, there are fewer direct community impacts (e.g. noise, air pollution, and visual) than if the alignment were elsewhere.


## Displacements

- Least amount of overall displacements compared to $1-5$ improvements (22 displacements for West Arterial Road vs. 24 for 3 lane and 42 for adding a $4^{\text {th }}$ lane).


## Other

* Requires agreement with the mailroad
, ost
- $\$ 947 \mathrm{M}(20015)$


## Transportation and Transportation-Related Analyses

To develop this Strategic Plan two separate analyses were undertaken, the first in the SummerFall 2001 when five multi-modal option packages were selected for further analysis. The option packages were based on ideas and comments from the public and consistency with the Problem, Vision and Values Statement. The option packages that were analyzed all included new river crossing capacity across the Columbia River for transit and vehicles. The option packages were:

- Express Bus/3 Lanes
- Light Rail/3 Lanes
- Express Bus/4-Lanes
- Light Rail/4-Lanes
- West Arterial Road

Each of the option packages was compared to three additional scenarios:

- Existing Conditions 2000 - the current state of the I-5 Corridor,
- No Build 2020 - what is expected to happen in the year 2020 if the Region builds only the currently funded projects, and
- Baseline 2020 - what is expected to happen in the year 2020 if the Region constructs the funded projects in "No Build" AND the other projects listed in the Region's 20 year plans.

The option packages also included a substantial increase in basic transit service levels in Portland and Clark County and the implementation of a strong transportation demand management program on both sides of the river. Maps of the option packages, with descriptions of the physical improvements and a comparison of transportation performance, can be found in Attachment A, page A2.

After adopting Draft Recommendations for the Corridor in January 2002, the Task Force asked for additional evaluation and design work to be completed on the Bridge Influence Area, between (SR500 and Columbia Blvd, and including light rail between the Expo Center and Downtown Vancouver). This focused examination of the bridge and its influence area resulted in the development of four river crossing concepts, which can be found in Attachment B, page A17.

This plan also has a component that focuses on the needs of the freight and passenger rail system. This analysis was a cooperative effort among the owners of the rail system (Burlington Northern/Santa Fe and Union Pacific) and the users of the system (Amtrak, the States of Oregon and Washington, the Ports of Vancouver and Portland, and the Cities of Portland and Vancouver). The rail analysis focused on an agreement among the parties about existing conditions, expected growth rates, short-term/incremental improvements to gain capacity and the long-term needs of the system.

## Mode Share for RTP Scenarios Average Week Day Person Trips

| Mode | 1994 | 2020 <br> Financially <br> Constrained | 2020 <br> Prioirty | 2020 <br> Preferred |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pedestrian | $4.79 \%$ | $5.94 \%$ | $5.94 \%$ | $5.93 \%$ |
| Bicycle | $0.89 \%$ | $1.02 \%$ | $1.06 \%$ | $1.07 \%$ |
| Transit | $2.95 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $5.69 \%$ | $5.98 \%$ |
| Auto Person trips | $88.6 \%$ | $85.7 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ | $84.0 \%$ |
| Other (includes school bus) | $2.86 \%$ | $3.04 \%$ | $3.01 \%$ | $3.02 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total Person Trips | $6,507,736$ | $10,471,204$ | $10,437,204$ | $10,431,745$ |
| Total Non-Sov (shared ride, | $38.04 \%$ | $38.21 \%$ | $39.44 \%$ | $39.74 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

I-5 T+T Partnership | Transit less than 690 in 2020 2002

Figure 3-7. 2020 Person-Trips to Clark County Using 1-5 Bridge in 4-HR PM Peak Period


If you want citizen to use transit send them where then want to go not for a downtown Pennsfer,

* Industrial atlas $2004 \mathrm{Pg} 44,48,49,50-53$ where the Jobs
Are



TR-5: Light Rail Transit (LRT)
Staff Recommendation: Advance

(1) Pass
(1) Could
and is advanced?

* Transit including Light rail is

$$
\text { project in } 2020 \text { to be } 69(180,000 \text { cussing } 10,440 \text { transit }
$$

* RC -14 © 30,000 failed

$$
10,400 \text { transit }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 300,000^{+} \text {is really what } \mathrm{RC}-14 \text { will } \text { carry. }
\end{aligned}
$$



TR-4: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - Full
Staff Recommendation: Âdvance



## TR-3: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)- Lite

## Staff i Recommendation: Advance





## TR-1: Express Bus in General Purpose

 Lanes
## Stafí Recommendation: Advance




## TR-2: Express Bus in Managed Lanes

## Staifi Recommendation: Advance

| Step A Question | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pass/ } \\ & \text { Fail } \quad \text { Reasons } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q1. Traflic | Pass Could deetease vehicular demand through shifi to transil wilihin the Bridge Influence Area by giving preference and a speed advantage to transit. |
| Q2. Transit | Pass Could improve transit performance by managing congestion and reducing the potential for collisions, thereby improving transit reliability. |
| Q3. Freight | NA |
| Q4. Safety | U |
| Q5. Bike/Ped | NA |
| Q6. Seismic | NA |
| $\mathrm{P}=$ Pass $\quad \mathrm{F}=$ Fail | $\mathrm{NA}=$ Not Applicable $\quad \mathrm{U}=$ Unknown |



## TR-5: Light Rail Transit (LRT)

## Staff Recommendation: Advance



* Date provided an earlier chapters state the significant of a new Corridor for our Region a the economy


RC-14: New Corridor Crossing Near BNSF Rail Crossing
Staff Recommendation: Not Advance

${ }^{1}$ May provide some potential benefit in congestion management relative to 2030 No Build conditions.
Note: A variation of this component was introduced at the 3-22-06 Task Force meeting. Staff evaluated the revised component and believes it fails for similar reasons as summarized above.

* Conflicting data from this Statement to Several Studies Showing Significant Benefits for freight.
* Bridge is not built to correct Size of project not 30,000 vehicles but 300,000


RC-14: New Corridor Crossing ivear BiNS Rail Crossing
Staff Recommendation: Not Advance

${ }^{1}$ May provide some potential benefit in congestion management relative to 2030 No Build conditions.
Note: A variation of this component was introduced at the 3-22-06 Task Force meeting. Staff evaluated the revised component and believes it fails for similar reasons as summarized above.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Confecting Data West arterial took } 2580 \text { off } \\
& \text { sol I-5 and Ias } 75 \% \text { scale then the } \\
& \text { new Canidon. The west arterial WAS to } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Capacity very small. The BIC wilt not } \\
\text { be either. }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Introducing the Ideas: Crossing the River

The project team considered 23 ideas for crossing the Columbia River and recommends that 9 advance for more investigation.

Crossing Considerations:
$\checkmark$ - Flight paths from Pearson Airpark
$\checkmark$ - Flight paths from Portland International Airport
$\checkmark$ Marine Navigation

### 3.4 Question 4: Does the Component improve Safety and Decrease Vulnerability to Incidents Within the Bridge Influence Area?

### 3.4.1 Safety and Incidents Related to Aviation

Two airports have influence on the airspace in the vicinity of the I-5 river crossing. Historic Pearson Airfield is located about one-half mile immediately east of 1-5, while Portland International Airport (PDX) is located about three miles to the east of the project. For both airports, airspace requirements defined by the FAA must be considered to assess their impact on the vertical locations of the river crossing components (e.g. bridge towers).

The Pearson airspace has the most significant influence on the project because of its proximity to the existing I-5 bridge. FAA requirements state that airspace needs to be clear of obstructions for the safe operation of aircraft. This airspace was superimposed on an aerial map and the components were evaluated for penetration into the airspace. It should be noted that the existing $I-5$ bridge lift towers penetrate the Pearson airspace surface. Figure 3-9 shows how various bridge levels would relate to the Pearson airspace.

Figure 3-9. Relationship of Bridge Levels to Pearson Airpark Airspace


* The New Corridor is one mile Further West. This well met the airspace
re quincment. Safety is enhanced.
height of approximately 65 feet for a low level bridge, and approximately 110 feet of clearance for a mid-level bridge. These clearances should be provided over at least one of the existing navigational channels ${ }^{2}$. A high-level bridge would have a clearance of approximately 129 feet and would match the clearance of the existing I-205 bridge.
3.4.4 Attributes of Components Satisfying Question \#4 for Marine Navigation

The horizontal location of a new bridge, either by itself or in tandem with the existing bridge, would affect vessel navigation operation and safety. Components that keep the existing bridges make it more difficult for navigational operations on the river. This is because vessels traveling on the river will need to navigate through another set of piers. In addition, the operators of river barges have stated that it is very difficult to navigate through the large channel opening of the I5 bridge and then make an " $S$ " curve to access the opening of the BNSF Railroad bridge downstream. Components that keep the existing bridges and that are located closer to the downstream railroad bridge have the greatest potential to create navigational problems on the river. Figure 3-10 shows the relationship of upstream and downstream new bridge locations as they might affect marine navigation.

Figure 3-10. Marine Navigation Considerations


* New High SPAn Bridge will help navigation issues.
${ }^{2}$ Bridge elevations and clearances may be evaluated and discussed further with the Coast Guard throughout the project as more data is collected.
* New Corridor bridge next to BNSF
will up grade current movable Span + add additional lift SPAN to BNSF

Kris Strickle introduced the marine navigation and aviation issues affecting the project. These include reducing or eliminating the "s curve" maneuvers that marine vessels must navigate between the I-5 bridges and the railroad bridge to the west. The project team has been in discussion with the US Coast Guard regarding acceptable height clearances for marine navigation. USCG prefers a higher, wider, upstream bridge and will issue public notice for 30 day review on height/width after DEIS is published for comment.

The Federal Aviation Administration also has interest in preserving/protecting flight space for Pearson Airpark and, to a lesser extent, Portland International. The existing I-5 bridge intrudes into Pearson Airpark airspace because it was there before the airport.
 However, FAA would not grandfather the existing height into a new bridge.

Together, the marine and air space issues provide a tight area within which any new structure could be constructed.

David Parsi gave an overview of vehicular safety issues in the Bridge Influence Area, BIC
does not.
intrude in which included an analysis of five-year crash data on both sides of the river. He noted that there is an average of more than once crash per day in the Bridge Influence Area and

## Air space.

 that the accident rates are higher than average for similar urban Interstates. Parisi showed maps of where the accidents occur, the type and severity. Through this work, he demonstrated a strong correlation between collisions and out-dated, or non-standard highway design features, including narrow shoulders, short on and off-ramps, merging and diverging spaces and sight distances. He noted that bridge lifts result in a three to four times more likelihood of collisions, and that over twice as many collisions occur during periods of congestion.Parisi walked the Task Force through the current routing of the bicycle and pedestrian pathways, noting the narrow path, the steep climbs and descents, lack of connectivity and other impediments to safe bike or foot travel.

Kris Strickler reviewed the seismic issues, noting that I-5 is a lifeline yet the current bridges don't meet seismic standards, and we don't currently know if it's feasible to upgrade/retrofit them.

## V. Component Screening Results

Transit was discussed first. There were 14 ideas that had been considered. Each was presented with a recommendation to advance or not in the process. A summary follows:

TR-1 - Express Bus in General Purpose Lanes
TR-2 - Express Bus in Managed Lanes
TR-3 - Bus Rapid Transit Lite
TR-4 - Bus Rapid Transit Full

Advance
Advance
Advance
Advance
periods (ie., 9 to 10 hours). All of the arterial river crossing components fall into a middle area between these extremes. Staff recommends that any arterial river crossing concept that results in:

- 8 or more hours of afternoon/evening congestion- component fails Question \#1;
- 4 hrs or less of afternoon/evening congestion- component passes Question \#1;
- 5 to 7 hours of afternoon/evening congestion- component is not eliminated from consideration based on this criterion because, while resulting in increased congestion and delay, it may result in other benefits.

RC-21, which would result in 8 to 9 hours of afternoon/evening congestion, fails Question \#1 under this recommendation. The other five arterial river crossing components do not.

## Question \#2: Transit

In order for an arterial river crossing to improve transit service performance within the l-5 Bridge Influence Area and serve the key I-5 transit markets, it needs to be physically proximate to the current l-5 corridor. If it is not, it imposes unacceptable out of direction travel delays on transit, compromising the viability of serving key transit markets.

RC -19, RC-22 and RC-23 are all physically proximate to the current l-5 corridor and pass Question \#2. RC-14, RC-15 and RC-21 are located one mile or more east or west of the current I-5 corridor and do not satisfy Question \#2.

## Question \#3: Freight

As explained above, the project team has limited freight specific data against which to evaluate these arterial bridge components. Because all of these arterials but one (RC-21) provides marginal congestion relief (ie., 6 to 7 hours), staff is proposing that only RC-21 fail for freight mobility reasons since it provides inadequate congestion relief ( $8-9$ hours) along $1-5$ within the Bridge Influence Area. Concepts RC-19, RC-22 and RC-23 receive an "unknown" rating because it is not clear how they will tie into the regional arterial network and whether there would be freight mobility benefits as a result of those connections.

Because RC-14 and RC-15 provide direct connections to regionally significant freight destinations (the Ports of Portland and Vancouver and the regional freight resources adjacent to them), staff proposes they receive a "pass" on Question \#3, in essence "giving them the benefit of the doubt" that these unique connections, coupled with their level of congestion relief, provide freight mobility benefits sufficient to meet the criteria of Question \#3.

## Question \#4: Safety

In order for an arterial river crossing to improve safety within the I-5 Bridge Influence Area, it must do three things: 1) not significantly encroach into Pearson Airpark or Portland International Airport airspace, 2) maintain or improve navigational safety in the vicinity of the l-5 corridor crossings, and 3) reduce future $\mathrm{I}-5$ traffic demands compared to today's levels or redesign $\mathrm{I}-5$ within the Bridge Influence Area to meet current design and safety standards to the greatest extent possible.

Only RC-21 creates an unacceptable encroachment into airport airspace and therefore should be eliminated from further consideration.
(2) up grade current BN SF Rail bridge ensuring (2B) New Budge thigh Span improves Reduce traffic in BIA + . removes Hayden Island exit to new binge

Traffic congestion is increasingly spreading into the off-peak periods (including weekends) used by freight carriers, as shown in Figure 3-8. Declining freight carrier access slows delivery times and increases shipping costs, diminishing the attractiveness of I-5 and the uses served by I5, and negatively affecting the region's economy.

Figure 3-8. Northbound and Southbound I-5 Truck Volumes (2005)


### 3.3.2 Attributes of Components Satisfying Question \#3

In order for a component to satisfy Question \#3, the component must either:

- Maintain future traffic demands such that they can be accommodated on I-5 within the Bridge Influence Area at acceptable congestion levels so freight is not further affected, or
- Increase the traffic-carrying capacity of I-5 within the Bridge Influence Area to accommodate forecast traffic levels at acceptable congestion levels, thereby improving freight mobility.
* Third Bridge Provide direct Access from I-5 into our major industrial areas, making one continues Corridor. Direct to industrail Areas * industrail Corridor, Maine Du.Corvider, Calunkia Corridor + HW4 30.

TR-5 - Light Rail Transit
TR-6 - Streetcar

TR-7 - High Speed Rail
This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 and 2

Advance
Advance

Do not advance

- Q1 - Could not serve many of the identified travel markets, generate significant ridership and thus reduce vehicular demand (hard to do with trains that go 175+ MPH)
- Q2 - Does not improve transit performance and can't be feasibly integrated into existing service structures
TR-8 - Ferry Service Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 and 2
- Q1 - Long, out of direction travel times would not generate significant ridership and thus reduce vehicular demand.
- Q2 - Does not improve transit performance and can't be feasibly integrated into existing service structures
Note: Ferry service wouldn't serve multiple transit markets such as Hayden Island, Delta Park, and North Portland.

TR-9 - Monorail
Do not advance
This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Question 2
- Q2 -Does not improve transit performance and can't be feasibly integrated into existing service structures
Note: Monorails have special purpose applications and have not been successfully used for general public transit service in the U.S.

TR-10 - Magnetic Levitation Railway
Do not advance
This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 and 2
- Q1 - An experimental high-technology rail system that serves long distance trips (i.e., Salem to Seattle). Would not generate significant ridership and reduce vehicular demand.
- Q2 - Does not improve transit performance and can't be feasibly integrated into existing service structures

TR-11 - Commuter Rail Transit Do not advance
This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Question 2
- Q2 -Does not improve transit performance and can't be feasibly integrated into existing service structures. Existing railroad right-of-way misses key transit markets.

The rail district idenified as Transit market See Map
suppopa

A Screening CR14 0.5 Bike and pedestrian to read as follows.
The BIC will promotion, enhance, and add capacity to bike and pedestrian trails in Washington and Oregon.

Promotes more use by making connection to current bike trails: Peninsula Crossing Trail, Columbia Slough Trail, 40 mile loop, Hayden Island Dr. Trail, Swan Island, downtown Portland, and Columbia Shores Trail. Access to bike network and other trails, BIC connects several trails. Using trails rather than I-5 Freeway will attract more users. Bike access to downtown Vancouver, Jantzen Beach Mall, Expo Center, and light rail connects to the convention center and downtown Portland provides transportation to entertainment events.

Enhances and upgrade high volume bike route. North Portland Rd. is upgraded to multi-use paths closed to motor vehicles. PDOT map, Portland By Bicycle has three designations currently on North Portland Rd. as follows. 1. Multi-use paths closed to motor vehicles. 2. With difficult connections and shared roadway. 3. Moderate and higher traffic streets.

Adds capacity. BIC creates additional access with new paths to Smith and Byebee Lakes, industrial areas in Vancouver and Portland. A new bridge from Portland to Vancouver, and Jantzen Beach creates, the first local access bridges, between our two cities.

Only 1\% of the current I-5 traffic is bikes across the Columbia River and in 2020, it is hoped to be $\mathbf{2 \%}$. BIC make access to the industrial areas, ports, retail, entertainment, and natural areas. Very few citizens use their bikes to commute to work. Downtown Portland is not the only destination for biker's commuting to work. The majority of bike riding is done for entertainment. The BIC creates local access bridges to many locations of enjoyment as well as work.

I believe this to be a more accurate description of the merits BIC provides to our bike and pedestrian network. The bike/pedestrian trails are used for commuting and leisure in our community. Please see next four maps.

I believe CRC staff did not gave a fair, balanced, or honest evaluation to the bike/pedestrian data on the advantage of a local access third bridge. And using it to screen out the BIC was unprofessional and inappropriate behavior. Unprofessional in that bike/pedestrian while important is $1 \%$ of the congestion across the river, it out ranked air quality, historic encroachments, and local access bridges without using I-5 all current goals, BIC meets. Inappropriate that CRC staff can show choice in what projects they want, and not be overly careful to be accurate in the presentation of data with project they have clearly shown prejudice too. To not mention any of the many merits a bike/ped bridge would provide to the entire bike system is unfair and borders on dishonesty in the evaluation presentation. To have every printed presentation of BIC option from the start marked "staff doesn't recommend for advancement", before a full EIS lacks balance and integrity.


RC-14: New Corridor Crossing ivear BNSF Rail Crossing
3.2.4 $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ Transit Market Analysis

1. Sixty-six percent ( $66 \%$ ) of all person trips will be traveling northbound on I-5 from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County. The remaining $34 \%$ will be traveling southbound from Clark County to the Portland metropolitan area.
2. Over $80 \%$ of all northbound person trips will originate in five "I-5 corridor" districts: Hayden Island, Delta Park, Rivergate, North Portland, and Portland Central City. These five districts will account for approximately 25,200 trips in the 4-hour PM peak travel period.
3. In comparison, trips from the west of this corridor (e.g., Washington County, West
 in New corridor Area Portland) and to the east (generally east of NE $33^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue) will collectively account for less than $20 \%$ of the northbound afternoon trips that cross the I- 5 bridge.
4. The Portland Central City, which includes downtown Portland, the Lloyd District, and Central Eastside Industrial District, will be the largest generator of person trips to Clark County (approximately 8,500 person trips). The Salmon Creek district will be the primary destination for these trips ( 3,900 trips).
5. North Portland will be the next largest trip producer to Clark County ( 5,300 trips), followed by Rivergate with 4,500 trips, Delta Park with 4,000 trips, and Hayden Island with 2,900 trips to Clark County.
6. The Bridge Influence Area will be a significant trip origin for trips to Clark County. Of the 30,264 total person trips from the Portland metropolitan area to Clark County, approximately $6,900(23 \%)$ of the trips will originate in either Hayden Island or Delta Park. Both of these districts are within the Bridge Influence Area.

${ }^{1}$ May provide some potential benefit in congestion management relative to 2030 No Build conditions.
Note: A variation of this component was introduced at the 3-22-06 Task Force meeting. Staff evaluated the revised component and believes it fails for similar reasons as summarized above.



3.5.2 Attributes of Components Satisfying Question \#5

In order for a component to satisfy Question \#5, the component must either:

- Improve the existing sidewalks across the Interstate Bridge, as well as other key bicycle, pedestrian and disabled person connections, to meet or exceed current shared use design standards, as well as provisions in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, or
(Provide, as an element of a new river crossing, a new shared use pathway designed to meet or exceed applicable standards, to serve bicyclists, pedestrians and disabled persons.
The new corridor does this and does
not stop any up grades on the Current I-5 Bridges. Please see mapps shew all the connections to Current Bile Poles -


## Mode Share for RTP Scenarios Average Week Day Rerson Trips

| Mode | $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ <br> Financially <br> Constrained | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ <br> Prioirty | 2020 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Preferred |  |  |  |  |
| Bicycle | $4.79 \%$ | $5.94 \%$ | $5.94 \%$ | $5.93 \%$ |
| Transit | $0.89 \%$ | $1.02 \%$ | $1.06 \%$ | $1.07 \%$ |
| Auto Person trips | $2.95 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $5.69 \%$ | $5.98 \%$ |
| Other (includes school bus) | $88.6 \%$ | $85.7 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ | $84.0 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $3.04 \%$ | $3.01 \%$ | $3.02 \%$ |
| Total Person Trips | $6,507,736$ | $10,471,204$ | $10,437,204$ | $10,431,745$ |
| Total Non-Sov (shared ride, <br> bike, walk, transit) | $38.04 \%$ | $38.21 \%$ | $39.44 \%$ | $39.74 \%$ |
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## Industry Standards <br> Not <br> Being Followed <br> Environmental Justice Issues

## Transparency is lacking in the CRC process and data

## Starting with Money

CRC staff was asked to provide a line by line list of expense in connection with the project. To make it available on a monthly bases on their web site and at meetings. That request from task force members and the environmental justices were made at May 2005 meeting and at several meeting since, yet are still unavailable. How much money has been spent on what and how much remains? It is suppose to be part of public record. I put in writing the following questions and others. You will find the questions and CRC answers in the back of this booklet.

## Here a highlight of the lack of transparency.

## Expense such as:

1. Rent on CRC office space instead of using current transportation office Lights, heat, phone, equipment and supplies.
2. Magnets with pictures of the bridge, polo shirts and other shirts with decals of CRC for staff to wear.
3. How many employees, job tittles, pay and date of hire. Names are not necessary give them each a number.
4. Are any staff members receiving money from others sources to work on this project?
5. It's important to find out if engineers where hired before projects task force members chose options. Why several options RC-14 through RC-19, RC-21, and RC-22 new corridor components did not develop detailed alignments or engineering designs?

This was CRC response

The CRC team is currently working on a reporting tool that will be updated monthly. Expenditures through April 2006 total (as of May 2006) $\$ 9.2$ million, or and average of $\$ 767,000$ per month since the start of the project on May 1, 2005. The CRC anticipates expenditures exceeding $\$ 1$ million per month. Expenditures are being monitored by responsible state officials who fully understand their fiduciary responsibility to the public financial information is public record, and is available upon request.

## This is from CRC web site

February 2005: The CRC Task Force convenes its first meeting.
September 2004: The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) sign a "Memorandum of Understanding" to jointly pursue the Columbia River Crossing project. They form the Joint Commission Subcommittee to provide oversight of the project.

February 2004: WSDOT and ODOT begin work to further develop recommended project concepts from the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership and consider financing options and issues.

CRC staff gave updates in September 2004 at RTC and JPACT on acquiring staff and working on getting task force members and how it was hard to get citizens to agree to being on the task force. CRC first task force meeting was February 2005 and work had to be done to prepare for the meeting.

That said I'm glad they have state officials who understand their fiduciary responsibility so they can just provide all the information CRC has given to them. It is public record and requiring each individual citizen to request the expenditures lack TRANSPANCY. What is CRC staff hiding and why are they putting in writing they started a year later than they did?
How many are on staff for the CRC project?

CRC answer
The CRC project staff varies from month to month. On average, there are about 57 people working on the co-located office.

A monthly accounting would show amount of hours, pay and benefits.
Please list their job tittles.
CRC answer.
Names and job titles are available for you to review at the CRC office in Vancouver when formally requested through Tonja Gleason. You can make and appointment to review the records by contacting Tonja Gleason at 360.816 .2188

This was requested in writing why should I have to do it again. Why do I have to go to their office when they could email, fax, send it in the mail? Why are CRC not making so hard to get information.?

Please provide dates of hire.
CRC answer
You can arrange for specific information from the CRC office in Vancouver, recognizing that some personal information may no be available under the request for public records.

What information is unavailable and why? How come they can't just give employees a number that they keep private?

No handouts have been presented showing actual numbers of traffic counts to any citizen open houses and out reach. Please provide a breakdown of origination and destination for freight, truck, commerce, commuters, and transportation needs, Columbia River Crossing Transportation needs such as doctor, schooling, sports, and other activities.

CRC answer
A significant amount of existing traffic data has been collected and is available for review at the CRC office in Vancouver. Information from this data has been synthesized into a format that is being used for public and task force meetings. Some of the data you have requested ( trips to the doctor, school, sports, and other activities) is not available for project area. Some, such as origins and destination for freight, are under development (there is a comprehensive freight study being conducted by the region, the results of which will be available sometime in 2007)

There is a significant amount of data that they Will Not bring to the meetings. Why? Where is the transparency the I- 5 corridor has been studied from the 1980's by several groups using tax dollars? Why won't they bring the current and former data. Why do I have to go to the CRC office in Vancouver to review information?

Transparency is lacking on every level and in all areas of Columbia River Crossing. Staff will not bring in data numbers, questionnaires that citizens have answered (they sum it up and filter to group statements) maps.

CRC will not provide email address to contact Task Force member who are supposed to represent different groups. CRC staff does not forward information given to task force members.
They also continue to share information and discus information in emails out of the view of the public what does not met requirements of the open meeting laws in Oregon and Washington and they know and continue even when comments come to them.

## Industry Standards

During the Transportation and Trade Partnership meetings in 2001 Kate Deanne ODOT's project manager explained to me why it was important for citizen to sign in on sign-in sheets at meetings. Kate had noticed I was attending but not signing in at the T\&T partnership meetings. Kate pointed out that it was standard at government meetings to use sign in sheets as part of the meeting minutes to show citizen participations.

Sign-in sheets provide information;

1. It shows individual citizen involvement
2. A citizen wishing to comment on a series of meetings has a record of participant.
3. It list how many citizens are involved in the process
4. It shows how many business affiliates are involved in the process.
5. It show's how well out reach is working.
6. It gives officials unable to attend meetings an idea of who all was there at the meetings.

Kate convinced me of the importance I sign in. I also encourage others to sign in.
Columbia River Crossing meeting notes for May 2005 has a list of task force members present, member substitutes present, absent members, project team members as part of the formal meeting notes. Citizens are not listed, ever.

1. I thought staff forgot, so after the May meeting, I asked that citizen sign-in sheets become a matter of record in the minutes as other transportation meeting do.

Nothing has happened
2. I asked again that citizen attending the meeting be added to the formal minutes after all we where being asked to sign in.

Nothing has happened
3. I wrote up a list of this and other EJAG issue that where not being met and gave it to staff.
A. Staff would not forward the list to the task force members.
B. Staff would not put any questions or answers in writing, however
C. They would discus the list over lunch with Charlie Tindal and I.

Nothing has happened
It's a year later and nothing has happened with the list of EJAG issue. .

## Why?

What needs to happen?
CRC staff needs to pull out the sign-in sheets and amend the formal meeting notes showing what citizen have attended each meeting and their affiliations. These amended meeting notes need to be made available. It's an easy job for a good typist.

Attached:
JPACT, RTC, BI-State and CRC formal meeting attendance pages.... CRC is the only one unwilling to follow industry standards. Why?

The current Columbia River Crossing Mangers have been asked to address these issues and problems, to date all of these problems persist.

1. No name tags on task force members.
2. Name placement cards that state who representative, represents.

Example: Sam Adam Portland City Commissioner, Bob Russell Oregon Trucking Assoc. Larry Paulson Port of Vancouver, etc.
3. The sign in sheet is confusing and every meeting people have not signed up for citizen comment period, because is unclear, hard to read in very tiny writing. They have been asked to have a large sign saying sign up here to speak, change the sign in sheet to large enough lettering to read, make a separate sign in sheet for speaking, they have refused and continue using the same sheet.
4. No name tags for the citizens who are participating.
5. Will not provide public information of the task force representative for constituents and citizens who may want to contact them in communication form. Example. Bob Russell, OTA russell@otrucking, 503.513.0005, 4005 SE Naef Road. Citizens and task force members have not been provided this vital normally public information. Not only has, it not been provided but also the task force managers have told us, we can try and catch the representatives before and after meetings as they hurry in and out. With no communication of any form allowed wants, the meeting has start.
6. When final votes are made a group Aye and Nay is used. Constituents have no way of knowing who voted for what. The final vote needs to be recorded, to show how each representative has voted. "Group" Aye, Nay does not follow meeting laws in either state. This voting practice has been pointed out, by task force members as inappropriate, and it continues.
7. No breaks during a $21 / 2$ hour to keep citizens from talking to any representatives. Keeping them possibly from returning promptly to their seats.
8. No notes, hand out, information, or contacting task force representative in any form during meeting. In meeting protocol. EVEN BEFORE VOTE WITHOUT CITIZEN TESTIMONY BEFORE VOTES!!!!!! Also when the information is incorrect or faults.
16.There are several groups with elected official and others that are meeting about the Columbia River Crossing. This "groups" how many there are, when they met, how often they met, who attends, meeting notes, up dates, have not been disclosed at the official Columbia Crossing task force meetings. These groups believe they have veto over the Columbia Crossing task force without citizen input of knowledge. How many groups? Where, when, why are they meeting? Why all the Secrecy? Veto power? Without open meeting laws being met.
17. Maps of the complete study area have not been brought to meetings and are not on the web site. Maps of the study area have been missing. After several request to bring maps showing the complete study area. A map was brought to the last meeting. It did not show the neighborhoods, on either side of I-5 in Oregon, Washington or on Jantzen Beach. North Portland alone is 40 thousand plus other neighborhoods adjacent to the freeway. It showed I-5 from SR 500 to Portland Blvd. north and south and approximately 3 Blocks on the east and west side of I-5 excluding the majority of all the neighborhoods.
18. The task force paid staff, ODOT, WADOT, and outside paid consultants all wear the exact same uniform. It is impossible to distinguish between paid consultants state employees. Why are they all dressed a like? Who paid for all the fancy uniform shirts? If a uniform is required, why are they all a like? Why don't the two states dress a like and the paid consultants, dress differently? This is very confusing to the citizens, trying to figure out who's, who and what's in it for them.
19. On line survey for citizen was done so poorly, several hundred where thrown out. The task force managers forgot to set up the web site so people could not take more than one survey. Approximately 1400 surveys total came in. Approximately 200 where kept is valid. How was it determined that 1200 where bad? Who did the 200 get kept? What was the determining factor? Why weren't they all thrown out? Did the 200 hundred chosen say what they wanted and the other 1200 didn't. Where is all the original information? When can we see the 1400 and what they said? What is the difference in findings from what was thrown out.
20. Month after month, the task force members have asked for a line by line list of expenses. How much is being spent and on what? What did those uniforms cost and who okayed them? What is the money spent on? The rumors is they are spending between 1 and 3 million dollars a month? This is before the citizens have picked a project.

Approximately $1 / 3$ of the task force members are missing from each meeting. The November meeting started with 7 of the 38 members present.
9. The meeting notes do not show what citizen where present even through they are asked to sign in. Citizens have no way to prove they where present. For legal suits how do you show you have participated from the start? JPACT, RTC, and most regular government meeting show the citizen names in the meeting note. It is very disrespectful to the citizen who have taken the time, energy and money to participate.
10. Citizen testimony is not recorded in whole when they testify. A three-minute communication is turned into one or two sentences total. It does not communicate what the citizen participating has said.
11. Citizen testimony in writing NEVER is give to the task force representatives and does not show up on the web site. Representative asked, said that they have NEVER receive any write communication from citizen even though write citizen communication has been handed in at EVERY meeting. These write citizen comments handed in as part of record have not been put on the web site either.
12.The agenda showing citizen comment period is only available on the web site less than a week before the meeting. The task force managers have been asked to have the agenda for the next meeting the current meeting show when citizen will speak. Each meeting has had the citizen comment period at a different time.
13. Have a stated length of time for each citizen's comment so preparation can be made. How long a citizen speaks is important to have advance notice. The task force managers' citizen comment period is 15 minutes in total. It will be divided at each meeting, as the citizen comment period begins. However they will not allow any citizen over 3 minuets even it's only one person signed up to speak for the 15 minute period.
14. Million of taxes payers dollars have been spent in over 20 years of studying a new crossing over the Columbia River. These studies and the booklets formed out of these studies are not available at the meetings. Booklets that stating what has and hasn't been studied, results and to consult when questions are raised. Not available for the task force members, the citizen or task force manager to answer basic question.
15. Meeting times are not appropriate for citizen to attend. At 4-6:30 PM in the middle of the week. Daily shift ends at 5 PM plus travel makes it almost impossible for citizens to travel there before 6 PM . Those that work swing shift go to work at 3 PM. Example: A mall open house on a Saturday 11AM to 2 PM, why only 4 hours in the middle of the day and one off the least visited Malls in the area. The mall is open 8 AM to 7 PM . This one of many reasons why the open houses and meetings are so poorly attended.


Meeting Summary
Columbia River Crossing Task Force


February 3, 2005 Scheduled: 4-6:30 p.m.

## Members Present:

Sam Adams, City of Portland
Rich Brown, Portland Business Alliance
Rex Burkholder, Metro
Bob Byrd, Identity Clark County
Lora Caine, Friends of Clark County
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County
Hal Dengerink, Washington State
University Vancouver (Task Force Cochair)
Elliot Eki, Oregon/Idaho AAA
Dave Frei, Armada Neighborhood
Association
Jill Fuglister, Coalition for a Livable
Future
Lynne Griffith, C-TRAN
Brad Halverson, Overlook
Neighborhood Association
Henry Hewitt, Stael Rives (Task Force
Co-chair)
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground
Monica Isbell, Portland Business
Alliance
Dean Lookingbill, Regional
Transportation Council
Ed Lynch, Vancouver National Historic
Reserve Trust
Dick Main, Central Park Neighborhood Association
Mark McCloud, Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Wally Mehrens, Columbia Pacific Building Trades
Bob Russel, Oregon Trucking Association
Art Schaff, Washington State Trucking
Association
Jonathan Schleuter, Westside Economic
Alliance
Karen Schmidt, Washington Freight
Mobility Strategic Investment Board
Steve Stuart, Clark County
Walter Valenta, Bridgeton
Neighborhood Association
Scot Walstra, Vancouver Chamber of
Commerce
Tom Zelenka, Oregon Freight Advisory
Committee
Members' Substitutions Present:
Bob Applegate for Bill Wyatt, Port of
Portland
Addison Jacobs for Larry Paulson, Port
of Vancouver, USA
Neil McFarlane for Fred Hansen, TriMet
Project Team Members Present:
Katy Brooks, The JD White Company,
Inc. (JDW)
Kyle Brown, JDW
Rob DeGraff, Co-Project Director
Doug Fico, Co-Project Director
Matthew Garrett, Project Team
Don Wagner, Project Team
Kris Strickler, Project Team
Absent Members:
Dr. Wayne Branch, Clark College
Fred Hansen, TriMet
Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver, USA Association
Jonathan Schleuter, Westside Economic Alliance
Karen Schmidt, Washington Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board Steve Stuart, Clark County
Walter Valenta, Bridgeton
Neighborhood Association
Scot Walstra, Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Tom Zelenka, Oregon Freight Advisory Committee

## Members' Substitutions Present:

Bob Applegate for Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland
Addison Jacobs for Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver, USA
Neil McFarlane for Fred Hansen, TriMet
Project Team Members Present:
Katy Brooks, The JD White Company, Inc. (JDW)
Kyle Brown, JDW
Rob DeGraff, Co-Project Director
Doug Ficco, Co-Project Director
Matthew Garrett, Project Team
Don Wagner, Project Team
Kris Strickler, Project Team

## Absent Members:

Dr. Wayne Branch, Clark College
Fred Hansen, TriMet
Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver, USA
$\uparrow$
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Bart Phillips, Columbia River Economic Development Council Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver,

Janet Ray, Washington AAA
Dave Shields, City of Gresham
Jeri Sundval, Environmental Justice
Action Group

## Columbia River $\square$ CROSSING

Meeting Summary<br>Columbia River Crossing Task Force<br>November 30, 2005<br>4-8:00 p.m.<br>OAME, Main Conference Room<br>4134 North Vancouver, Portland, Oregon

## Members Present:

Sam Adams, City of Portland Charles Becker, City of Gresham
Dr. Wayne Branch, Clark College
Rich Brown, Bank of America
Rex Burkholder, Metro
Lora Caine, Friends of Clark County
Hal Dengerink, Washington State
University Vancouver (Task Force Co-chair)
Elliot Eki, Oregon/Idaho AAA
Dave Frei, Armada Neighborhood Association
Jill Fuglister, Coalition for a Livable Future
Lynne Griffith, C-TRAN
Jerry Grossnickle, Columbia River Tugboat Association
Brad Halverson, Overlook Neighborhood Association
Fred Hansen, TriMet
Henry Hewitt, Stoel Rives (Task Force Cochair)

## Member Substitutes Present:

Todd Coleman for Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver
Susie Lahsene for Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland
Alan Lehto (attended portion of meeting for Fred Hansen, TriMet)
Don Lemmons for Karen Schmidt, Washington Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board

Brett Hinsley, Columbia Pacific Building Trades
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground
Dean Lookingbill, Regional Transportation Council
Ed Lynch, Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust
Steve Petersen, Portland Business Alliance
Bart Phillips, Columbia River Economic Development Council
Bob Russel, Oregon Trucking Association
Art Schaff, Washington State Trucking Association
Jonathan Schlueter, Westside Economic Alliance
Walter Valenta, Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Scot Walstra, Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce

Tom Miller (attended portion of meeting for Sam Adams, City of Portland)
Lisa Prentice for Monica Isbell, Portland Business Alliance
Thayer Rorabaugh for Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver
Lawrence Russell for Jeri Sundvall, Environmental Justice Action Group

Absent Members:

Bob Byrd, Identity Clark County
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County
Monica Isbell, Portland Business Alliance
Dick Malin, Central Park Neighborhood
Association
Mark McCloud, Greater Vancouver
Chamber of Commerce
Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver, USA
Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver

## Project Team Members Present:

Mike Baker, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA), Guest Facilitator Katy Brooks, The JD White Company, Inc. (JDW)
KC Cooper, JDW, Guest Facilitator
Rob DeGraff, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Amy Echols, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

## I. Transportation Demand Management Overview

The Task Force meeting was preceded at 3:30 p.m. by a presentation by David Parisi, Parisi Associates, on Transportation Demand Management and Transportation System Management (TDM/TSM). TDM measures generally focus on minimizing automobile travel, while TSM focuses on operating, regulatory, and service policies that can achieve an efficient and productive transportation system. His presentation is available on the project website. David also discussed the finding of the I-5 Partnership that transit service is the single most important investment necessary to TDM/TSM success. Task Force members asked if the roadway pricing strategy would be used as an incentive for people not to drive. David responded that tolls can be used to raise money to pay for projects, and can also be used to help regulate travel demand. Members also inquired about freight-only lanes. David replied that freight-only lanes are in the toolbox and may be considered.
Action: No action required.

## II. Public Comment

Henry Hewitt, Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Task Force Co-chair, received comments from six citizens. Written comments are included in Appendix A. The following people provided comments: Paul O. Edgar, Vinton Erickson, Travis Huennekens, Susan C. Morton, Sharon Nasset, and Lawrence E. Russell. Summaries of verbal comments follow.
Paul Edgar stated that the CRC Task Force is acting prematurely by not exploring other costeffective alternatives, such as improving the I-205 corridor. He also commented on safety concerns regarding the Terwilliger curves and the Marquam Bridge.
Sharon Nassett encouraged citizens to participate in public comment and announced she would hold 9 to 12 citizen meetings. She also expressed her concern about the accuracy of the project influence area map. Further, she inquired about a July 20, 2005, Washington/Oregon Joint Transportation Commission Subcommittee meeting that CRC Task Force members did not attend.

## Columbia River <br> CROSSING

## Meeting Summary

| Meeting: | Columbia River Crossing Task Force |
| :--- | :--- |
| Meeting Date: | May 17, 2006, 4:00-6:30 pom. |
| Location: | WSDOT SW Region Headquarters, |
| 11018 NE $51^{\text {si }}$ Circle, Vancouver, WA |  |

Tom Miller for Sam Adams, City of Portland
Dr. Wayne Branch, Clark College
Rich Brown, Bank of America
Richard Brandman for Rex Burkholder, Metro
Bob Byrd, Identity Clark County Lora Caine, Friends of Clark County
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County Hal Dengerink, Washington State University Vancouver (Task Force Co-chair) Elliot Eki, Oregon/ldaho AAA
Dave Frei, Arnada Neighborhood Association
Jill Fuglister, Coalition for a Livable Future Jerry Grossnickle, Columbia River Tugboat Association
Brad Halverson, Overlook Neighborhood Association
Fred Hansen, TriMet Henry Hewitt, Stael Rives (Task Force Cochair)

## Absent Members:

Charles Becker, City of Gresham
Brett Hensley, Columbia Pacific Building Trades
Monica Ispell, Portland Business Alliance
, Dick Main, Central Park Neighborhood Association
Mark McCloud, Greater Vancouver
Chamber of Commerce
Steve Petersen, Portland Business Alliance Janet Ray, Washington AAA
Karen Schmidt, Washington Freight Mobility
Strategic Investment Board

Adrienne DeDona for Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground
Dean Lookingbill, Regional Transportation Council
Ed Lynch, Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust
Betty Sue Morris, C-TRAN
John Ostrowski, C-TRAN
Katy Brooks for Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver, USA
Bart Phillips, Columbia River Economic Development Council
Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver
Bob Russel, Oregon Trucking Association Jonathan Schlueter, Westside Economic Alliance
Steve Stuart, Clark County
Walter Valenta, Bridgeton Neighborhood
Association
Tom Zelenka, Oregon Freight Advisory
Committee

Jeri Sundvall-Williams, Environmental Justice Action Group
Scot Walstra, Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland

## Project Team Members Present:

| Ron Anderson | John Osborn | Lynn Rust |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Doug Ficco | Peter Ovington | Gregg Snyder |
| Jeff Heilman | David Parisi | Rex Wong |
| Jay Lyman | Anne Pressentin |  |
| Linda Mullen | Laura Reilly |  |

## Announcements

The purpose of the meeting was announced by Co-chair Hal Dengerink:

- to finish the discussion and selection of components to move forward for further study;
- to consider transit and replacement bridge ideas begun at April 26 meeting;
- to discuss how the Task Force wants project staff to combine these components into packages.

Peak Oil and Demand Modeling: Staff is working to arrange for a speaker on these topics and will schedule this for an upcoming meeting.

## Regional Transportation Council resolution:

Reminder that Task Force alternates may not participate in voting.
Action: Motion passed:
Motion to support the Regional Transportation Council board's Policy Statement on Guidance for the Transportation Corridors Visioning Process and Context for Addressing New Columbia River Crossings (see meeting materials, attachment from RTC).

All approved except Jill Fuglister, who abstained.
Walter Valenta noted that there is also some interest in including Bi-State Coordination Committee as a forum for discussing this issue. Steve Stuart said it could be brought up at that meeting the next morning.

Other materials: A handout was given to Task Force members titled Appendix A: Attachments to Public Comments, April 12-13, 2005 Open Houses in response to Dave Frei's request for attachments referred to in the Database of Public Comments Received through April Open Houses.

## Environmental Justice Update

- An environmental justice training has been scheduled for the June Task Force meeting. The trainer will be John Ridgeway of the Washington State Department of Ecology, who will lead this full discussion of the federal Environmental Justice rules and how they apply to the CRC project. Note: June meeting will be extended to four hours to accommodate this ( 4 pm to 8 pm ).


# Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council <br> Board of Directors <br> August 3, 2004, Meeting Minutes 

## 1. Call To Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Royce Pollard on Tuesday, August 3, 2004, at 4:30 p.m. in the Clark County Public Service Center $6^{\text {th }}$ Floor Training Room, Vancouver, Washington. Those in attendance follow.

## Board Members:

Brian Beecher
Bill Ganley
Matthew Garrett
Lynne Griffith
Pat McDonnell
Arch Miller
Royce Pollard
Craig Pridemore
Judie Stanton
Bob Talent
Don Wagner
Ed Orcutt
Joe Zarelli
Guests:
Keith Ahola
Ed Barnes
Pete Capell
Mike Clark
Justin Clary
Paul Edgar
Becky Eisiminger
John Fratt
Mark Garrity
Chuck Green
Michael Kepcha
Mary Legry
Ginger Metcalf
Erin Middlewood
Scott Patterson
Ed Pickering
Thayer Rorabaugh
Bill Stewart
Sharon Wylie
Staff:
Lynda David
Bob Hart
Mark Harrington
Dean Lookingbill
City of Washougal Council Member
City of Battle Ground Council Member
ODOT Region One Manager
C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
City of Vancouver Manager
Port of Vancouver Commissioner
City of Vancouver Mayor
Clark County Commissioner
Clark County Commissioner
Skamania County Commissioner
WSDOT SW Regional Administrator
Representative $18^{\text {th }}$ District
Senator $18^{\text {th }}$ District
Skillings-Connolly, Inc.
Washington Transportation Commissioner
Clark County
WSDOT
City of Ridgefield
Citizen
Port of Vancouver
Port of Vancouver
WSDOT
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Citizen
WSDOT
Identity Clark County
The Columbian
C-TRAN
C-TRAN
City of Vancouver
The Oregonian
Clark County
Senior Transportation Planner
Transportation Section Supervisor
Transportation Analyst
Transportation Director

# Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors <br> February 1, 2005, Meeting Minutes 

## I. Call To Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Arch Miller on Tuesday, February 1, 2005, at 4:05 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, Vancouver, Washington. Attendance follows.

Board Members Present:
Brian Beecher, Washougal Council Member Marc Boldt, Clark County Commissioner Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member Matthew Garrett, ODOT Region One Manager Lynne Griffith, C-TRAN Exec. Director/CEO
Pat McDonnell, Vancouver City Manager
Arch Miller, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Betty Sue Morris, Clark County Commissioner
Paul Pearce, Skamania County Commissioner
Royce Pollard, Vancouver Mayor
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Board Members Absent:
Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor
Brian Prigel, Bingen Mayor
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Jim Honeyford, Senator $15^{\text {l/ }}$ District:
Bruce Chandler, Representative $15^{\text {th }}$ District:
Dan Newhouse, Representative $15^{\text {th }}$ District
Don Benton, Senator $17^{\text {th }}$ District
Jim Dunn, Representative $17^{\text {th }}$ District
Deb Wallace, Representative $17^{\text {th }}$ District
Joe Zarelli, Senator $18^{\text {th }}$ District
Ed Orcutt, Representative $18^{\text {th }}$ District
Richard Curtis, Representative $18^{\text {th }}$ District Craig Pridemore, Senator 49 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ District
Bill Fromhold, Representative $49^{\text {th }}$ District Jim Moeller, Representative 49 ${ }^{\text {监 }}$ District

## Guests Present:

Sam Adams, City of Battle Ground
Ed Barnes, WA Transportation Commissioner
Peter Capell, Clark County
Justin Clary, City of Ridgefield
Paul Edgar, Citizen
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT
Brent Grening, Port of Ridgefield
John Hoefs, C-TRAN
Addison Jacobs, Port of Vancouver
Mike Mabrey, Clark County
Dick Malin, Citizen
Ginger Metcalf, Identity Clark County
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Thayer Rorabaugh, City of Vancouver
Scott Sawyer, City of Washougal
Bill Stewart, The Oregonian
Mark Turpel, Metro
Terri Tweedell, Identity Clark County
Steve Vestal, WSDOT
Bob Voller, Citizen
Bill Wright, Clark County

## Staff Present:

Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner Mark Harrington, Transportation Analyst Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor
Dean Lookingbill, Transportation Director
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative/Staff Assistant

## II. Approval of January 4, 2005, Meeting Minutes

ROYCE POLLARD MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 4, 2005, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LYNNE GRIFFITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## III. Citizen Communications

There was no citizen comment.

## Bi-State Coordination Committee <br> Meeting Report <br> November 3, 2005

## 1. Welcome and Approval of September 29, 2005, Meeting Report

The meeting of the Bi-State Coordination Committee was called to order by Chair Rex Burkholder at 7:30 a.m. at the Clark County Elections Building Conference Room 226, 1408 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Those in attendance follow:

Committee Members
Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor
Roland Chlapowski, City of Portland Alternate
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County Commissioner
Doug Ficco, WSDOT SW Alternate
Matt Garrett, ODOT Region One Manager
Lynne Griffith, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground City Manager
Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver Executive Director
Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver Mayor
Fred Hansen, TriMet General Manager
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Staff
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Dean Lookingbill, RTC
Mark Turpel, Metro
Diane Workman, RTC
Interested Guests
Ed Barnes, Washington State Transportation Commissioner
Richard Brandman, Metro
Pam Brokaw, Representative Brian Baird's Office
Justin Clary, City of Ridgefield
Kate Deane, ODOT
Chris Deffebach, Metro
Walt Evans, Schwabe Williamson \& Wyatt
David Forte, WSDOT
Stuart Gwin, City of Portland
Bob Hart, RTC
Addison Jacobs, Port of Vancouver
Jim Leahy, Bechtel
Alan Lehto, TriMet
Steve Matthews, WSDOT
Brian McMullen, WSDOT
Sharon Nasset, Economic Transportation Alliance
Joy Overstreet, Citizen, Vancouver
Thayer Rorabaugh, City of Vancouver
Jeanne Stewart, Vancouver City Council Member
Rex Wong, Columbia River Crossing
Bill Wright, Clark County

## GUESTS PRESENT (Cont.) AFFILIATION

Brianne Echenhart<br>Dale Himes<br>Sharon Nassit<br>Nancy Kraushaar<br>Alice Rouyer<br>Ron Papsdorf<br>Portland State University<br>Washington State Department of Transportation<br>NPBA<br>City of Oregon City<br>City of Milwaukie<br>City of Gresham

STAFF

Dick Benner Richard Brandman Renee Castilla Kim Ellis Tom Kloster Mark Turpel

## I. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Rod Park called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:17 a.m.

## II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

ACTION TAKEN: Fred Hansen moved and Roy Rogers seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of October 9, 2003 as amended. The motion passed.

AMENDMENT: October $9,2003,2^{\text {nd }}$ page, reference to Powell/Foster to include pavement and preservation.

## III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO JPACT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Chris Smith, Transportation Chair for the NW District Association (neighborhood association for NW Portland) and current TPAC member stated that they have completed a twenty-year update to their neighborhood plan with the City of Portland. He expressed a concern regarding a late amendment to the plan that the neighborhood association feels has impacts on regional planning. He explained that as part of the plan, an area on the north side of Juan Street was rezoned to allow offices use. This has led to concerns regarding livability impacts in their neighborhood as well as regional concerns in terms of losing industrial lands to office use. He said that the rezoning was done at the request of ESCO to allow them to remain there and build headquarters office space. He stated that having headquarter space is not something that the neighborhood opposes, however they oppose the speculative office space development portion. Further, that high-density employment should occur in a 2040 regional center not in industrial areas. The impact of that would be serious transportation problems in that corridor as indicated by property owners own consultant's analysis. It would also differ transportation resources that should be going to centers to be applied to this challenge. To the extent that they are not able to mitigate that would also mean they would have freight movement problems as well. These issues were raised in a letter from Councilor Burkholder to Commissioner Francesconi however his understanding is that letter has yet to be answered. In fairness to Commissioner Francesconi, there is report of an SDC associated with this intended to provide mitigation however they have


Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
MINUTES
December 15, 2005
7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
Council Chambers

| MEMBERS PRESENT | AFFILIATION |
| :---: | :---: |
| Rex Burkholder, Chair | Metro Council |
| Sam Adams | City of Portland |
| Brian Newman | Metro Council |
| Bill Kennemer | Clackamas County |
| Roy Rogers | Washington County |
| Rob Drake | City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County |
| Lynn Peterson | City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County |
| Dick Pedersen | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) |
| Fred Hansen | TriMet |
| Paul Thalhofer | City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County |
| Don Wagner | Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) |
| Bill Wyatt | Port of Portland |
| MEMBERS ABSENT | AFFILIATION |
| Matthew Garrett | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1) |
| Rod Park, Vice Chair | Metro Council |
| Maria Rojo de Steffey | Multnomah County |
| Steve Stuart | Clark County |
| Royce Pollard | City of Vancouver |
| ALTERNATES PRESENT | AFFILIATION |
| Chuck Becker | City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Multnomah County |
| James Bernard | Cities of Clackamas County |
| Dean Lookingbill | Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council |
| Jason Tell | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1) |
| OTHER COUNCILORS PRESENT |  |
| Robert Liberty | Metro Council |
| GUESTS PRESENT | AFFILIATION |
| Kenny Asher | City of Milwaukie |
| Meeky Blizzard | Office of Congressman Blumenauer |


| GUESTS PRESENT | (cont) | AFFILIATION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Washington County |
| Kathy Busse |  | TriMet |
| Olivia Clark |  | City of Cornelius |
| Jef Dalin |  | Port of Portland |
| Rick Finn |  | DEQ |
| Marianne Fitzgerald |  | Schnitzer Steel |
| Ann Gardner | Citizen, Washington County |  |
| Kathryn Harrington |  | OHSU |
| Mark Kemball | CRC |  |
| Tom Markgraf | ETA |  |
| Sharon Nasset | City of Gresham |  |
| Ron Papsdorf | Multnomah County |  |
| Karen Schilling |  | City of Cornelius |
| Terry Whisler | City of Hillsboro |  |
| John Wiebke |  |  |

## STAFF

Richard Brandman, Jon Coney, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Tom Kloster, Jessica Martin, Kathryn Sofich, Randy Tucker

## I. CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME OF NEW MEMBERS

Chair Rex Burkholder declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:39 a.m.

## II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Sharon Nasset, 4772 N. Lombard, appeared before the committee and stated her appreciation for the Cost of Congestion report presented December $1^{\text {st }}$. She also spoke of the importance of how public transportation works versus how it looks, noting specifically that people working nontraditional hours do not have access to public transportation as well as those living in areas outside of the city have bus stops that have no shelters, benches or paved places to wait.

## III. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

Chair Burkholder announced that the January 19, 2006 JPACT meeting would start at 7:15a.m. in order to accommodate Ms. Gail Ackerman, who would be presenting an Oregon Transportation Plan update.

## IV. CONSENT AGENDA

## Minutes

ACTION TAKEN: Mayor Rob Drake moved for approval of the amended October $13^{\text {th }}$ and November $10^{\text {th }}$ meeting minutes. Councilor. Lynn Peterson seconded the motion and it passed.

## JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

November 13, 2003

| MEMBERS PRESENT | AFFILIATION |
| :---: | :---: |
| Rod Park | Metro Council |
| Matthew Garrett | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1) |
| Craig Pridemore | Clark County |
| Fred Hansen | TriMet |
| Carl Hosticka | Metro Council |
| Bill Kennemer | Clackamas County |
| Don Wagner | Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) |
| Larry Haverkamp | City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County |
| Maria Rojo de Steffey | Multnomah County |
| Karl Rohde | City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County |
| Jim Francesconi | City of Portland |
| Rex Burkholder | Metro Council |
| Roy Rogers | Washington County |
| MEMBERS ABSENT | AFFILIATION |
| Stephanie Hallock | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) |
| Royce Pollard | City of Vancouver |
| Bill W yatt | Port of Portland |
| Rob Drake | City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County |
| ALTERNATES PRESENT | AFFILIATION |
| Andy Ginsburg | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) |
| Dean Lookingbill | SW Washington RTC |
| Susie Lahsene | Port of Portland |
| GUESTS PRESENT | AFFILIATION |
| Kathy Busse | Washington County |
| Karen Schilling | Multnomah County |
| Kevin Downing | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) |
| Rod Monroe | Metro Council |
| Jim Bernard | City of Milwaukie |
| John Gillam | City of Portland |
| John Rist | Clackamas County |
| Dave Nordberg | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) |
| Phil Selinger | TriMet |
| John Russell | Oregon Transportation Commission |
| Robin McArthur | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1) |

# Bi-State Coordination Committee <br> Meeting Report <br> September 23, 2004 

## 1. Welcome and Approval of August 10, 2004, Meeting Report

The meeting of the Bi-State Coordination Committee was called to order by Chair Rex Burkholder, at 7:15 a.m. at Metro Regional Center, room 370A-B, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland. He announced at that at 8 a.m., Bi-State Coordination Committee members are invited to join members of JPACT in welcoming Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Administrator Jenna Dorn in the Metro Council Chamber.

Those attending the $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{State}$ meeting are listed below:

## Committee Members

Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor, Chair
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County Commissioner
Matthew Garrett, ODOT, Region 1 Manager
Lynne Griffith, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground Manager
Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland Alternate
Don Wagner, WSDOT, SW Regional Administrator
Rod Monroe, Metro Councilor Alternate
Staff
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Bob Hart, RTC
Mark Turpel, Metro
Jan Faraca, Metro
Interested Guests
Edward Barnes, WSDOT Commissioner
Jim Bernard, City of Milwaukie Mayor
Karen Ciocia, J.D. White Co., Inc.
John Cullerton, Metro
Rob DeGraff, ODOT
Mark Garrity, WSDOT
Jim Howell, AORTA
Greg Miller, Associated General Contractors
Sharon Nasset
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
$\because$
Lynn Peterson, City of Lake Oswego
Dale Robins, RTC
Thayer Rorabaugh, City of Vancouver
Karen Schilling, Multnomah County
Kristopher Strickler, WSDOT
Laurel Wentworth, City of Portland

## Environmental Justice Issues And Problems with Meetings

CRC

At the last CRC task force meeting Task Force members and the public asked basic question that have been asked from the beginning that have still not been answered in writing. Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder recommended that I put together a list of these questions in an email and send it to all interested parties encase, they had questions too. Rex also recommended that I put a time of when I wanted the questions answered the suggestion that a week was about the right amount of time.

Charge of committee
The Charge of the I-5 Corridor study was the I-5 Corridor. The Charge of the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership was the I-5 Corridor. Did the Federal government and the Governors of Oregon and Washington changed the Charge? Is the Charge still the I-5 Corridor? Does the Charge still include heavy rail infrastructure?

## Bridge Influence Area

The original BIA modeling has errors in the traffic count. These errors where pointed out in the May 2005 meeting. A new model showing the adjustments in the "old modeling" have still not been not been provide to the task force member or the public.

1. The BIA shows $11 \%$ Washington County traffic leaving the I-5 Corridor at Marine Dr. This traffic was identified by PDOT in the St. Johns Truck Study as the linchpin that damages the economy, environment, and livability in the St. Johns and North Portland residential and retail center. PDOT identified 75\% of the truck traffic in downtown St. Johns as traffic cutting through because of the congestion on the I-5 Corridor. The I-5 project is suppose to take care of this problem by keeping the traffic in the corridor and not in our neighborhoods. That $11 \%$ modeling needs to go back into the I-5 Corridor count going over the 405 bridge south of the BIA. The new plan should not be based on this damaging practice continuing.
2. The original modeling of the BIA left out Swan Island traffic, which are approximately $22 \%$ of the traffic over the Columbia River Crossing.
3. That $33 \%$ that goes throw the BIA to destination south of BIA needs to be addressed in the modeling.
4. Modeling showed that when the I-5 corridor get traffic relief that there is a shift in traffic counts of approximately $15 \%$ from 205 to $1-5$ the shorter preferred route. This is not show in the modeling.
5. The BIA boundaries show SR500 to the North in Washington and Columbia Blvd. the South in Oregon. Columbia Blvd. has NO exit off from the North. The exit of Victory Blvd. goes to Hayden Meadows and the ramp continues to downtown Historic Kenton at the end of the Denver viaduct is south of Columbia Blvd. outside of BIA. Kenton has a huge truck and car traffic problem with traffic traveling through downtown not to Kenton. This traffic's destination is South of Kenton outside the BIA. Much of this traffic is leaving the I-5 corridor and using surface neighborhood streets because of the congestion on I-5. ODOT is studying this major problem and has data. The percentage that is show to get off at Columbia Blvd. must be reevaluated as to where they are going and how much of the traffic is leaving the freeway early because of congestion on I-5.
6. The BIA east and west boundaries from I-5 go east 6 miles to include the 205 bridge yet only go west $1 / 2$ mile and does not include the rail road the Port of Vancouver the Port of Portland, North Portland Peninsula and major industrial area in Washington and Oregon. This does not address freight, trade, rail, or other transportation issues.

## Expense and Accountability

In May 2005, EJAG and others asked for a month to month itemized list of expense to be posted on the web and handouts presented at meetings. This issue has been raise several times. The staff is spending 1 to $1 / 1 / 2$ million dollars a month every month for over a year and still has not presented itemized lists. We are still in the out reach stage not study. Please post an itemized list of expense on the web site now and bring hand outs to each meeting.

How many members of staff are there and what are their job titles? When where they hired?
Minutes to the meetings do not include the citizens who participate at the meetings. Until recently hand outs given to the task force member by citizen at CRC meetings where not put into the official records and forwarded to the task force members.
The task force members have asked to appoint two members to speak to the press. The media reports have been vary inaccurate and often do not reflect how members believed the meeting went. Why is the staff still giving out the press release and why haven't to task force members been appointed to sum up the meetings and inform the press? It was as recommend that all former and current press releases be put on the web site. This has been done before with other transportation task force as a meeting summary. WADOT, ODOT and PDOT representatives in transportation meeting continually suggest that the Columbia River Crossing needs to be replaced before it falls down. This is a faults and misleading statement and needs to stop. One official statement that is read must be established. Such as:
*Both of the bridges that make up the Columbia River Crossing are structurally sufficient and meet all Federal requirements with approximately 50 years of life left. The Columbia River Crossing Bridge is considered to be obsolete because the traffic infrastructure was built for slower speed, lower capacity and with entrances and exits that are to close to each other. Also consider obsolete is the Highway 26 Corridor and the I-5 corridor, from Terwilliger to the I-5 Bridge at the Columbia for the same reasons. *

Missing data
The Columbia River Crossing underwent an inspection recently and received and $A$ one rating. The issue of seismograph has been raised. Since transportation is, a system and none of the bridges in our area meet current Federal Standards for seismograph how does the Columbia River Crossing Bridge place. The I-5 and 205 have several bridges in what order are they as far as an inspection and seismograph?

No handouts have been presented showing actual numbers and percentage traffic counts or citizen open house out reach.

Meeting information and packages are not made available to task force member or public be fore meetings including issue to be voted on. It has
been suggested that meeting information packages be made available a week before the meetings.

## Land Use

The actual cost of the land, availability and ease of construction has not been addressed. The I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership identified the project to the west as having the least amount of displacements. The displacement of building at I-5 listed major impact on retail and residential, as well as encroachment on the Historic Fort Vancouver. The cost of the land near I-5 is very expensive, plus mediation, purchase of buildings, relocating, moving business, inventories, labor issue, destruction, hauling and length of time cost. What are these actual cost compared to the almost bare, vacant and publicly owned land on the Westside where the Bi State Industrial Corridor (BIC) alignment is?
How does the New BIC a new North/ South corridor compare with the amount of home removed from the I-5 corridor building in Oregon and Washington? BIC comparison is a new corridor, it to a bridge over the Columbia River project.
Oregon has identified the need for a new North/South highway and rail corridor in ODOT Strategic Capacity Enhancement Investment. How can we fast track the BIC, which is a North/South highway rail corridor?

Construction on I-5 before another structure is built is not acceptable.
Thank you, for your time. I look forward to having these question answered soon. I am working on a more complete list of question but wanted to get this short version out so we would have the answers by the next meeting.

May 26, 2006

Sharon Nasset
Economic Transportation Alliance
2225 N. Lombard Street, Suite 210
Portland, OR 97217

## Subject: Request for Information

Dear Ms. Nasset:
The purpose of this letter is to provide responses to questions and statements in your email request for information dated April 23, 2006. Efforts were made to address your questions as well as provide responses to some of the statements that were not questions. Several of our responses reference additional information that is available at the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project office in Vancouver in accordance with requests for public information.

Following are verbatim sections of your email highlighted in bold, followed by the CRC response shown in italics:
"Charge of committee:"

The Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Task Force was established at the direction of the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Washington Transportation Commission in 2004-2005. The Charter for the CRC Task Force can be found on the project website at:
http://whw, columbiarivercrossing. org/materials/meetingmaterials/l'askeorce. 041905 Charter 1.pdf
whe Charge of the I-5 Corridor Btudy was the I-5 Corridor. The Charge of the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership was the I-5 Corridor.

Is the Charge still the I-5 Corridor?"
No, the CRC task is to alleviate the bottleneck for transit and vehicles at the river crossing and improve safety between SR500 and Victory Blvd. The charge of this project is still within the I-5 corridor, but it does not include the entire corridor as previously studied in the Partnership phase.
"What is included in the I-5 Corridor?"

See above.
"Did the Federal government change the charge?"
No.
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"Did the Oregon governor change the charge?"
No.
"Did the Washington governox change the charge?"
No.
"Does the Charge still include heavy rail infrastructure?"
No. This is a highway and transit project.
"Bridge Influence Area"
"The original BIA modeling has errors in the traffic counts. These errors where pointed out in the May 2005 meeting. A new model showing the adjustments in the "old modeling" have atill not been provided to the task force members or the public."

The CRC Project staff disagrees that there are errors of the magnitude asserted in paragraphs labeled 1 through 3 below. The CRC staff is available to meet to review how the data was developed and to clear up misunderstandings related to the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership's modeling effort.

For the Step A Screening of proposed components, CRC project staff updated and refined the data used in the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership model. Those refinements have provided the project with more current data with which to assess the effectiveness of components in addressing the problems identified in the project problem definition. Furthermore, a fully updated model with a 2030 analysis horizon will be developed and will be used to assess the packaged alternatives that will be developed this spring and summer with the components that survive Step A screening.
"1. The BIA shows 11\% Washington County traffic leaving I-5 at Marine Drive. This 11\% modeling needs to go back into the I-5 count going over the I-405 Bridge south of the BIA. This same traffic was identified by PDOT in the St. Johns Truck Study as the linchpin that damages the econcmy, environment, and livability in the gt. Johns and North Portland residential and retail centers. PDOT identified 75\% of the truck traffic in downtown St. Johns as traffic cutting through because of the congestion on I-5. The I-5 project is supposed to take care of this problem by keeping the traffic on I-5 and not in our neighborhoods. The new plan should not be based on this damaging practice continuing."

See above. The CRC focus is on I-5 at the bottleneck. Transportation alternatives must address the praject's Purpose and Need. Even with freight improvements, it is unlikely that all of the truck traffic will be removed from the St. John's neighborhood.
$n^{2}$. The original modeling by the BIA left out the Swan Island traffic, which accounts for approximately $22 \%$ of the traffic over the Columbia River Bridge."

See above.
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"3. This 33\% effecting congestion in the BIA modeling should be included in the modeling."

See above.
"4. The Modeling shows that when I-5 gets traffic relief, there is a shift in traffic counts, of approximately $15 \%$, from $\mathbf{I - 2 0 5}$ to $1-5$, and that is because r-5 is the shorter preferred route by at least this percentage. This is not shown in the modeling."

The question of traffic diversion between $I-5$ and $I-205$ was not studied in any detail in the I-5 Partnership. It will be considered during the upcoming CRC modeling work. Traffic diversion has the potential to be a significant factor as we evaluate alternative packages through this calendar year and in the DEIS as a locally preferred alternative is chosen.
"5. The BIA North boundary is shown as GR500 to the North in Washington. The South boundary is shown as Columbia Blvd. in Oregon. Columbia Blvd. has NO exit off from the North. The exit to Victory Blvd. goes to Hayden Meadows and also continues to downtown Historic Kenton, at the end of the Denver viaduct. This is south of Columbia BIvd. which is outside of the BIA boundaries. Kenton has a huge truck and car traffic problem because all modes are using this route to go south of Kenton, not to conduct business in Kenton. Much of this traffic is leaving I-5 and using these types of surface neighborhood streets because of the congestion on $\mathrm{I}-5$. ODOT is studying this major problem and has data. The percentage that is shown to get off at Columbia Blvd. must be reevaluated and a determination made as to where their destination is. Is this traffic leaving I-5 early because of congestion on I5?"

The CRC will evaluate the impacts of various alternative packages on potentially affected local arterials and surface streets as part of the evaluation process this summer and again as alternatives are studied in the DEIS.
"6. The BIA east boundary is 6 miles east of I-5 and includes the I-205 Bridge. On the other hand the west boundary is only $1 / 2$ mile west of $I-5$ and does not include the rail roads, The Port of Vancouver, The Port of portiand, The North Portland Peninsula and other major industrial areas in Washington and Oregon. This does not address freight, trade, rail, or other transportation issues."

The project is looking at $I-205$ because of the possibility that it may be impacted as the result of the traffic diversion precipitated by a decision to toll I-5. This has enabled the project team to develop demographic and other data needed for the EIS in.the event a decision on tolls makes that detailed analysis of these issues around I-205 a necessity.

The CRC project will clearly take into consideration the impact of alternatives on freight, the Ports, and derivatively, commerce.
"Expense and Finical Accountability through public information"
"In May 2005, FJAG and others asked for a month to month itemized list of expenses incurred by the CRC group to be posted on the web and in handouts
presented at meetings. This issue has been raise several times. The staff is spending $\$ 1$ to $\$ 11 / 2$ million dollars a month every month for over a year and still has not presented itemized accounting lists. We are still in the out reach stage not study. Please post an itemized list of expenses on the web site now and bring updated handouts to each meeting."

The CRC team is currently working on a reporting tool that will be updated monthly. Expenditures through April 2006 total $\$ 9.2$ million, or an average of $\$ 767,000$ per month since the start of the project on May 1, 2005. The CRC anticipates expenditures exceeding $\$ 1$ million per month. Expenditures are being monitored by responsible state officials who fully understand their fiduciary responsibility to the public. Financial information is public record, and is available upon request.
"How many of the CRC members are CRC staff?"
We define "CRC staff" as employees of ODOT, WSDOT, and the consultant team working on the CRC. Staff from each of the six Project Sponsors (Portland, Vancouver, C-TRAN, TriMet, RTC and Metrol are also working on the project.
"How many are on staff for the CRC project?"
The CRC project staff varies from month to month. On average, there are about 57 people working at the co-located office.
"please list their job titles?"
See above. Names and job titles are available for you to review at the CRC office in Vancouver when formally requested through Tonja Gleason. You can make an appointment to review the records by contacting Tonja Gleason at (360) 816-2188.

## "please list their hire dates?"

See above. You can arrange for specific information from the CRC office in Vancouver, recognizing that some personal information may not be available under the request for public records.
"Minutes of the meetings do not include the citizens who participate at the meetings. Thank you for changing policy so that recent handouts given to the task force members by citizen at CRC meetings are put into the official records and forwarded to the task force members. The task force members have asked to appoint two members to speak to the press. The media reports have been vary inaccurate and often do not reflect how members believed the meeting went. Why is the staff still providing the press releases and why haven't to the two task force members been appointed to sum up the meetings and inform the press?"

The Task Force Co-chairs, Henry Hewitt and Hall Dengerink, are the official spokespeople for the Task Force. It is their prerogative, which they have not exercised, to appoint other task force members as Task Force spokespeople. The CRC team handles press relations (press releases, media contacts, scheduiling). Task Force meetings have been a public process and most meetings are covered by the media. Inaccuracies in reporting are beyond the control of the project.
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"It was has been recommended that all former and current press releases be posted on the web site. This has been done before with other transportation task forces as a meeting summary."

It is the intent of the project to post Press Releases on the Website at: ht tp: //ww. coiumbianivercrossing.orq/materials/pressRoom, aspx The Press Archive includes the releases.
"WADOT, ODOT and PDOT representatives in transportation maeting continually suggest that the Interstate Bridge needs to be replaced before it falls down. This is a faults and misleading statement, according to ODOT information, and needs to stop."

The CRC Team has not stated that the bridges will fall down, but what we have stated is that they do not meet current seismic design standards. While we cannot tell you at what specific magnitude on the Richter scale the bridges would fail, we can conclude that they would be extremely vulnerable during a significant seismic event.
"One official statement that is read must be established.
Such as:
*Both of the briages that make up the Columbia River Crossing are structurally sufficient and meet all Federal requirements with approsimately 50 years of life left. *None of the bridges'in our area meet current Federal seismograph standards,"

Comment noted.
"please provide a list of how well each of the bridges in our area will do during an earthquake"

The CRC office does not have seismic information on area bridges as it is not relevant to the scope of this project. You will need to contact the agencies that own the bridges to ask if they have information.

## "Misaing data"

"The Interstate Bridge underwent an inspection recently and received and an one rating. The issue of seismograph has been raised. Since transportation is a system and neither the Interstate or the Glenn Jackson Bridge meet aurrent Federal Standards for seismograph, a new orossing should be provided elsewhere to provide gafe access while these bridges are up graded."

Your comment is noted. Any replacement bridge would be constructed to current seismic standards.
"No handouts have been presented showing actual numbers of traffic counts to any citizen open house out reach. please provide a breakdown of origination and destination for freight, truck, commerce, conmuters and transportation needs, Columbia River Crossing Transportation needs such as doctor, schooling, aports, and other activities."

A significant amount of existing traffic data has been collected and is available for review at the CRC office in Vancouver. Information from this data has been synthesized into a format that is being used for public and task force meetings. Some of the data you have requested (trips to the
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doctor, school, sports and other activities) is not available for the project area. Some, such as origins and destinations for freight, are under development (there is a comprehensive freight study being conducted by the region, the results of which will be available sometime in 2007).
"Past and present Meeting information and packages are not made available to task force members or the public before the meetings and do not include a list of issues to be voted on. It has been suggested that meeting information packages be made available one week before the meetings."

Project materials are posted to the website one week prior to each Task Force meeting.

## "Land Use"

"The actual cost of the land and the availability has not been addressed in any of these meetings."

The estimated costs of acquiring right of way that might be necessary for the CRC will be determined much later in the process, as required by NEPA, when it has been determined what will be built and where it will be located.
"Several years ago The I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership identified a project to the west of I-5 as having the least amount of displacements of property owners. The reconstruction on I-5 on their reports listed major impacts to retail, residential as well as encroachment onto the Historic fort Vancouver. The cost of the land near I-5 is very expensive, plus mediation, purchase of buildings, relocating, moving business, inventories, labor issue, destruction, hauling and length of time cost. What are these actual costs compared to the almost bare, vacant and publicly owned land on the Westside where the Bi State Industrial Corridor (BIC) alignment is?
How does the New BIC, a new North/South corridor, compare with the amount of homes removed from the I-5 corridor building in Oregon and Weshington."

Your comments are noted. To date, the CRC has not packaged the components into alternatives and estimated the impact of potential displacements. No actual costs or data is yet available.
"BIC
is a new corridor to reduce congestion on I-5 which includes a bridge over the Columbia River. ODOT has identified the need for a new North/South highway and heavy rail corridor in their Strategic Capacity Enhancement Investment study. How can we fast track BIC, which is a North/South highway heavy rail corridor?"

In order to advance a project like the BIC, it must be incorporated into the regional plan on both sides of the river; have support among local, regional, state and federal agencies and have community and political support as well.
"Replacement of any bridge on the I-5 corridor before an additional structure is built is not acceptable."

Comment noted.

Sharon Nasset
May 26, 2006
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"I have delivered a full description of the BIC to the CRC Task Force Members and RTC. In 2004 I presented the BIC to several official transportation groups and CRC when it started in 2005. At the last CRC, the BIC was shown as an option RC-14 and it had several errors in its description."

In the Draft Step A Screening process, CRC staff used the description of the BIC found on the BIC website.
"CRC Draft Components step A Screening Report pg. 3-12 errors."
"Question 1. The BIC does not tunnel Mill plain Blvd. but follows BNSF rail line and does not involve Fruit Valley Rd. The West Arterial from the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership in almost the same aligmment. West Arterial is a much small lift span arterial with 8 stoplights instead of being an expressway. The much small West Arterial an "approximately 6 minutes, delay is reduced by $20 \%$, and congestion is reduced by $17 \%$. West Arterial Road's four-lane bridge over the Columbia River is near dapacity during the morning and afternoon peak periods."* The BIC is 12 lanes and 3 lanes for transit."

The CRC team agrees the BIC increases vehicle capacity. The team evaluated this revised version of the BIC in Step A screening. We found that the BIC in its new configuration reduced projected 2020 PM Peak congestion to 6-7 hours, compared to 9-10 hours for the "no build." Other, more effective crossing components that were presented reduced congestion levels to 4 hours or less, leaving the BIC as an unacceptable solution for alleviating the bottleneck at the river crossing.
"Question 2 Went Arterial final findings "There is an increase in transit rider ship. The increase is due to additional transit service on the West Arterial and in the I-5 Corridor." * The West Arterial and BIC give direct access to major industrial areas with very high employment."

Comment noted.
"Question 3 "New road.. provides $t$ access between Portland and Vancouver, particularly for freight between the ports of Vancouver and Portland, and to the Columbia Corridor and the NW industrial area. This improvement is also targeted to reduce truck traffic in the $S$. Johns, and North Portland neighborhoods and provides an alternative access to Hayden Island. Substantially reduces delay on truck routes and prevents delays on truck routes from growing worse." *"

Comment noted.
"Question 4 It reduces congestion in the corridor, removes freight traffic from the BIA, provide more capacity for over the Columbia River."* It provide alternative to I-5 so that safety standards an be address on the I-5 Bridge Crossing."

Comment noted. Without added capacity and re-design of the BIA, collisions are expected to increase 40 percent over 2005 conditions.
"Question 5 It provide bike/ped pathways connecting with the 40 mile loop, gives access to the Smith and Bybee lakes, industrial area, provides access to Vancouver and Jantzen beach. It does not help the BIA because the BIC in

Sharon Nasset
May 26, 2006
Page 8
not in the narrow scope of the BIA. 40,000 people live in north Portland and would have access to the before stated areas. *see portland area bike maps."

Although bicycle and pedestrian mobility would improve in the BIC, it would not improve current BIA mobility by causing out of direction travel. Thus it fails the Purpose and Need of the CRC on this criterion.

```
"questions 6 A new Columbia River Crossing does not stop upgrading of the
existing I-5 bridge and does provide an alternative while upgrades are being
done.
- Displacements mLeast amount of overall displacements compared to I-5
improvements.
- Lessen traffic emissions directly at the freeway.
    *final strategic Plan June 2002 I-5 Partnership page 41 and community
forum meeting evaluation results November 10, 2001 page 74 can be found on
the I-5 Partnership web site."
```

Comment noted.

```
"Now let take about air quality, less amount of displacements, substantially
reduces truck days, helps the economy, lessen truck traffic in several
neighborhoods, add capacity over the river, and in the corridor. There are
several other advantages including it can be completely built in }5\mathrm{ years or
less and is a corridor not a wide stop on I-5,"
    The data developed by the I-5 Partnership, as reflected in their
    recommendation, and in the CRC Step A Screening, does not support the BIC
    perspective that it is superior to other potential transportation
    solutions in the BIA.
```

As mentioned at the start of this letter, several of the responses indicate additional information is available in the CRC office in Vancouver. In addition, experts are available to describe in more detail some of the issues you raised.

Sincerely,


Kris Strickler, P.E.
Deputy Project Director

## c: Doug Ficco, WSDOT Project Director John Osborn, ODOT Project Director

On July $19^{\text {th }}$ and $20^{\text {th }} 2005$, Transportation Commissioners from both Oregon and Washington met for hearings on transportation issues. Also in attendance at these Hearings were people from different transportation groups as well as interested business people who had been provided advance notice so they could participate in discussions if they wished. Noticeably missing from the Hearings were the members the I-5 Task Force. Only one or two people from of this group found it important enough that they should make an appearance in the time slot set aside to discuss the Columbia River Crossing. Sharon Nasset was one of the few people to give a presentation at the Hearing. The Washington Commissioners had expected to hear comments from the I-5 Task Force members. Needless to say, the Commissioners noted there were no oral or written comments made by any of its 38 members.

The Commissioners, seeing the disinterest shown by the Task Force, commented that until more interest is shown for the Columbia River Crossing Project, it would be hard to make this one of their top priorities.

Susan C. Morton<br>(Economic Transportation Alliance)

## Questions Brought Forth by the Community

Transportation Commissioners for the states of Oregon and Washington traveled to Portland for a special meeting on July 20, 2005, with members of the Columbia River Crossing Task Force.

As a Task Force member, are you aware that this meeting took place in a room packed with transportation industry representatives?

- Were you given the time, date, and place and the importance of this meeting?
- Has the Task Force been notified of this error in not being invited to this special meeting?
- Has a notice been sent to Transportation Commissioners of lack of notification to the Task Force members?
- Why hasn't a summary of the July 20th meeting been presented?
- Why hasn't this error been acknowledged?
- How will notification of future meetings be sent to Task Force Members and citizens at large?
- Who will send the notice?
- Will there be notification of all future meetings concerning Columbia River crossings?
- Has a new meeting been scheduled with the Transportation Commissioners?
- How were the transportation industry representatives notified of the meeting?
- Why did transportation representatives get priority notification of the meeting?


## For Future Transparency

- How many separate groups in Oregon and Washington are studying the Columbia River crossing?
- Who is participating in these groups?
- How often do these meetings occur?
- How are citizens notified of these meetings?
- Where are notes of these meetings posted?
- Can we expect a monthly update on these meetings?
- In the future, will a calendar of all meetings that involve the Columbia River Crossing be distributed monthly?

Thank You.

# CITIZEN'S <br> TRANSPORTATION SUMMITT 

The Portland / Vancouver Metropolitan area is having a transportation crisis and needs your help. With your direction and your leadership, we can get back on the right track. The current study of the Columbia River Crossing is costing approximately $\$ 1.5$ to 2 millions dollars every month, with no identified projects. Please become involved and help move our transportation solutions forward. Thank you, Concerned Neighbors.

Name

## Address

| Come Zip Code__ Work Zip Code |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ E-mail |  |  |
| 5 \% YeS I would like this to be submitted as my formal statement. |  |  |
| I-5 Corridor (I-84 in Portland to 99 NE in Vancouver) |  |  |
| $\square \square \square \square \square$ Do you think we need more bridge capacity across the Columbia River? |  |  |
| 늠ㅁ Should we enlarge the current I-5 bridge? |  |  |
| 늠ㅁ Do you think we need a new (third) bridge between Vancouver and Portland? |  |  |
| 늠ㄴ Do you think I-205 is congested now? |  |  |
| ㄴㅁㅁㄴ Do you think we need local access bridges between Vancouver and Portland? |  |  |
| 늠ㅁ Do you think we need a bridge in the Camas areas? |  |  |
| $\square \square \square \square \square$ Should we build a new route (located away from I-5) to take traffic off of I-5? |  |  |
| $\square \square \square \square \square$ Should we build more bridges and roads? |  |  |
| ㅁㅁㅁ ( Should we have more bus routes? |  |  |
| $\square \square \square \square$ Should we build more light rail routes? $^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  |
| $\square \square \square \square \square$ Should we try to force people out of their cars by increasing costs and congestion? |  |  |

## Transit/Buses

Do you think our buses are a good way to get to work?
Do you think that our bus system should be 24 hours?
Do you think our bus system needs to service our regional industrial areas better? Do you think our buses should go to light rail stations or direct to the destination? Do you think we need to continue spending money to improve our bus system? How do you rate our bus sysfem now?

## Citizens * Open house * Open mike *

## Speak up and direct the future transportation of our region, Washington and Oregon.

 Come to one or all of the six transportation summit meetings.Three Vancouver meetings:

- Feb 4: 11 AM to 6 PM Clark Co. Public Service Center 1300 Franklin St. Van, WA. 6th floor. (Presentation and public open mike $1-3 \mathrm{pm}$ )
- Feb 8: 1:30-7 PM Fisher's Landing Transit Cente 3510 SE 164 th Ave. Van, WA. (Presentation \& public open mike 2-4 \& 5:30-7 PM)
- Feb 11: 4:30-8 PM at Prairie High School 11500 NE 117th Ave. Van, WA. (Presentation \& public open mike 6-7:30 PM) * tentative

Pleae leave this survey with survey taker or mail to address on other side - Survey ends March 1, 2006 www.newinterstatebridge.com Check web site for the results of the survey.

## CITIZEN'S <br> TRANSPORTATION SUMMIT

## Light rail

Do you think that light rail is a good way to get to work.
Do you think light rail should have priority at stoplights? (stopping all traffic)
Do think we should spend money on light rail?
Do you think we should continue spending to build on our light rail system?
Do you think light rail should go to Vancouver now?
Do you rate our light rail system highly?
Did you vote for light rail?
Do you think that building light rail will reduce road congestion?

## Metro



Metro controls transportation planning in Portland area. Are they doing a good job?

## Do you think metro should continue handling transportation planning?

ㅁㅁㅁ Do you like the decisions metro makes concerning transportation?
ㅁ ㅁ ㅁ Do you think that Metro provides a reliable transportation system?
ㅁ प प D Do you think your transportation dollars are spent well?
Funding priorities. How should our tax dollars be spent. Rate 1 through 5.


Three Vancouver meetings:

- Feb 4: 11am to 6pm Clark Co. Public Service Center 1300 Franklin St. Van, WA. 6th floor. (Presentation and public open mike 1-3 pm)
- Feb 8: 1:30-7pm Fisher's Landing Transit Cente 3510 SE 164 th Ave. Van, WA. (Presentation \& public open mike 2-4 \& 5:30-7 PM)
- Feb 11:4:30-8 PM at Prairie High School 11500 NE 117th Ave. Van, WA. (Presentation \& public open mike 6-7:30 PM) * tentative

Please leave this survey with survey taker or mail to:
Concerned Neighbor's Survey / Sharon Nasset
1113 N. Baldwin Portland OR. 97217 Survey ends March 1, 2006
Please check web site for survey results.
www.newinterstatebridge.com
Please download copies of this survey from our web site and distribute your friends \& neighbors.

## Congestion Relief

Congestion comes from not enough capacity in our transportation corridors and transit system. The larger the population the more capacity is needed. Roads or transportation corridors are not about what is currently traveling on these corridors, fossil fuel propelled vehicles, but their location and capacity levels. Roads keep civilization functioning. At one time people walked on these corridors, then horse, wagon, steam engines, and currently fossil-fueled vehicles. Limiting our transportation corridors is damaging to our environment, economy, military and safety. Transportation is a system with a variety of options to help create a healthy balance. Here are some basic beginning steps to ease congestion.

1. We must establish a 24 -hour bus system. Portland is a 24 -hour town with an employment and entertainment transportation need. The traffic increase at 1:30 PM every day starts with employees who were not offered the opportunity to take mass transit to work. Employees working swing shift, graveyard and early morning shifts do not have transit service to and from work. The employer pays for mass transit services and so do many employees. They deserve and need the services they have paid for.
2. Bus transit service must be increased to include adequate service into the industrial areas.
3. All bus stops need to have a bench and cover to attract clients and for comfort. Benches with advertisement can raise revenue. These funds can maintain bus stops and up grade pedestrian sidewalk access to transits stops. $25 \%$ of the transit stops in Portland are considered inaccessible to the physically challenged, elderly and young due to lack of sidewalks and unsafe walking conditions.
4. Create a network of Limited Motorized Corridors to help separate different modes of transportation for safety, reliability, and less congestion on major streets of commerce. These corridors would be for pedestrians, bikes, and small motorized vehicles, up to 20 MPH. Limited Motorized Corridors would parallel main streets of commerce for business access and transit opportunities. Please see Limited Motorized Corridor on my web-site.
5. Build a new third North/South corridor to the west of the current I-5. By building a new Columbia River crossing connecting our industrial areas together it will create direct access. This will relieve congestion on the l-5 Corridor and take truck traffic out of several neighbors. Please see Bi-State Industrial Corridor www.newinterstatebridge.com. This must to be started right away. Because of the drain on the economy the current l-5 study monies must be dedicated to solve congestion.
6. Heavy Rail is the backbone of our transportation system. It is the most cost effective, least polluting, environmentally friendly, and safest way to transport goods. It is one of the least expensive infrastructures to build and brings the largest amount of freight into an area. It supports our trucking industry and brings good family wage jobs into hubs all across the United States. Rail is friendly to all commodities it carries from goods and services to people. Besides providing jobs, railroads put a majority of their money back into their infrastructure. They provide stability for the economy by building into the land and are an industry that cannot just pick up and leave. To relieve congestion and strengthen our economy we need to double and triple track our existing rail system. Rail tends to be less intrusive to land use policy, due to the right of way generally being set aside and owned. With the increase of rail capacity by the adding of additional tracks you have the ability to relieve congestion and pressure on our road system. Rail already serves many of our centers of employment, commerce, and entertainment. Rail has the ability to make small towns and coastal towns year around destinations. There are many ways of creatively financing multi track rail capacity. Because rail tends to be less expensive than highway and road infrastructure you get way more bang for your buck. Encouraging resort areas, casinos, shipping suppliers, commuters, and tourism to purchase advance, future options to use the rail similar to time share for future is one financing option. A rail lottery
and other creative fundraising ideas are ways to defray the cost of adding to our rail system.

[^0]:    ${ }^{1 /}$ Delay Time + Elapsed Time

[^1]:    (A) New bridge from Rivergate to U.S. Hwy 30
    (B) Redesigned BNSF railroad/truck bridge and new Carey Bivd.

    New road around St. Johns with river crossing access.

[^2]:    The St. Johns Review, Inc. $515-840,2209$ N. Schofield, Portland, Or., 97217

[^3]:    ${ }^{1} 2020$ morning peak period trips were not analyzed as this travel model is not as thoroughly calibrated as the afternoon peak period model, due to incomplete freight and transit data.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ www.columbiarivercrossing.org

[^5]:    ' 2020 morning peak period trips were not analyzed as this travel model is not as thoroughly calibrated as the afternoon peak period model, due to incomplete freight and transit data.

