

Meeting Summary
Columbia River Crossing Task Force
May 4, 2005
4–6:30 p.m.
Clark County Hearing Room, 6th Floor
Clark County Public Service Center
1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington

Members Present:

Dr. Wayne Branch, Clark College
Rex Burkholder, Metro
Bob Byrd, Identity Clark County
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County
Hal Dengerink, Washington State University
Vancouver (Task Force Co-chair)
Elliot Eki, Oregon/Idaho AAA
Dave Frei, Arnada 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
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground
Monica Isbell, Portland Business Alliance
Dean Lookingbill, Regional Transportation
Council
Ed Lynch, Vancouver National Historic
Reserve Trust
Dick Malin, Central Park Neighborhood
Association
Mark McCloud, Greater Vancouver Chamber of
Commerce
Wally Mehrens, Columbia Pacific Building
Trades
Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver, USA
Bart Phillips, Columbia River Economic
Development Council
Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver
Art Schaff, Washington State Trucking
Association

Jonathan Schleuter, Westside Economic
Alliance
Dave Shields, City of Gresham
Steve Stuart, Clark County
Jeri Sundval, Environmental Justice Action
Group
Walter Valenta, Bridgeton Neighborhood
Association
Scot Walstra, Greater Vancouver Chamber of
Commerce
Tom Zelenka, Oregon Freight Advisory
Committee

Members' Substitutions Present:

Susie Lahsene for Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland
George Vartanian for Lora Caine, Friends of
Clark County

Project Team Members Present:

Ron Anderson, David Evans and Associates,
Inc. (DEA)
Katy Brooks, The JD White Company, Inc.
(JDW)
Rob DeGraff, Oregon Department of
Transportation (ODOT)
Amy Echols, Washington State Department of
Transportation (WSDOT)
Doug Ficco, WSDOT
Jeff Heilman, Parametrix
Jay Lyman, DEA
David Parisi, Parisi Associates
Gregg Snyder, Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)
Kris Strickler, WSDOT

Don Wagner, WSDOT
Ken Winterstein, PB

Henry Hewitt, Stoel Rives (Task Force Co-chair)

Absent Members:

Sam Adams, City of Portland
Rich Brown, Bank of America
Lora Caine, Friends of Clark County

Janet Ray, Washington AAA
Bob Russel, Oregon Trucking Association
Karen Schmidt, Washington Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland

OPENING REMARKS & AGENDA REVIEW

Hal Dengerink, Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Task Force Co-chair, began the meeting by informing attendees that Henry Hewitt, Task Force Co-chair, was ill and would not attend, but would chair the next meeting. He asked Task Force members to introduce themselves briefly.

Katy Brooks, The JD White Company, Inc., introduced herself as the CRC Task Force Facilitator.

Hal reviewed the agenda (Appendix B).

Hal turned the meeting over to Doug Ficco, Co-Project Director, to introduce the project consulting team.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Doug explained that in the last Task Force meeting, the Washington and Oregon Departments of Transportation (DOTs) team reviewed its search for a consultant to carry forward the CRC environmental process. WSDOT's request for qualifications received one submittal. The DOTs held a workshop with local partners, the DOTs, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the consulting team. The DOTs and their local partners agreed that this was the consulting team needed to take the project forward. The team is led by David Evans and Associates (DEA) headquartered in Portland, Oregon. The sub-consultants are: Parametrix, CH2MHill, Parsons Brinckerhoff, The JD White Company, Inc., and 17 others. Doug introduced Jay Lyman, Consultant Team Project Manager, David Evans and Associates (DEA), and asked him to introduce his team members.

INTRODUCTION OF PROJECT CONSULTING TEAM

Jay Lyman expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work with the Task Force, local agencies, and stakeholders at-large on this exciting and challenging project. He has been working with staff from both DOTs to get underway as quickly as possible.

Jay Lyman is a Senior Project Manager with DEA and has managed transportation corridor work for the last 26+ years, involving six DOTs throughout the west. He was the Consultant Project Manager for the last phase of the project with the I-5 Partnership and the strategic plan that came out of it.

He stated that the team's history with this project began in late 1998 and provides a good understanding of the issues of the past and the studies done to address the issues. The team recognizes that the project is enormously complex and challenging, and requires the best minds from around the country to address it. He added that this team has expertise in mega-projects, transit, highway Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), bridge crossings, and bridging between two cities. The staff represents project experience from 20 different states.

Team members include Ron Anderson, DEA, who will assist Jay Lyman. Ron's 38 years of experience include 30 with WSDOT, and he concluded his WSDOT career as Northwest Region Administrator.

Ken Winterstein, PB, who will be the Design Engineering Manager, comes to this project after a stint managing the draft EIS for the Alaskan Way Viaduct project in Seattle.

Jeff Heilman, Parametrix, who will be the Environmental Task Manager, has worked on major transit and highway projects in both Washington and Oregon. Jeff Heilman will manage the environmental team and be directly responsible for the production of the EIS.

Gregg Snyder, PB, who will be the Transit Planning and Engineering Manager, has an extensive background in federal transportation authority work, both in EIS approach and new start programs for new investments and transit facilities.

David Parisi, Parisi Associates, will manage the transportation, planning, and traffic elements of the study. David will be responsible for making sure the design alternatives address all modes of transportation and will work closely with Metro and RTC on transportation modeling and forecasting.

Doug noted that a team of specialists will support each of these individuals. Ken Winterstein will have three major design groups working for him: a bridge design group focusing on the CRC and highway design groups working on Oregon and Washington. Members can expect to see key staff from these groups and others as the project moves forward.

Hal asked for questions. Tom Zelenka asked staff to give Task Force members a contact list of the team firms.

TASK FORCE VALUES & VISION EXERCISE

Hal turned the meeting over to Katy to discuss the Draft Vision and Values Statement (Appendix D).

Katy thanked those who had attended the bridge influence area site tours. She noted that there would be opportunities for members who did not go on a tour to attend one this summer. The tours provide firsthand information from varying perspectives regarding issues and interests around the bridge influence area.

Katy discussed the importance of a common vision that incorporates the values of the group. The Vision and Values Statement will serve as a litmus test for weighing decisions as the project progresses. The statement also will inform the DOT staffs as the project justification and purpose and needs statement are written. The development of the project justification and purpose and need statement are some of the first steps taken before the scoping process of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

KEY ISSUES & INTERESTS

Before the group discussed the Vision and Values Statement, Katy shared some of the key issues discussed in one-on-one meetings with Task Force members. Katy called attention to the Key Issues and Interests worksheet (Appendix D) that provides feedback on what was heard during the interviews and illustrates the members' diverse interests. Reviewing these issues would serve as a means of generating discussion and furthering understanding of individual interests and issues. Katy said the challenge of meeting only four times per year, as scheduled now, is that the group has limited opportunities to discuss each other's interests and issues and gain insight. After reviewing the key issues, the group could review and discuss how they apply to the Vision and Values Statement.

The I-5 Partnership Problem, Vision and Values Statement, and Draft Vision and Values Statement were made available to members and the audience (Appendix D).

Katy said that the Task Force from the previous process accomplished a great deal in forming consensus around the group's vision and values, and suggested that this group build on the good work already completed. The updated Vision and Values Statement for the NEPA CRC Task Force utilizes language from the previous group's statement as a starting point.

EIS

Katy began a review of the Key Issues and Interests worksheet. The first category of the worksheet is the EIS process. Many members want to expedite the process and others noted that the NEPA

process is long, arduous, and careful. She added that a lot of members are ready to keep moving and get the bridge built. Other members are worried that something will be missed along the way if the process moves too quickly.

Some members mentioned that this project should not hamper other projects, namely the widening of I-5 between Delta Park and Lombard. Additionally, members discussed how the number of alternatives that require analysis will affect the project timeline.

Task Force Composition

Based on feedback, Katy said Task Force members think that the membership of the Task Force is broad and inclusive, and that members noted that dozens of others could be around the table as well, but that representation at this point seemed adequate. Many members wanted to know how the Task Force will be effective with 39 members.

Walter Valenta asked whether someone from the railroad is on the Task Force, and Katy responded that, while there is not, the ports are meant to represent maritime, rail, aviation, and freight. Walter Valenta inquired whether a rail representative had been asked to be on the Task Force and had declined. Walter Valenta commented that a significant stakeholder was missing because a rail representative is not included. Doug Ficco replied that the project team is in contact with Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF). He noted that Mike Powell, the representative liaison with the DOTs from BNSF, is retiring within the next 2 weeks and the DOT team would brief his successor.

Scot Walstra asked if scoping would name the BNSF rail bridge as an impacted area. Doug Ficco replied that the rail bridge is not part of scoping as of yet, but that it has not been excluded from the process.

Public Outreach

Katy stated that members gave a lot of input on public outreach for the project, and are aware of the diverse interests. She added that, whatever public process is developed, it must be accepted by the community. Numerous members thought public education would be important because people need to have a good grasp of the project context, issues, and ramifications.

Interstate Cooperation

Katy stated that Portland/Vancouver cooperation came up frequently. She noted that understanding each city's issues has been historically difficult and needs to be addressed. She said that the Task Force members articulated their willingness to increase the level of cooperation and consideration for both sides of the river. Katy pointed out that Portland and Vancouver do have differences, including their own unique cultures.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart requested the project scope be broadened to include Oregon and Washington because the implications of the project reach farther than Portland and Vancouver.

Eric Holmes asked if the project would recognize statewide interests because it would be funded by the state legislatures.

Congestion Management

Katy said that congestion management is the reason the Columbia River Crossing project exists—congestion is an issue across the bridge and at chokepoints in and around it. Freight mobility is an issue for neighborhoods and freight industry professionals alike. Transit, in whatever form it may take, Katy noted, is another key component of the CRC.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart asked whether members were talking about a larger CRC system or the scope specifically for the I-5 crossing. Rob replied that the project included adjusting or expanding the capacity in the current corridor and a multi-modal project. Rob added that the DOTs do

not know if they are considering tearing out or recycling the current bridge. They are confident that the project will go from SR 500 in Vancouver to Columbia Boulevard in Portland. He noted that the project is not just the bridge itself, it is also the 4.5-5 mile stretch that contains eight interchanges.

Walter Valenta asked if it was fair to say that this group has narrowed down the corridor more than the previous Task Force.

Rob replied that, during scoping, the community might want to look at a third corridor. The FHWA expects the project team to look at a new corridor besides I-5 and I-205. He noted that the corridors would have to be analyzed in scoping. He stated that the members would need new information besides the information they had 3-4 years ago.

Dave Frei stated that he would like to make sure pedestrian and bike traffic components are visible in the project.

Land Use

Katy stated that members also commented extensively on land use and communities, and noted that members are working in a primarily built environment and there are existing land uses for Vancouver, Clark County, Portland, and beyond. She emphasized that members have to be mindful of the project footprint, and aware of the I-5 Partnership planning process and its recommendations. Katy noted the importance of the environmental justice component and of considering the people living along the I-5 corridor on both sides of the river.

Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz asked, “Where are you placing the fund? The 1% environmental justice fund (that was included as a recommendation in the previous I-5 Partnership process)? Is that getting placed in funding or under this (NEPA) environmental justice?”

Katy replied that the fund was not under discussion at this time, because the Task Force is at the beginning of its process. The purpose of today’s exercise is to provide feedback from interviews with Task Force members. Katy explained Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz’s comment: an action item in the I-5 Partnership set aside 1% for building communities. Katy is not sure how that action item would be carried out in this project. Katy asked DOT staff for comment.

The context for Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz’s question, Rob explained, is in the Draft Vision and Values Statement: *“distributing fairly the associated benefits and impacts for the region and the neighborhoods adjacent to or affected by the Crossing.”* He added that, at this point, the DOTs are not talking about specific recommendations that came out of the I-5 Partnership; rather, they are discussing the underlying principles that will shape the project. He also noted that the idea of environmental justice is incorporated in the Draft Vision and Values statement and, if it is not adequately addressed, Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz could speak up at that point.

Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz’s stated, “I think it is an adequate value statement to capture that. Since it was not listed on there, I wanted to make sure it was remembered in the process.” Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz stated, “I am actually really comfortable it’s being carried out right now in the Delta Park project. I believe there are lessons gained there on how to do it. I’m confident that we will continue. I just wanted to make sure that it wasn’t forgotten somehow in this process.” Katy replied that if members review the Draft Vision and Values statement and believe it is not incorporated, members can discuss it and make changes.

Tom Zelenka stated that the Draft Vision and Values Statement is vague and ambiguous. He asked who is distributing the money; if the government is distributing benefits, Task Force members may be creating the wrong set of expectations. He asked how the DOTs are viewing the statement, as it should not be seen in a legalistic sense.

Katy responded that the Draft Vision and Values Statement is a litmus test designed to acknowledge the varied interests and complexities of the project as the Task Force deliberates on its

recommendations to the DOTs. She noted that members should develop a Vision and Values Statement to a point that they are comfortable incorporating it into the Task Force charter.

Referring to the third bullet of the Draft Vision and Values Statement (supporting a healthy and vibrant land use mix of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, cultural and historical areas), Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart said he would hate to create expectations that the CRC would support a healthy land use mix because land use is complicated. He noted that the values set up are unrealistic expectations. Katy replied that there would be compromise among members, and that the group's challenge is incorporating many perspectives into Task Force recommendations. Members' points are well taken, but the opposite point could be at the table at the same time. She emphasized that members need to think broadly and act deliberately at this point. Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart replied that the values are not broad enough.

Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder requested concrete examples illustrating the third bullet. For example, if the bridge were higher above Hayden Island, people could pass underneath it and the bridge's understory would support a healthy mix of commercial and recreational uses. Members need four or five quick concrete examples of areas where the design of the bridge could help achieve a healthy mix. He added that Vancouver Mayor Royce Pollard could talk about how to connect Vancouver's Historic District to downtown Vancouver with a pedestrian walkway.

Mayor Royce Pollard emphasized that the third bullet is required and members have to be responsible for what they are proposing. Members have to be committed to mitigating, to the best of their ability, the impacts that are going to be forced onto neighborhoods.

Structural Considerations

Katy stated that member feedback on structural considerations were not completely consistent regarding the project's number of through lanes. The comments in respect to the height of the structure were fairly consistent and most members are aware of the restrictions from Pearson's flight path to Portland International Airport. Another issue was ensuring that commercial maritime traffic is able to travel back and forth by taking into consideration the height from the water to the bridge.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart asked if location of the structure could be added to the Key Issues and Interests worksheet, and Katy said it could.

Mayor Royce Pollard asked members to remember Vancouver's airfield.

Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz asked for clarification on revisiting the number of lanes on the bridge because she thought the issue had been resolved in the previous Task Force. Katy said that revisiting data and recommendations from the I-5 Partnership planning process is a challenge in how it will be integrated into the NEPA process. Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz responded that it would be revisited in terms of alternative analysis, but wondered whether the submitted proposal would be consistent with the prior process. Rob said that all the data concerning the number of lanes and size of the structure would have to be revisited to determine what should be built now. Such a major investment has to be built to the capacity needed. The team does not know what they will build, but will head in the direction the data falls.

Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz responded that she found that piece of the scope disturbing because of all the presentations Jay Lyman had given to the previous Task Force about lanes and off- and on-ramps being the primary issues. She noted that the previous Task Force also had a tremendous number of negotiations and broad consensus around the number of lanes. She emphasized the number of issues to be dealt with and alternatives to evaluate. All the work and money spent should not be irrelevant.

Doug Ficco stated that the past work is not irrelevant and the team would build on past data. Members have to justify how many lanes they recommend. Serena asked for clarification. Because this is an interstate, Doug Ficco replied, the federal government ultimately decides what the project will include. Members have to look at the historic traffic data and modeling. He noted that the project team would

work with local partners RTC and Metro to determine the demand of the structure. Members will have a chance to comment on what the data shows. He added that the team does not know whether the data will change at this time.

I-5 Partnership & Strategic Plan

Fred Hansen asked if the project team could articulate the I-5 Partnership and their work in relation to it. He noted that one could say the team is building on recommendations, unless new data says they should conclude differently. He added that another way to say this is: “it is nice work, but we are starting fresh with no preconceived ideas.” Is it the co-chair’s responsibility to tell members how they should think about this? Katy responded by referring to the charter. She noted that this project is a specific section out of the corridor that was studied in the previous process. This project includes the CRC. She stated that the work of the CRC Task Force is part and parcel of the work done by the I-5 Partnership. Members have the distinct task of providing input to the DOTs during the NEPA process. Some of the data will have to be refreshed and considerations revisited.

Fred Hansen asked whether members should presume that there will be three through lanes unless new data shows to the contrary, or if it was looked upon as a recommendation, but this project would look afresh at it. He noted that, either way, one could find ways to satisfy NEPA.

Rob responded that, in scoping, the team would start with the eight concepts recommended in the I-5 Partnership strategic plan. He noted that this will be a public process. The public may suggest things the I-5 Partnership Task Force did not choose to forward, such as a tunnel. The refreshed traffic data would be useful, as Metro and RTC are updating their modeling. Rob noted that all these things would be considered and other questions entertained as the project goes into scoping.

Jeri Sundval stated that she represents residents of North and Northeast Portland and is concerned with air quality, diesel particulate, pollution, and high asthma rates. She expressed great concern regarding losing acknowledgement of these issues through a new process.

Hal commented that the Task Force should include and reevaluate recommendations from the Strategic Plan. New data will be brought into the NEPA process. Hal said that the addition of new Task Force members for this process will also need to contribute to the discussion and evaluation of alternatives. The DOT team and the Task Force need to demonstrate that they have thoroughly evaluated the alternatives.

Design

Bart Phillips stated that there are design considerations with the bridge because it would become a part of the built environment in Portland and Vancouver.

Jerry Grossnickle said that pier placement should be a part of the structural considerations because the scope of the transportation corridor should include the navigation corridor.

Brad Halverson stated that the design of the bridge is critical. Although the current bridge functions, it is not pretty and does not work. The bridge needs to connect to the water, SR 14, and Hayden Island. The CRC is a world-class problem and needs a world-class solution.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart stated that the design of the I-5 bridge is beautiful. One side is on the Historic Register and the other will celebrate its 50th anniversary soon, and the bridge is structurally sound after 100 years.

Mayor Royce Pollard stated that design parameters are not why we are here today. The bridge is dysfunctional. He believes in the project and is willing to commit to the time the process will take.

Environment

Scot Walstra stated that pollutant vehicle emission levels will be significantly reduced in the future, and noted that it will be meaningful for the study to understand what emissions will look like in the

next couple of decades because they will change significantly as people demand cleaner vehicles. Katy replied that she is not sure it is in the scope, but will put it on the structural considerations.

Katy stated that water, air, noise, wetlands, open space, the built environment, and humans are all inclusive in the environment category.

Project Funding

Katy said a number of members were concerned with project funding. The considerations are 1) finding the funding, 2) where the project is in the sequence of funding and design, 3) funding windows of opportunity (such as federal appropriations), and 4) its source. She noted that she knew the project team did not have answers yet, but that a funding plan will be an important part of the NEPA process.

Eric Holmes asked the Task Force not to undersell the project because it would be competitive on a national scale. The I-5 bridge is one of the weakest links of the lifeblood of the West Coast economy—the I-5 corridor.

Lynne Griffith asked if the Task Force could look at the operating costs associated with a particular design and transit mix.

Dean Lookingbill asked members to address public/private partnership.

Ed Lynch stated that, if members were not willing to talk about tolling both bridges in order to get this built, they were wasting their time. Washington is talking about a billion-dollar project on the waterfront in Seattle and a bridge across Lake Washington. The chances of getting state funds are minimal because most of Washington's residents are in the Puget Sound area. Oregon is not in the position to fund the project either. He asked, "if members are not willing to toll, what are they talking for?"

Hal mentioned the tolling presentation scheduled later in the meeting, and stated that Katy was providing feedback for issues brought up previously to determine whether some should be added or removed. He was concerned the argument was going beyond the agenda.

Cost

Jill Fuglister stated that she is concerned about the budget for the EIS process. \$20 million on the EIS process seems like a huge amount of resources when members could build on the first Task Force. She noted that members should understand tradeoffs. If this project is funded, what are the states winning and losing?

Connected Facilities and Transit

Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder asked that members remember the segment of the population that is not able to use a vehicle due to age, disability, or socio-economic situation.

Katy stated that the Vision and Values Statement addressed transit and that the group could talk further about whether the statement is adequate on this issue.

Katy briefly touched on feedback regarding the economy. The economic impacts of congestion are profoundly connected to the greater regional area of Portland, Vancouver, and Clark and Multnomah counties.

Hal asked if members would like to proceed with the Draft Vision and Values Statement or table it and come back to it later.

Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder stated that members need to discuss how they treat the past I-5 Partnership recommendations. Are they going to bind themselves to the data? He would like to add to the Draft Vision and Values Statement the decision on how they use previous recommendations.

Hal asked if members wanted to continue the vision and values discussion or put it off until the next Task Force meeting. He asked for a show of hands. Five fingers meant continuing the discussion, one meant tabling it. The vote was a tie.

Fred Hansen said members would get closer to closure by taking 5-10 minutes to continue the discussion on the Draft Vision and Values Statement.

Hal stated that they would continue the discussion on vision and values.

DRAFT VISION & VALUES STATEMENT

Katy began discussing the Draft Vision and Values Statement.

Maritime, Aviation, & Freight Considerations

Susie Lahsene stated that railroads should be added to the connected facilities category. She commented that, in the economy category, the linkage between the two states as one marketplace is not clear and it is critical that the statement reflect that.

Fred Hansen echoed Susie Lahsene's first point and wanted to add marine activities to the connected facilities category.

Design

Walter Valenta stated that design should be a primary category, vision, and something the Task Force aspires to. Design should be brought in at the beginning because of the billion dollars that would be spent. He added that he wants a bridge that members are proud of and is a landmark. He did not know where the group was on this issue, and would like to find out the importance of design. He stated the only way to see if design is a primary consideration is to make it a value.

Katy paraphrased that Walter Valenta would like to have a vision and values category of design and a sense of place.

Vision and Values Development

Katy referred to the Vision and Values worksheet (Appendix D), and said she wanted to go through the categories of the Draft Vision and Values Statement and talk about what they may or may not encompass and whether their language is close to what the Task Force desires. The first box on the worksheet speaks to access, variety of modes, and congestion. Katy asked if this box encompassed those three issues and whether the group could stand behind the statement.

Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz asked which statement they were working from.

Katy replied that she included the Draft Vision and Values Statement bullets into the worksheet. For tonight, the Task Force would not get into the introduction, but she would like members to come to consensus surrounding the bullets.

Cost Effectiveness

Tom Zelenka said that, while he did not disagree with the Draft Vision and Values Statement, cost effectiveness is missing from all the categories.

Katy confirmed that cost effectiveness could be a potential addition for the group to include in their statement.

I-5 Partnership Recommendations

Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz stated that Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder had a third issue: how to use the I-5 Partnership recommendations.

Wally Mehrens asked if there are eight or six concepts from the I-5 Partnership because he only sees six.

Katy replied that these are not design concepts, they are categories that form the Draft Vision and Values Statement. The concepts are actual design concepts that came out of the previous I-5 Strategic Plan.

Katy suggested that the group discuss what is not included in the statement and that the project team will circulate an updated version for review after incorporating tonight's input. Due to the limited number of scheduled Task Force meetings, it was suggested that members could work on the Vision and Values Statement online in preparation for final discussion at the September meeting. She asked the Task Force to respond to this suggestion.

Hal asked Katy to be clear on what she wanted from people.

Next Steps in Vision and Values Statement Development

Katy stated that there would be a summary of tonight's meeting. The additional input is 1) how to use information from the previous process, 2) cost effectiveness of the process, and 3) importance of design. She asked if anything was missing from that list. She would take members' comments and circulate revisions.

Lynne Griffith asked if input from the interviews conducted with Task Force members is represented in the statement.

Katy replied that based on a first round of discussion with Task Force members through the interview process, much of the content of the Vision and Values Statement developed in the I-5 Partnership/Strategic Plan process addressed issues raised in the interviews. The I-5 Partnership Vision and Values simply is serving as a starting point.

Hal asked Katy to send out a revised Draft Vision and Values Statement and Key Issues and Interests worksheet, and Katy responded affirmatively. She noted that she wanted to share input with members, and if they have the time, they might want to read the interview summaries, which covers the key issues point-by-point.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart noted that he would like to know how and where the redrafting of the Vision and Values Statement will be accomplished.

Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder asked how the Vision and Values Statement will analyze the larger impacts of induced demand. He did not know if it should be included as a land use goal or the growth management piece. He is concerned with growth patterns in Clark County and the Oregon side based on different models and treatments.

Katy stated that she would add language to that effect.

Wayne Branch asked if they are taking comments and then validating them or coming back to this group and seeking validation. Katy responded that they would come back to the Task Force for validation. She added that she wants to make sure missing points are incorporated and sent back to members between now and the next meeting.

Wayne Branch requested that the second bullet in the statement include the movement of workers to access employment opportunities and/or skill development. He asked if it should be there or is it implied somewhere else. Katy replied that she will incorporate it.

Hal stated that members should not hesitate to send comments to Katy.

Bob Byrd stated that members do the one to five vote at the next meeting on line items and there might be consensus if they voted over e-mail.

Multnomah County Commissioner Serena Cruz responded that, if members voted outside the group, they would not know each other's intentions.

Katy suggested that they do as much tweaking online as they can, but have a discussion during the next meeting.

Hal replied that nothing will be adopted over e-mail.

Jeri Sundval emphasized that the meeting's public comment should not be overlooked. She asked if the public could be involved in the e-mail commenting process.

Katy responded that the Vision and Values Statement is for the Task Force to develop, but that discussion, whether online or during public meetings, would be made available to the public.

PROJECT UPDATE

Hal moved the meeting into the project update agenda item, stating that opinions have been expressed about funding. Tolling has been talked about as an option. The Oregon and Washington legislatures have been talking about funding issues for awhile.

He added that the project is of sufficient scope and will require a process for funding that goes beyond what the federal, state, and local governments can contribute. He noted the probable need for tolling or a private sector component. This is a project that has implications far beyond the local community. Tolling is a gap-closer. He noted that tolling should not be the first funding discussion members have. Other funding sources exist and would be discussed during the project.

Rob DeGraff presented a technical update on funding. The project team made presentations to the Oregon and Washington Transportation Commissions in April in order to provide a base understanding of how tolls work and some preliminary analysis on how tolls potentially could be applied to this project. (Slides from his presentation can be found in Appendix C.)

Fred Hansen asked whether variable tolls by time of day were being considered. Rob replied that would be another assumption. He noted that these are threshold assumptions about toll collection. Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart asked which direction vehicles would be tolled. Rob responded that, if both bridges are tolled, vehicles will be tolled in one direction.

Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder asked if the trips are truck trips or commuter trips. Rob responded that the trips include cars, trucks, and buses.

Susie Lahsene stated that at today's volume of 125,000 trips, 10,000 represent truck trips.

Fred Hansen asked if the data states that I-5 is more popular, or—if only one bridge is tolled—would there be more migration to I-205? Rob responded that the slides demonstrate a demand for the I-5 corridor that is not used because of congestion. Right now, people are going out of their way to travel across I-205. He noted that, when the capacity of the I-5 crossing is expanded, there is a significant migration of traffic back to the I-5 corridor.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart asked how Rob determined the pent-up demand for the I-5 corridor. Rob replied that, when the I-5 bridge is expanded with no tolls, traffic increases from 140,000 to 180,000 trips. He added that, when both bridges are tolled, traffic on I-205 goes down and traffic on I-5 goes up significantly, demonstrating that people want to be on the I-5 corridor.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart asked if it is modeling growth rates. Rob replied that the process uses the traffic model the region uses right now. Lynne Griffith asked if the model factors in a mode switch. Rob said the model assumes that there is transit in the scenarios.

Susie Lahsene asked if the middle bars on the slide indicate if there is not a new bridge in 2020, there will be more trips than in other scenarios. Rob replied that when tolls are imposed, people will not take trips or will consolidate them. Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart asked if Rob had the number of trips for 2020 on I-205, if there is a new I-5 bridge and no tolls on either bridge. Rob responded that there would be around 125,000 trips per day and it would be the same number if both bridges are tolled.

Tom Zelenka stated that it would be helpful if members had a background piece sent to them explaining the regional model, assumptions used, and how data is collected and input so members have a sense of the model that is more than garbage in, garbage out. Rob replied that the whole point of the presentation is for members to judge whether tolls should be taken into the next round of work. He noted that, when revenue projections are in question, receiving \$150 million a year is estimated if only the I-5 bridge is tolled and \$170 million a year if both bridges are tolled—a significant revenue stream to consider in the next phase. He also noted that the DOTs would be doing additional tolling work and research. He can provide background information for the presentation, but members will be in the middle of helping develop assumptions for the next phase of work.

Tom Zelenka stated that this raises a set of issues of decision-making that will affect the view people take of policy decisions to generate dollars. He also noted a set of questions regarding the legal framework for imposing tolling both at the state and federal levels. The third aspect is that this region has experience with tolling and it would be useful to refresh our understanding of tolling as a viable mechanism associated with the construction and operation of previous toll bridges.

George Vartanian asked if the intent of the tolls is to pay for the bridge and remove them once the bridge has been paid for, or to continue them for maintenance. Rob replied that the duration of the tolls is a policy decision.

Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart said that in the next phase he would like to see a breakdown of the revenues that show how much is brought in from traffic originating from the Oregon and Washington sides of the river. Rob replied that it would be an issue they would talk about in some detail.

Dick Malin asked about the obstacle of current federal law and members starting on revising the law on federal funding. Rob replied that the team has been talking with federal people regarding the reauthorization bill in Congress. Congress is talking about enacting it next month. There are amendments in the bill that create a new pile of projects with tolls. The project team has to see if the bill solves their problems, but it may not. He noted that the project team could talk to their delegations about creating a bill. They will have to see what happens within this session of Congress.

Hal reiterated that this is a feasibility study; it is not a decision that they are going to toll. He noted that it is a look at the complexity of the tolling issue—not a matter of, “we are going to toll or we are not going to toll.” He added that a series of things needs to be looked at. If members are taking a close look at this presentation and reviewing it they should come back with what the assumptions ought to be: are the assumptions in the fee scale appropriate and is the money adequate or too much? He noted that other issues are federal authority and the cost of doing the tolling. Rob stated that the figures presented consider managing the tolling program. Hal responded that tolling is a complex issue and members need to look at it in detail.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Washington State Representative Deb Wallace was called to comment. She stated that she represents the 17th District, which includes areas of Clark County. She noted that she wanted to thank the members for their efforts and realized the importance of their commitment to changing the face of the state and community. She noted that she is the vice-chair of the House Transportation Committee and wanted to give members a sense of the visibility of the project around the state. The discussion used to be the east and west divide—now that has changed. The CRC is one of three projects, but in reality it is one of many that were submitted for funding and the competition is fierce. The three main projects are the Alaskan Way Viaduct, the floating bridge, and CRC. She noted that the chair of the Washington House Transportation Committee said CRC is the third project, which is good news. She added that she wants to give members a sense of the competition for transportation funding. The CRC is included in the transportation funding package. However, Pierce County has 32 legislators and in Southwest Washington, there are nine, if they are all on the same page. Legislators are playing a fierce, competitive game and have to do everything in the face of other legislators. She added that they have

delivered in terms of this project, not only \$50 million, but also the means to align the legislation for Oregon and Washington for tolling and other pieces that allow public/private partnerships. It is good news that members now have the tools they did not have before.

She noted her caveats: the first is that the project has to move. She worked on projects related to CRC 12 years ago. The second is that members need to make decisions. The third is the I-205 bridge has problems and is a part of this project. She added that members need to look at all high capacity transit options. Without I-205, she cannot support CRC. She added that the last caveat is the most important: the region has been successful because there is a partnership. There are nine legislators and a bi-state region in DC and their strength is working together.

Jim Howell was called to comment. He stated that he would like to speak to the last meeting and read from his materials. His materials (Appendix E) were distributed to members. He added that “the bridge” was continually mentioned and it has not been determined if a new I-5 bridge is needed. He reminded members that this is a broader issue than just the freeway, and perhaps the freeway is not the most significant issue. He noted that it would be nice if there were other options.

Joe Hopkins was called to comment. He said he was from Ridgefield, Washington. He thanked the members for working on the project and looking ahead. He noted that he read about the project in *The Oregonian*. He stated that he would like to have a bridge of beauty that delights the eye and lifts the spirit.

Ray Whitford was called to comment. Ray stated that he was from Gresham, Oregon, and was concerned with the design and thanked the members. He added that the I-5 Partnership did a good job thinking about the vision; this project needs high speed rail, a straight shot through Portland, and the train station moved to the east side. He added that, with the cost of jet fuel, members needed to think about alternatives like green diesel.

Scot Baumhofer was called to comment. He stated that alternative fuels have not come about and we have gone in the wrong direction. There will be 60 years of bonds to pay off if we link expenditures to revenues. He suggested members bring tolls in as soon as possible, with higher rates during rush hour to reduce traffic jams and pollution. Property tax or sales tax should be incorporated to parts of the road. At some point, gas prices could double, imitating those in Europe, which will change the model.

Jim Carlick was called to comment. He addressed the cost benefit of light rail. His materials (Appendix E) were distributed to members. He obtained his information from the I-5 Task Force website. He stated that if light rail had an increase of 4,000 riders, it would add \$1.2 billion. The projected cost would be \$300,000 per person attracted to light rail, instead of the bus. 4,000 people are 42% of one lane of traffic. He asked why members would spend \$1 billion on one lane of traffic. He added that any time it is asserted that light rail reduces pollution, members have to remember automobiles do not put radioactive elements into the air like light rail.

Sharon Ehlmann, Economic Transportation Alliance, was called to comment. She emphasized that the project should be a vision for Washington and Oregon’s economy. She added that the first priority should be bringing businesses into the states by building another corridor to divert traffic and improve freight mobility. She noted that members are not looking at future construction on I-5, which will shut down lanes and be a detriment to the economy. She concluded that leadership is key in creating a public/private partnership similar to the Tacoma Narrows project.

Sharon Nasset, Environmental Justice Action League, was called to comment and stated that she is from North Portland. She distributed materials (Appendix E) to members. Sharon thanked Serena for bringing up the 1% environmental justice fund. She emphasized the damage I-5 does to the neighborhoods of Vancouver and North Portland. The area has the highest amount of asthma and cancer. She noted that the bridge is structurally sound and meets all requirements and that the I-5 Corridor reached capacity in the 1990s. She suggested taking away the bottlenecks and not widening the corridor. She added that four lanes on the bridge would add more pollution and 1% is not worth our health. She reminded members that leadership is not building bridges, it is making the bridge

green by decreasing the pollution that comes off of it. Sharon stressed that anyone that stands in the way of a new crossing is causing congestion, pollution, and ruining our economy. Even if the I-5 bridge were not to capacity, the next bridge that should be built should address port-to-port connections, Jantzen Beach access, and adding a few bridges to the east and west corridor. She stated that the driver of reducing congestion and building bridges will always be about the economy. The only way to have good jobs is to watch the environment because no one wants to live somewhere that is unpleasant. Sharon also stated that she understands that the current I-5 bridge is in sound condition and does not need replacing.

Written public comment was submitted by R. Hughes, “I am willing to pay a toll—but I am not willing to sacrifice our downtown Vancouver for on-ramps. I want a beautifully designed, functional bridge and we are willing to pay—use the rails already in place/bury light rail. It’s too expensive.”

NEXT MEETING

Hal stated that the next scheduled meeting would be September 12th, and that a great deal remains to be done between now and then. Katy will send members input and materials.

The meeting ended at 6:48 p.m.