

**Meeting:** Columbia River Crossing Task Force  
**Meeting Date:** March 22, 2006  
**Location:** WSDOT SW Region Headquarters,  
11018 NE 51<sup>st</sup> Circle, Vancouver, WA

**Members Present:**

Sam Adams, City of Portland  
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)  
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  
Alan Lehto for Fred Hansen,  
TriMet  
Henry Hewitt,  
Stoel Rives (Task Force Co-chair)  
Monica Isbell, Portland Business Alliance

Dean Lookingbill, Regional  
Transportation Council  
Ed Lynch, Vancouver National  
Historic Reserve Trust  
Dick Malin, Central Park  
Neighborhood Association  
Steve Petersen, Portland  
Business Alliance  
Bob Russel, Oregon Trucking Association  
Steve Stuart, Clark County  
Jeri Sundvall-Williams, Environmental  
Justice Action Group  
Walter Valenta, Bridgeton Neighborhood  
Association  
Scot Walstra, Greater Vancouver Chamber  
of Commerce  
Tom Zelenka, Oregon Freight Advisory  
Committee  
Susie Lahsene for Bill Wyatt, Port of  
Portland

**Task Force Members Absent:**

Dr. Wayne Branch, Clark College  
Charles Becker, City of Gresham  
Rich Brown, Bank of America  
Elliott Eki, Oregon/Idaho AAA  
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground

Janet Ray, Washington AAA  
Art Schaff, Oak Harbor Freight  
Karen Schmidt, WFMSIB  
Jonathon Schlueter

**Team Members Present:**

Doug Ficco  
 Rob DeGraff  
 Kris Strickler  
 Jay Lyman  
 Barbara Hart

Gregg Snyder  
 David Parisi  
 Mike Baker  
 Linda Mullen  
 Anne Presentin

**I. Meeting Minutes**

The Task Force approved the February 1 meeting minutes. Language was added to read “Based on previous studies the costing of moving the rail bridge is about \$42 million. If moving the rail bridge is determined to be necessary to provide for marine safety for an alternative, it will be included in the description of that alternative.”

**Action:** Changes proposed were approved.

**II. Opening Remarks**

Chairman Hal Dengerink introduced Barbara Hart as the new facilitator for the Task Force and noted that Katy Brooks would still be involved, but as a representative of the Port of Vancouver.

Chairman Dengerink updated the Task Force about changes made to the Evaluation Framework by the Project Sponsors Council and InterCEP. He explained that the points were minor, that these groups have some institutional or regulatory interests in the project. He and Co-Chair Hewitt had discussed the items and felt they were acceptable changes.

**Action:** Consensus to accept the changes

**III. Arch Miller, Regional Transportation Council**

Chairman Dengerink then introduced Arch Miller, of the Regional Transportation Council. Mr. Miller commented that the I-5 bridge needs to be fixed, and that the decision to do so was made by the I-5 Partnership in 2002. He then updated the Task Force with information relating to a new north-south corridor study process that RTC will be taking on. It may provide an opportunity or avenue to discuss a third crossing between Vancouver and Portland, in a longer-term process.

Rex Burkholder commented that he supports that effort and would like coordination with Metro at the appropriate time.

**Action:** No action necessary

Jill Fuglister asked why the public comment section was moved to the end of the agenda. It was noted that the group had agreed to have public comment at the beginning of the agenda when it was a decision-making meeting. This meeting was informational so the comment period was moved.

**Action:** No action necessary

#### **IV. Step A Component Screening**

Jay Lyman introduced the task force to the component screening background information that had been mailed to members the week prior. The Step A screening process was meant to identify components that have fatal flaws, and was applied only to Transit and River Crossing components – the other components will be considered later in the process.

The primary criteria were the six pass/fail questions based upon the problem definition, whereby any component that didn't meet the criteria would be recommended to fail and not advance in the process. The six questions are below and apply specifically to the Bridge Influence Area.

- Does the component:
  - Increase vehicular capacity or decrease vehicular demand?
  - Improve transit performance?
  - Improve freight mobility?
  - Improve safety and decrease vulnerability to incidents?
  - Improve bicycle and pedestrian mobility?
  - Reduce seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River Crossing?

Each of the six criteria applied to the River Crossing component and the first two applied to the transit component.

Mr. Lyman noted that the context for answering the pass/fail questions related to travel demand and market analysis; vehicular, aviation and navigation safety; design constraints and seismic considerations. He requested that Task Force members hold their questions until the end because of the quantity of material to get through in the meeting.

David Parisi gave an overview of traffic and travel information in the Bridge Influence Area that included volume information, where people are entering and exiting the area, current and 2020 projected hours of congestion.

Gregg Snyder reviewed transit information including existing service, existing and 2020 projected transit travel times and future travel markets. Most trips will originate in Downtown Portland, North Portland, Rivergate, Delta Park and Hayden Island.

David Parisi reviewed freight movement, including current and projected tonnage by mode, and how mid-day congestion will impact freight travel in the future.

Kris Strickler 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 Parisi gave an overview of vehicular safety issues in the Bridge Influence Area, 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 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.

The Task Force took a break for dinner and reconvened for the Screening Report Results.

## **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	Advance
TR-2 – Express Bus in Managed Lanes	Advance
TR-3 – Bus Rapid Transit Lite	Advance
TR-4 – Bus Rapid Transit Full	Advance

TR-5 – Light Rail Transit

Advance

TR-6 – Streetcar

Advance

TR-7 - High Speed Rail

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 and 2
- 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.

Note: Prior studies show that commuter rail can't be operated on the existing, congested freight rail trackage.

#### TR 12 – Heavy 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.

Note: Heavy rail transit service is appropriate for the world's largest and most congested cities where population density and ridership demand exceeds light rail and bus capacity.

#### TR-13 – Personal Rapid Transit

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 and 2
- Q1 – As a theoretical concept, a PRT system has never been built for general public transit service and therefore can't reduce vehicular demand
- Q2 – Does not improve transit performance and can't be feasibly integrated into existing service structures

#### TR-14 – People Mover/Automated Guideway 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.

Note: People movers are rare because they consist of driver-less trains operating in either underground tunnels or elevated railways.

#### River Crossing Components

There were 23 considered.

RC-1 – Replacement Bridge/Downstream/Low-level/Movable

Advance

RC-2 – Replacement Bridge/Upstream/Low-level/Moveable

Advance

RC-3 - Replacement Bridge/Downstream/Mid-level

Advance

RC-4 – Replacement Bridge/Upstream/Mid-level

Advance

RC-5 – Replacement Bridge/Downstream/High-level

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Question 4
- Q4 – Would result in unacceptable encroachment into Pearson Airpark airspace

RC-6 – Replacement Bridge/Upstream/High-level

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Question 4

- Q4 – Would result in unacceptable encroachment into Pearson Airpark airspace

RC-7 – Supplemental Bridge/Downstream/Low-level/Movable Advance

RC-8 – Supplemental Bridge/Upstream/Low-level/Movable Advance

RC-9 – Supplemental/Downstream/Mid-level Advance

RC-10 – Supplemental/Upstream/Mid-level Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Question 4
- Q4 – Would result in unacceptable encroachment into Pearson Airpark airspace  
Note: Bridge high point located far enough north to align with north channel of Columbia River. Creates the airspace encroachment.

RC-11 – Supplemental/Downstream/High-level Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Question 4
- Q4 – Would result in unacceptable encroachment into Pearson Airpark airspace

RC-12 – Supplemental/Upstream/High-level Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Question 4
- Q4 – Would result in unacceptable encroachment into Pearson Airpark airspace

RC-13 – Tunnel to Supplement Existing Bridges Advance

RC-14 – New Corridor Crossing Near BNSF Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 2, 4, 5 and 6
- Q2 – Does not provide service to population centers on Hayden Island. Out of direction travel times for trips between Salmon Creek and downtown Portland. Does not improve transit performance within the Bridge Influence Area.
- Q4 – Maintains known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions. Future I-5 safety would be expected to worsen as demand increases.
- Q5 – Does not improve or provide new multi-use pathway across Columbia River in the I-5 corridor or improve I-5 related bicycle/pedestrian connections.
- Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing.

RC-15 – New Corridor Crossing, plus widen existing I-5 bridges Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 2, 4, 5 and 6
- Note: Not feasible to add new travel lanes between existing I-5 bridges. Without the I-5 improvement, it performs similar to RC -14.
- Q2 – Does not improve transit performance within the Bridge Influence Area.

- Q4 – Maintains, and may exacerbate, known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions. Future I-5 safety would be expected to worsen as demand increases.
- Q5 – Does not improve or provide new multi-use pathway across Columbia River in the I-5 corridor or improve I-5 related bicycle/pedestrian connections.
- Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing.

#### RC-16 – New Western Highway (I-605)

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 through 6
- Q1 and 3 – Does not significantly increase vehicular capacity or reduce demand for commuter and truck freight travel along I-5.
  - Q2 – Does not improve transit performance within the Bridge Influence Area due to:
    - Not directly serving transit markets in North Portland,
    - Long, out of direction travel times for trips between Salmon Creek and downtown Portland,
    - Little future transit demand for travel between Clark County and Washington County.
  - Q4 – Maintains known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions. Future I-5 safety would be expected to worsen as demand increases.
  - Q5 – Does not improve or provide new multi-use pathway across Columbia River in the I-5 corridor or improve I-5 related bicycle/pedestrian connections.
  - Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing.

#### RC-17 New Eastern Columbia River Crossing

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 through 6
- Q1 and 3 – Does not significantly increase vehicular capacity or reduce demand for commuter and truck freight travel along I-5.
- Q2 – Does not provide service to Hayden Island or Delta Park. Long, out of direction travel times for trips between Salmon Creek and downtown Portland. Does not improve transit performance within the Bridge Influence Area.
- Q4 – Maintains known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions. Future I-5 safety would be expected to worsen as demand increases.
- Q5 – Does not improve or provide new multi-use pathway across Columbia River in the I-5 corridor or improve I-5 related bicycle/pedestrian connections.
- Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing.

#### RC-18 – I-205 Improvements

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 through 6
- Q1 and 3 – Does not significantly increase vehicular capacity or reduce travel demand for commuter and truck freight along I-5.
- Q2 – Does not improve transit service to identified I-5 transit markets.
- Q4 – Maintains known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions. Future I-5 safety would be expected to worsen as demand increases.
- Q5 – Does not improve or provide new multi-use pathway across Columbia River in the I-5 corridor or improve I-5 related bicycle/pedestrian connections.
- Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing.

RC-19 – Arterial Crossing to Supplement I-5

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1, 3, 4, and 6
- Q1 and 3 – Does not significantly increase vehicular capacity or reduce demand for commuter and truck freight travel along I-5.
- Q4 – Does not address known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions. Future I-5 safety would be expected to worsen as demand increases.
- Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing.

RC-20 – Replacement Tunnel

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1, 2, 3, and 5
- Q1 and 3 – Does not serve I-5 commuter and truck freight trips within the Bridge Influence Area.
- Q2 – Does not improve transit performance within the BIA because it does not provide service to key transit markets in downtown Vancouver, Hayden Island, and North Portland.
- Q5 – Does not improve or provide new multi-use pathway across Columbia River in the I-5 corridor or improve I-5 related bicycle/pedestrian connections.

RC-21 – 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Crossing

Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1 through 6
- Q1 and 3 – Does not significantly increase vehicular capacity or reduce demand for commuter and truck freight travel along I-5.
- Q2 – Does not provide service to Hayden Island or Delta Park. Out of direction travel times for trips between Salmon Creek and downtown Portland. Does not improve transit performance within the Bridge Influence Area.

- Q4 – Does not address known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions. Future I-5 safety would be expected to worsen as demand increases.
- Q5 – Does not improve or provide new multi-use pathway across Columbia River in the I-5 corridor or improve I-5 related bicycle/pedestrian connections.
- Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing

RC-22 – Non-Freeway Multi-Modal Columbia River Crossing      Do not advance

This alternative fails on the following questions:

- Does not satisfy Questions 1, 3, 4, and 6
- Q1 and 3 – Not feasible to elevate existing I-5 structures to eliminate bridge lifts. Does not significantly increase vehicular capacity or reduce travel demand along I-5. Results in out-of-direction travel for commuters within the Bridge Influence Area.
- Q4 – Many known I-5 non-standard design features that contribute to vehicular collisions would remain.
- Q6 – Investment in an alternative corridor does not reduce the seismic risk of the I-5 Columbia River crossing.

RC-23 – Arterial Crossing with I-5 Improvements      Advance

Mr. Lyman discussed next steps, including applying Step B screening to the Transit and River Crossing Components and reporting Step B results at the April 26 Task Force Meeting.

## VI. Question and Answer and Comments Session

Many Task Force Members had questions or comments to offer. They are summarized below.

**Tom Zalenka** – Regarding the Pass-fail criteria, shouldn't question 1 be two separate questions – one for increasing capacity and one for decreasing demand?

Mr. Lyman – The criteria reflect the problem definition as approved by the Task Force.

Mr. Zalenka – I don't think that the question was a straightforward question now that I've had more detail to look at. I want to make sure the process is transparent.

**Steve Stuart** – Commented that he didn't believe the term "Origin and Destinations" was an accurate way to portray Parisi's trip study and that the issue is entries and exits to the system.

Mr. Lyman – I agree

**Mr. Stuart** – How does the project define capacity?

Mr. Parisi – Roughly 1700 vehicles per hour

Mr. Stuart – How do you define congestion?

Mr. Parisi – It's based upon service levels and how many cars get through, how many are in the queue and when speeds go down

**Serena Cruz:** How can you measure excess demand?

Mr. Parisi: Count the cars stuck in traffic

Ms Cruz - How do you count the people who are taking the later trip?

Mr. Parisi – By watching the length of time that the delays occur

**Henry Hewitt** – What do you mean by pre/post HOV when measuring transit travel times?

Response – The travel times are meant to measure apples to apples, with the first count taken before the HOV lane was put in, and the second one after the HOV lane in Washington was taken out.

**Jeri Sundvall** – Regarding page 4 (Origin/Destination Slide) – What is the time period?

Mr. Parisi – Four hours northbound, between 2 and 6 p.m.

**Ms. Sundvall** – Regarding page 7 – How does fuel price affect volumes across bridge? Do you assume hybrids or other vehicles will increase?

Gregg Snyder – We haven't done that

Ms. Sundvall – Would sufficient transit be a solution for congestion?

Mr. Snyder – Yes

**Scot Walstra** – Does westbound Pearson traffic influence PDX airplanes?

Response – PDX airspace is considered.

**Mr. Walstra** – Does the safety data include pedestrians and bikes accidents?

Bike and pedestrian people say they don't use the I-5 bridge because it's unsafe

Mr. Parisi – It includes them if they are on the mainline.

**Rex Burkholder** – Regarding page 3.7 in the report – Shouldn't the phrasing be regarding the BIA, not I-5 corridor?

Mr. Parisi – Yes.

**Bob Byrd** – Where did top line of green box (about marine navigation) come from?

Kris Strickler: It includes a survey of all potential users.

Mr. Byrd – Would USCG consider that?

Mr. Strickler – We could likely get an exception from the USCG.

**Laura Caine** – Regarding page 3.29, booklet 3.7 – other considerations, does that consider toll issues?

Mr. Lyman – We looked at feasibility and some technologies, but toll booths are not yet in the discussion. We are looking at electronic tolling and will have more information for you regarding that at a later time.

**Ms. Cruz** – Regarding safety and your comment that more vehicles cause more collisions, did you develop a rate that would show that the traffic does in fact group?

Mr. Parisi – We only looked at how DOT reports it. The relationship is about congestion, not volume.

Ms. Cruz – In relation to reducing traffic compared to today's levels: is that real or relative numbers?

Mr. Parisi – They're relative.

Ms. Cruz – Can't you do it with training, signage, other things instead of changing designs.

Mr. Parisi – There are 8 interchanges with in within 5 miles and standard call for no more than one per mile. Because of the non-standard designs, they lead to accidents.

Ms. Cruz – What if you created a traffic safety corridor, would that do it?

Mr. Parisi – Yes, to a limited extent. You could reduce speeds and reduce collisions, but you'd create more delay.

**Jerry Grossnickle** - Regarding Figure 3.5 – 9 hours of congestion - I saw a similar study for the towboat industry, but it had different results. Were restrictions on bridge lifts included? Because if so, it extends the congestion curve more.

**Jill Fuglister** – Regarding page 4 – Next Step, part b: As part of the O/D Survey, did you collect demographic info? That might be helpful for EJ issues. We'll need that.

Mr. Parisi – This was done through license plate monitoring, but the charts with the red and green dots can give that information.

Ms. Fuglister – Does that match with census tracts?

Mr. Parisi – We can try, but I won't guarantee it right now.

Ms. Fuglister – What other urban freeways compare to I-5?

Mr. Parisi – I-5 in the Portland central city, the I-405 loop, parts of I-205 and I-84

**Bart Phillips** – regarding the 2020 Transit Market, page 12, 1<sup>st</sup> slide - Aren't those park and ride lots? What are we really measuring?

Mr. Snyder – Yes, some are park and rides, some are final destination

Mr. Phillips – Isn't this really saying that the locations of park and ride facilities is driving this?

Mr. Snyder – 2020 mode show final destination

Mr. Phillips – If you move the facilities, don't you control the demand?

Mr. Snyder – Potentially

Mr. Phillips – Northbound direction only?

Mr. Snyder – Yes, evening peak is higher than morning, but we have morning peak data also.

**Ms. Sundval** – Can we get some large print?

**Tom Zalenka** – I have 4 or 5 questions or comments, but don't need answers now

1) North/South congestion slides – Northbound and Southbound have different peak times. Northbound has more people, a longer time, which makes it more complex.

- 2) Can we compare to other communities with a high percentage of commuter traffic to learn their through-put numbers and get ideas for better overall solutions? Include Seattle, Olympia, and the Canadian border.
- 3) Freight and the forecast mode split – there’s nothing related to safety and design issues. Are we looking at rail safety? Are we backing up trains?
- 4) Transit markets, adjacent to I-5 – why isn’t Washington County included? What about East county?
- 5) I want to understand the relationships between the Task Force, the Project Sponsors Council and InterCEP.

**Steve Stuart** – Regarding the Capacity/Demand graph, can we get average traffic speeds through BIA to help to begin to understand “acceptable congestion”, i.e. how slow is slow. Also, regarding safety – page 3-25 – was there prioritization of the accident locations or most important factor?

Mr. Parisi – We didn’t look at it like that because of the presence of non-standard features and high traffic levels.

Mr. Stuart – Regarding page 3.29 how many Willamette River Bridges meet seismic standards?

Is that a must?

Mr. Lyman – There are some important distinctions: the Willamette bridges serve local traffic; the Interstate is a lifeline structure.

**Rex Burkholder** – Page 4.1.1 seems written to interpret to add lanes. RC-19 and RC 22 – If combined with TDM, they might work. We might want these things when looking at what we can afford.

Response – RC-19 and 22 are safety issues, but RC 23 includes TDM.

Mr. Burkholder – Can we be careful about language? “Improvements” may be too value laden. Can we be more specific?

**Steve Stuart** – RC numbers 5, 6, 10, 11 and 12 all have one flaw – Pearson Air Park. Will we regret this 20 years from now if we take these off the table?

Royce Pollard – Pearson will be here longer than you and I.

**Hal Dengerink** – Regarding page 5, through trips versus others – If you gave them a different way to get on, would that change?

Mr. Parisi – The 2020 scattergram about origins and destinations in 2020 shows where people are traveling to and from. We could model traffic in other corridors to see if it would.

Mr. Dengerink – What is the threshold? Is there one for congestion and one for safety?

Mr. Parisi – We know we need to improve safety and can predict from the models that collisions will go up 50% to 60% by 2020.

**Alan Lehto** – Regarding TR-6, the streetcar. TriMet doesn’t believe it is compatible with existing Max Station designs. Also, a streetcar wouldn’t be able to meet capacity demands for crossing the bridge.

**Walter Zalenka** – Is the bias for new lanes? Does this information get to the less cars philosophy? We need to keep a valid slower growth idea on the table.

Mike Baker – The model for all of these included a high level of TDM/TSM.

Mr. Lyman – This will show up in greater detail when we begin the packaging efforts.

**Dick Malin** – It’s vital to understand the impacts this will have on Vancouver. We need to consider better east-west transit

Mr. Lyman – Our goal is not to preclude new east-west transit options.

**Question** – Does recommending against the ferry preclude the water taxi idea being considered in Portland?

Answer – No

**Ms. Cruz** – Regarding TDM and TSM – RC 14, 19, and 22 with TDM might be doable.

Mr. Parisi – We don’t know of a super TDM program that could save us 15 minutes.

Mr. Lyman – Our intent for now is to isolate these “stand-alone” components and address TDM in more detail in packaging. All will have an aggressive TDM program.

**Ms. Fuglister** – Can you clarify where we are in the process?

Bob Byrd – Is there something that staff sees that we don’t? I would like to see the data that Dave is referring to so we can be convinced too.

**Brad Halverson** – RC 13 – and RC ?? Why does the short tunnel pass and the long tunnel fail?

Response – the Bridge Influence area is not served by the long tunnel. It misses SR 14, Mill Plain and Fourth Plain in Vancouver and Hayden Island in Portland.

**Jeri Sundvall** – Regarding the Task Force – are we advisory? How much weight to do have?

**Mr. Dengerink** – If we don’t support something it is likely it won’t happen.

**Rex Burkholder** – I have questions regarding the fact that Step A is not complete, yet you are moving forward with Step B and propose to bring us those results next month.

**Doug Ficco** – We are concerned about the schedule. We need to keep the Step B process moving so that work can continue. We need that information.

## **VII. Communications Report**

Linda Mullen gave a run down of project communications activities, including the Open Houses on April 12 and 13; outreach to neighborhood associations; intention to be visible in the community. The EJ effort will include a committee made up of EJ and adjacent neighborhood members who will look at outreach plans, project milestones and design issues.

**VIII. Public Comment**

**Paul Edgar** – Sees errors in the analysis, thinks mixed use transportation is essential for Clark County and he doesn't want I-205 cut out of this project.

**Mikki Blizzard** – Washington County resident would like to see a combo of small, well thought out solutions because they will likely be more useful.

**Sharon Nasset** – would like to see a Bi-state industrial corridor. She would like the team to restudy the proposal she submitted.

**Ben Wilson** – advocated for a sky train that could go high speeds and is above the roadway system.

**DRAFT**