

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING TASK FORCE MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, October 12, 2005  
TIME: 4:00 p.m.  
PLACE: WSDOT Regional Headquarters  
11018 NE 51st Circle  
Vancouver, Washington

COURT REPORTER: KAREN M. SMITH, CSR

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 I N D E X

2 TOPIC: PAGE NO.

3 September 12 Minutes Approval . . . . . 5

4 Vision and Values Statement . . . . . 6

5 Project Problem Definition . . . . . 17

6 Evaluation Criteria . . . . . 60

7 Transportation Demand Management Overview . . . 86

8 Public Comment . . . . . 88

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 HAL DENGERINK: Our agenda is fairly full  
3 today so we'll have to keep our noses to the wheel, if you  
4 will, here. I know that not everyone is here but I'd like to  
5 go around the table and have the task force members introduce  
6 themselves again. I'm Hal Dengerink, Chancellor from  
7 Washington State University in Vancouver, the co-chair for the  
8 task force.

9 BOB RUSSELL: Bob Russell, Oregon Trucking  
10 Association.

11 HAL DENGERINK: Let me make a comment here  
12 about the microphones. Number one, you do not have to turn  
13 them on or off but you do need to get close to them.  
14 Acoustically this room is not terribly good so you do need to  
15 speak into the microphones for people to be able to hear you.

16 BOB RUSSELL: Bob Russell, Oregon Trucking  
17 Association.

18 REX BURKHOLDER: Rex Burkholder, Metro  
19 Council.

20 BRAD HALVERSON: Brad Halverson, North  
21 Portland Neighborhood Representative.

22 WALTER VALENTA: Walter Valenta, northern-est  
23 Portland Neighborhood Representative.

24 JERI SUNDVALL: Jeri Sundvall, Environmental  
25 Justice Action Group, North Portland

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 JILL FUGLISTER: Jill Fuglister, Coalition for  
2 a Livable Future.

3 SERENA CRUZ: Serena Cruz, Multnomah County  
4 Commissioner.

5 FRED HANSEN: Fred Hansen, Tri-Met.

6 WALLY MEHRENS: Wally Mehrens, Columbia  
7 Pacific Building Trades Council, AFL-CIO.

8 DICK MALIN: Dick Malin, Central Park  
9 Neighborhood Association.

10 LARRY PAULSON: Larry Paulson, Port of  
11 Vancouver.

12 SCOTT WALSTRA: Scott Walstra, Northwest  
13 Natural.

14 MARK McCLOUD: Mark McCloud, Vancouver Chamber  
15 of Commerce.

16 KAREN SCHMIDT: Karen Schmidt, Washington  
17 State Freight Mobility Board.

18 BOB BYRD: Bob Byrd, Identity Clark County.

19 DEAN LOOKINGBILL: Dean Lookingbill, Regional  
20 Transportation Council.

21 LYNNE GRIFFITH: Lynne Griffith, C-Tran, and  
22 next time I will do the seating arrangements so we at least do  
23 Washington-Oregon. Split them up a little bit.

24 ERIC HOLMES: Eric Holmes, City of Battle  
25 Ground.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   ANDREW NESS: Andrew Ness, sitting in for Lora  
2 Caine for Friends of Clark County.

3                   JONATHAN SCHLUETER: John Schlueter with  
4 Westside Economic Alliance.

5                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's Westside in the  
6 Metro region.

7                   KATY BROOKS: Katy Brooks, The JD White  
8 Company.

9                   HAL DENGERINK: Not only are we split we've  
10 got Oregon people sitting on the north side of the room. I'm  
11 assuming that people who are not here yet are having trouble  
12 navigating the bridge.

13                   Okay. Our first order of business is to approve  
14 the minutes from our last meeting. You'll notice that these  
15 versions of the minutes are a shorter, friendlier version.  
16 Anybody have any questions or concerns about them?

17                   If not I'll entertain a motion to accept the  
18 minutes of our last meeting.

19                   SPEAKER: So move.

20                   SPEAKER: Second.

21                   HAL DENGERINK: Anybody else?

22                   Okay. It's been moved and seconded that we accept  
23 the minutes of our last meeting. All those in favor say aye.

24                   TASK FORCE: Aye.

25                   HAL DENGERINK: Anybody opposed?

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1           Okay. The minutes are approved.

2           Okay. The next thing we need to talk about is the  
3 Vision and Values Statement which is something that we spent a  
4 great deal of time talking about actually at the previous two  
5 meetings. Let me tell you what has happened since our last  
6 meeting.

7           At the last meeting Henry appointed a subcommittee  
8 that included himself, me, Larry Paulson and Serena Cruz to  
9 finish off the draft of the Vision and Values Statement. Took  
10 input from a number of folks and rewrote it. Okay. You have  
11 in your materials a copy of the most recent draft of the  
12 Vision and Values Statement.

13           Let me express to you a concern that I have. We've  
14 been talking about Vision and Values now -- this is our third  
15 meeting with the subcommittee meeting in the meantime, okay.  
16 With this large a group, to get consensus around a given  
17 statement is somewhat problematic.

18           We seriously need to get through this so that we  
19 can get through the Problem Definition so that we can get to  
20 what is going to be the much more difficult part, okay, as I  
21 see it, which is the Evaluation Criteria.

22           So we have a Vision and Values Statement that you  
23 all received in the materials prior to the meeting, okay, and  
24 it has not changed since that piece came out as part of the  
25 materials at that point. Okay.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   So I'd like to have a short discussion here if  
2 people have concerns about the Vision and Values Statement as  
3 it currently stands, okay, and hopefully quickly move to  
4 adopting all of this.

5                   Rex, I know you want to say something.

6                   REX BURKHOLDER: Yeah, well I actually have  
7 two things. One is a letter that's coming around. I think  
8 everyone should have a copy now around the table. There  
9 should be extra copies for the group. We had discussion of  
10 this at the Bi-State Coordination Committee and one -- there's  
11 a couple editorial kind of issues that I think Serena helped  
12 present to the -- and put in the Values and Vision Statement.

13                   There's one other piece that the committee wanted  
14 me to present, a letter basically having -- under the section  
15 of regional economy, freight mobility, was adding to that  
16 language that the goal here is to -- in terms of freight  
17 movement is to look at solutions that actually favor truck  
18 mobility over solutions that simply increase a single occupant  
19 vehicle capacity as a suggested refinement of that piece.

20                   And then the other comment from Metro is the  
21 concern about the inclusion of the value of congestion  
22 reduction, which I know we had a lot of discussion about but I  
23 think it's a key one, especially when we're talking about how  
24 our Evaluation Criteria will be -- may come up.

25                   And from our perspective is that congestion

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 reduction is probably a nondeliverable outcome, that we can do  
2 a lot of stuff to increase mobility and through-put and  
3 numbers, but to actually say we're going to make it so it's a  
4 clear road at 8:00 a.m. in the morning is not going to be  
5 possible and something that we should probably not aim for  
6 because it just is not doable and feasible.

7                   So I'm worried about leaving that congestion  
8 reduction because it could be interpreted as people thinking  
9 that we're actually going to make the road open and I don't  
10 think we can do that. I think we can make it better and  
11 provide options but not open.

12                   So those are my two comments. One from the advice  
13 statement on behalf of them and the other is one from Metro on  
14 congestion reduction.

15                   HAL DENGERINK: Anybody else?

16                   JILL FUGLISTER: I have sort of a clarifying  
17 question about the process. Because we got that flyer about  
18 the open houses that are coming up and then the survey that's  
19 online that's collecting public input on concerns and issues  
20 and yeah, priorities of the public related to this project.

21                   So I was wondering how that input feeds into the  
22 Vision and Values because it sort of seems like to me that  
23 process-wise that information should inform the final, final  
24 version of Vision and Values that we adopt. I don't know if  
25 someone can explain the process or --

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1                   HAL DENGERINK: Yeah, let me respond to that  
2 and maybe somebody from the staff wants to jump in as well.  
3 As I see it, the Vision and Values Statement is a statement  
4 from the task force itself. It's kind of, you know, what are  
5 our values, again which we are going to judge the subsequent  
6 alternatives.

7                   The Problem Definition, which is the next thing  
8 that we need to get to, is the one that's saying what's the  
9 problem that we're attempting to solve, okay, with these  
10 criteria in mind. That is where we need the kind of public  
11 input, okay, in terms of what's the problem here that we're  
12 going to be solving for all of this.

13                   And that's where we have the open houses scheduled.  
14 We're going to talk about the Problem Definition here today  
15 but then we will have open houses that are already scheduled  
16 for public input around those. Then we'll come back after  
17 that and hopefully adopt the statement about the Problem  
18 Definition at that point.

19                   Then we'll move on to find -- to identifying  
20 specific measures about how we're going to judge the various  
21 alternatives that we look at, okay. For example, if you're  
22 talking about congestion reduction, not elimination, you might  
23 talk about the hours during which the congestion is there and  
24 slowing traffic down.

25                   We're going to reduce that amount, not necessarily

1 eliminate, as one of the measures that we're going to be  
2 talking about, okay. So that's where the role of the public  
3 input is. But the Vision and Values really is, as I  
4 understand it, a statement of this committee.

5 Does anybody from the staff want to clarify that at  
6 all?

7 ROB DEGRAFF: I think you have that exactly  
8 right, Hal, from our perspective. The Vision and Values is  
9 this group's statement of Vision and Values, goals and  
10 objectives.

11 HAL Dengerink: Okay. Go ahead.

12 JERI SUNDVALL: My question was very similar.  
13 It's about the process. Many of us who sit at this table are  
14 representing community who are here because we support -- we  
15 try and support the community's visions and values. So I  
16 don't see that as something that just a task force can dictate  
17 and then take out to the community. It just doesn't -- it  
18 seems like it's out of order.

19 HAL Dengerink: The -- you're here in part  
20 because presumably you understand what your constituents'  
21 values are, what are going to be the important issues to that  
22 group, is how I'm understanding it.

23 JERI SUNDVALL: And I'm here to represent  
24 Environmental Justice. With all due respect to everyone who's  
25 worked very hard on this, I appreciate it, but Environmental

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 Justice basically states that we check things with the  
2 community. We don't make the decision and then turn around  
3 and tell the community. That's what would be considered anti  
4 environmental justice.

5 KATY BROOKS: Can I take a shot at this?

6 HAL DENGERINK: Let me make a point here.

7 Let me reemphasize. We've been talking about  
8 Vision and Values here for, you know, our last three meetings,  
9 okay, a month ago and three months prior to that. My  
10 assumption is that there's been a fair amount of opportunity  
11 in the meantime for us to check in with our various  
12 constituents about those Vision and Values and that's kind of  
13 an opportunity.

14 Katy, do you want to --

15 KATY BROOKS: I just wanted to add that we are  
16 going out to the public at the end -- towards the end of this  
17 month to talk about values, to talk about vision, to talk  
18 about what folks find to be key issues and their interests.  
19 We have a whole public outreach effort that will initiate  
20 sometime -- I think on the 22nd is the first meeting.

21 It may not look like a Vision and Values Statement  
22 but that's exactly what we're going to be doing, is going out  
23 and talking to the public in that way, so you are not solely  
24 responsible for doing that, for representing everyone.

25 JERI SUNDVALL: My question is though then why

1 are you finalizing it here at this table where the community  
2 is not?

3 SERENA CRUZ: If I could, just for a moment.  
4 I mean I think there probably is tremendous consensus for the  
5 people around this table in moving forward with the statement  
6 that we have in front of us today.

7 I think the challenge is how do we incorporate the  
8 public involvement that will take place over the course of the  
9 next month and making sure that we check in with our working  
10 group that we've set up as a specific subcommittee to this  
11 task force so that there's an opportunity for a feedback loop.

12 That's -- I don't think there's a discomfort with  
13 moving forward. I think we want to move forward but provide a  
14 loop that comes back to us so that if we hear from the public  
15 broadly that their values or a piece of the vision that we  
16 missed, that we would all agree should be incorporated, that  
17 we would then revisit the statement and amend it, but we would  
18 keep moving on in our process.

19 And the same thing would be true with giving the  
20 Environmental Justice working group a few moments at the next  
21 meeting to report out their perspective and feedback on it.  
22 They've had opportunity so hopefully there shouldn't be much  
23 disconnect between what we've done in here and what they will  
24 say.

25 But it's to work in again a process of the

1 committee we've set up out of this as well as the public  
2 process, rather than it just being we're doing this process.  
3 We're doing it but there's no reconnect back to us. Does  
4 that --

5 HAL DENGERINK: Yeah. As I pointed out  
6 before, we've got the Vision and Values, we've got the Problem  
7 Definition, and then we have that process of identifying the  
8 criteria, that is the measurable kinds of pieces there, and at  
9 that point we're going to be interpreting those broader  
10 concepts from the value and a great deal of community input is  
11 going to be sought, okay, in order to say look, how do we  
12 interpret these, you know, how are we -- as we outline our  
13 values here, okay, how are we now going to go about looking at  
14 that, what kind of measures, what kind of criteria do you  
15 think we ought to be looking at as we move forward. So  
16 there's that part of it as well.

17 That is the opportunity for the public to help us  
18 interpret these values in terms of the actual measures that go  
19 on. That part of the feedback loop is there as well, okay.

20 Henry.

21 HENRY HEWITT: I agree with Serena and I think  
22 we ought to move ahead and adopt the Vision and Values  
23 Statement here today. But, you know, if we've got it wrong  
24 and somebody comes up with a great idea, I don't think we're  
25 saying don't come back with it.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1           And if the values aren't right at any point  
2 throughout this process, I don't think we're going to say  
3 well, we're going to decide it that way because that's what we  
4 decided back in October. So I believe the public process  
5 will perhaps inform our Vision and Values and we may get good  
6 ideas from it.

7           But I don't think we ought to, you know, kind of  
8 say well, let's wait and find out. I think we ought to go  
9 forward with something and approve it and recognize that it's  
10 never a closed subject until we're done with the process.

11           While I've got the mic, I disagree with Rex. I  
12 think we ought to leave congestion reduction in. I think we  
13 will strive for congestion reduction over what it would  
14 otherwise be, and I think, although it's a subtle nuance,  
15 congestion reduction and improved mobility are different sides  
16 of the same coin.

17           I don't think people understand freight mobility  
18 the same way they will hear congestion reduction and I think  
19 we ought to strive to have better mobility through reduced  
20 congestion over what we'll have if we do nothing. So I think  
21 that his point is subtly correct but it's incomprehensible, I  
22 think, to most people.

23           JONATHAN SCHLUETER: And Mr. Chairman, I  
24 would --

25           REX BURKHOLDER: I don't know whether to thank

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 you or let's go outside.

2 JONATHAN SCHLUETER: I would echo some of the  
3 same concerns as my fellow Oregonians across the room but as  
4 you all might expect, from a different perspective. I'm  
5 concerned that the visions and values listed here imply some  
6 sense of priority and I'm concerned that freight mobility and  
7 even commuter mobility rank lower than commuter -- community  
8 livability and aesthetics.

9 I'm not real interested, frankly, in monuments to  
10 this cause and the regional landmark that's described here.  
11 I'm concerned that freight mobility and commuter mobility take  
12 a back seat, if you'll pardon the expression, to the  
13 aesthetics and even the green space preservation and parks  
14 preservation listed higher up on this list.

15 I think we need to put more emphasis on safety and  
16 on the regional economy and freight mobility and have that  
17 coming right out of the chute as the goal of this project.  
18 This is a transportation bill, it's not a community livability  
19 program.

20 HAL DINGERINK: I have never assumed that the  
21 order in which things appeared on here dictated their  
22 priority.

23 JONATHAN SCHLUETER: So that that's in the  
24 record. Thank you.

25 HAL DINGERINK: Okay. I'll be happy to put

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 that in writing. I assume other folks feel the same way.  
2 Okay. No intent do that.

3 Yep.

4 FRED HANSEN: I think one of the dangers that  
5 we have at this kind of a stage is that we allow the perfect  
6 to be the enemy of the good and as a result I think really  
7 calling on both what Serena and Henry said, I would, if you're  
8 willing, just have a motion to adopt the vision statement as  
9 written.

10 HAL DENGERINK: So moved.

11 Second?

12 SPEAKER: Second.

13 HAL DENGERINK: So it's been moved and  
14 seconded that we adopt the Vision and Values Statement as  
15 prepared, with the understanding that we're free to go back  
16 and revisit it. Okay.

17 JILL FUGLISTER: I was going to suggest a  
18 friendly amendment which would be to actually put in a very  
19 specific checkpoint in the next month or two of our meetings  
20 after the public comment closes so it's on the agenda already  
21 now to, you know, make -- have a little checkpoint on the  
22 vision -- Vision and Values based on public comment.

23 HAL DENGERINK: Sure, and a perfect place to  
24 do that is at our next meeting where we will be discussing the  
25 Problem Definition and be getting the consideration of the

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1 individual measures to do that. I don't know that that has to  
2 be in the task force piece but we can certainly put that on  
3 the agenda for our next meeting. Okay. All right.

4 Finger vote? Five finger thing? All those in  
5 favor say aye.

6 TASK FORCE: Aye.

7 HAL DENGERINK: Anybody opposed?

8 JERI SUNDVALL: I am.

9 HAL DENGERINK: Any abstentions?

10 Okay. So the motion passes. Okay. Thank you.

11 The next piece of our agenda is the Project Problem  
12 Definition. Let me point out, by the way, that on the  
13 materials at least that I -- there was not -- the web page for  
14 the Columbia Crossing Task Force, which is simply  
15 Columbiarivercrossing.org, okay, so you can access materials  
16 on there at anytime. Okay. No spaces, just  
17 Columbiarivercrossing.org. Okay. You can check on that.

18 All right. The Problem Definition, all right, is  
19 something that you've seen before. We, in essence, had a  
20 discussion about this at our very first meeting, okay, and we  
21 spent some time on it at our last meeting as well.

22 It's a document that really kind of describes what  
23 is the problem that we are attempting to solve. Okay. It's  
24 one that the staff kind of continually provides us with  
25 updates about, has some new information for us to talk about

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 again today for all of this.

2 Our intent is that in fact after this meeting we  
3 will have three open houses that are scheduled. You've got  
4 the flyer in the materials that were sent out to you. They're  
5 scheduled Saturday, October 22nd from 11:00 to 2:00 at the  
6 Jantzen Beach Super Center; Tuesday, October 25 from 4:00 to  
7 8:00 p.m. at Clark College in Vancouver; and Thursday, October  
8 27 from 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Oregon Association of  
9 Minority Enterprises in Portland, the place where we had our  
10 last meeting actually.

11 So those are opportunities for public input as we  
12 have again at the end of today's meeting and written  
13 opportunities always. Then the hope is that at our next  
14 meeting, okay, which is scheduled for the end of November,  
15 that we will be able to adopt the Problem Definition piece.

16 So at this point I'd like to introduce Rob DeGraff  
17 and Jay Lyman who are going to present the Problem Definition  
18 materials for us.

19 Rob.

20 ROB DEGRAFF: Thank you, Hal.

21 Most of what I was going to do here today was  
22 actually summarize a memo that we sent out with the  
23 information prior to this meeting that talked about the  
24 relationship between the Vision and Values, the Problem  
25 Definition, purpose and need, and the Evaluation Criteria, and

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 your robust conversation with the chairs just now has actually  
2 stolen about half of my thunder so I will abridge my comments  
3 so that we can get to Jay.

4 But just briefly, just to make sure we have this in  
5 perspective, this Problem Definition, our goal is to create a  
6 common understanding between this group, the community, our  
7 partners in developing this project, on what the  
8 transportation problems are that this project is going to  
9 address.

10 We've been gathering information over the last few  
11 years. We have had comments from you last meeting on the  
12 initial exposure to this concept, and we will be taking this  
13 concept out to the general public as Hal just told you, at  
14 three public meetings starting a week from this Saturday, and  
15 giving the public the opportunity to talk to us about what  
16 they see the problems in the corridor being.

17 The team will then take that information that we  
18 both hear from you today and that we hear from the public at  
19 these public meetings and endeavor to fine tune, if you will,  
20 the Problem Definition and bring it back to you at your  
21 November meeting, and at that time we hope that, as Hal said,  
22 you will look at it, agree that we've got the problem defined,  
23 and make a recommendation that we can then take to the Project  
24 Sponsors Council at a meeting that they'll have in December.

25 The purpose and need which some of you have

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 probably heard about, it's been talked about, it's actually  
2 kind of a term of art in a NEPA process. It's a technical  
3 document that will translate the Problem Definition into  
4 language that's acceptable to the Federal Highway  
5 Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, our two  
6 federal co-leads for inclusion in the environmental document.

7 We won't be bringing the purpose and need to you  
8 for your review but it will -- it will, frankly, track the  
9 Problem Definition precisely.

10 And then the Evaluation Criteria, you will hear  
11 more about those later in the meeting today, but the  
12 evaluation framework, the goal of that is to establish  
13 criteria for measuring the alternatives that we will be  
14 developing over the next six months or so and to provide a  
15 logical process for us for narrowing those alternatives so  
16 that the voluminous ideas, frankly, that we're expecting to  
17 get from the public as we reach out to them so that we can  
18 figure out which of those suggestions have the most efficacy.

19 And as I say, you're going to hear quite a bit more  
20 about that later in this meeting. The project team, again  
21 after we have gone out and for public feedback on the  
22 Evaluation Criteria, we will bring that information back to  
23 you. Again we will fine tune it with your input and the  
24 public's input, and again the hope is to take Evaluation  
25 Criteria to the Project Sponsors Council in December.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1           So with that as sort of a foundation, I don't know  
2 if anybody wants to ask any questions of me on that stuff. If  
3 not I will turn the floor over to Jay Lyman and he will start  
4 talking to you in-depth about the Problem Definition.

5                   JAY LYMAN: Thanks, Rob.

6           As you guys recall, the last time we just had  
7 enough time to introduce the Problem Definition to you at the  
8 September meeting and the intent there was to start the  
9 dialogue. Since that time we have responded to your comments  
10 in a revised draft. There's been ongoing technical work, as  
11 Hal mentioned, and there continues to be ongoing work as we  
12 look to try to polish this toward a conclusion at the end of  
13 November.

14           I'd like to point out that we already know, for  
15 example, that the document we sent out to you on -- in the  
16 middle of last week has some changes that we will incorporate.  
17 I won't go into detail but, for example, on page two under the  
18 travel markets section there are some minor changes that we  
19 need to make as we move forward, so rather than take the time  
20 with the group I'll just say don't worry too much about that  
21 section now because we're going to be updating it.

22           The other one is when we get to the discussion of  
23 the seventh problem statement I will show some edits that were  
24 suggested at this meeting last time but not incorporated  
25 because it was an oversight so we wanted to catch them.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 You'll see them on the screen in edit mode and then you guys  
2 can act on them as you like.

3 All of you should have in your packets this problem  
4 -- draft Problem Definition, and again I'd like to remind you  
5 what we said last time is that the intent ultimately is that  
6 the definition of the problem is shown in a two column format.  
7 The bold text on the left is the problem statements that we  
8 want to work on and make sure they accurately reflect the  
9 views of the committee.

10 The stuff on the right that's labeled  
11 Details/Background is just that, it's explanatory information  
12 for the audience, for the readers to understand what's meant  
13 by the bold statement. It's not intended to be the text that  
14 you ultimately make recommendations on, but if you want to  
15 talk about something you think needs to go into that  
16 explanatory text, that would be fine, of course, as well.

17 So our goal today, since last time David Parisi  
18 spent a bit of time presenting this to you and doing the  
19 background on the nature of it, our goal today is for you  
20 folks to have a chance to talk about each of the problem  
21 statements as a group and we'll be taking notes as the  
22 conversation goes and we'll try to get through in the time  
23 that we have allotted to get through all seven problem  
24 statements.

25 The first is dealing with demand exceeding capacity

1 in the I-5 corridor and just bear with me, I'm going to read  
2 it, and then I'm just going to ask you folks whether that  
3 accurately reflects your understanding of this particular part  
4 of the problem.

5 "Travel demand exceeds capacity in  
6 the I-5 bridge influence area, causing  
7 heavy congestion and delay during peak  
8 travel periods for automobile, transit  
9 and freight traffic. This limits  
10 mobility within the region and impedes  
11 access to major activity centers."

12 One other explanatory note that I forgot to mention  
13 that I should, there are seven problem statements. The first  
14 six are all problems that are -- we recognize today. The  
15 seventh talks about the future. So all of these first six are  
16 saying this is what we think is the problem as we're  
17 experiencing today.

18 So with that we'd just like to open it up and say  
19 does -- and pose the question to the group, does this  
20 accurately reflect your understanding of this part of the  
21 problem in the corridor?

22 I got a head nod from Scott. That's a good sign.  
23 Dean.

24 DEAN LOOKINGBILL: I wanted to -- yes, I think  
25 that does in terms of the I-5 corridor. I guess I wanted to

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 suggest for discussion the notion that while this project is  
2 focused in this bridge influence area and the I-5 corridor,  
3 there's really an interaction that occurs, whatever we do in  
4 this corridor, with the I-205 corridor.

5           So I don't know if that sort of recognition comes,  
6 you know, and tails onto this Problem Definition statement or  
7 whether there's another place for it. I know on the front  
8 sheet, as you talk about the function of I-5, that might be  
9 another place because you kind of talk about both corridors  
10 individually.

11           That might be another place where you could add in  
12 to recognize the interaction of I-205 and that would be both  
13 -- currently. Obviously I think we have measured to some  
14 degree that the level of congestion in I-5 will spill over or  
15 will send some traffic to 205. Likewise, we can anticipate  
16 that whatever we were to do in the future, it's going to have  
17 some impact on 205. So I would suggest that's a piece we need  
18 to add in there.

19           JAY LYMAN: If I may, I think you're right  
20 that it probably ought to be in the introductory material  
21 describing the relationship of I-5 and I-205. The statements  
22 themselves, we are trying very hard to focus on what is the  
23 problem in the bridge influence area, recognizing that  
24 solutions in the bridge influence area will have wider effects  
25 that we need to measure and understand.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1                   But certainly to -- in describing the role of I-5  
2                   it would be very appropriate to have that in the introductory  
3                   as an issue.

4                   DEAN LOOKINGBILL: Right, and I wasn't trying  
5                   to indicate that you needed to talk about a project. I have  
6                   one other real quick one, if I could. Marine navigation.  
7                   Clearly the draw bridge itself has been something that we've  
8                   been talking about in terms of the problem and when that  
9                   bridge comes up it backs up traffic.

10                  We're talking about freight and a number of other  
11                  things, but then also if we think about the future, we've  
12                  talked about different bridge designs, one of which might be  
13                  sort of center, high span that didn't have to lift at all or  
14                  maybe not very frequent.

15                  Well again, both of these ideas are impacting  
16                  marine navigation. So again I wouldn't know exactly were we  
17                  want to do that but I think it's a part that needs to  
18                  interplay in our problems.

19                  HAL DENGERRINK: Dean, obviously it does affect  
20                  marine navigation but it's also true that marine navigation  
21                  affects the bridge influence area. So that's one of the  
22                  contributing factors to the problem that we're attempting to  
23                  solve, and given that, it would seem to me that maybe it's  
24                  there but -- Jay?

25                  JAY LYMAN: We have marine navigation I

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 thought addressed under the safety problem and it may be I'm  
2 mixing documents here but we need to have it included in there  
3 at some level as making sure the efficiency and safety of  
4 marine navigation is protected.

5 FRED HANSEN: I didn't see it.

6 JAY LYMAN: It may be missing in this document  
7 and I'll apologize, if there's six documents in my head I'm  
8 not keeping quite straight here so --

9 LARRY PAULSON: All you have to do is just  
10 pick up in the -- when you talk about the lift span in the  
11 second paragraph of the details and background, is to make  
12 clear that it is not just a traffic -- vehicle traffic that's  
13 at issue, it's also the freight traffic, the marine freight  
14 traffic.

15 JAY LYMAN: You got that, Katy?

16 KATY BROOKS: Yeah.

17 JAY LYMAN: Yes, sir.

18 BOB RUSSELL: Because of the existence of the  
19 Burlington Northern railroad bridge just to the west of the  
20 Interstate Bridge, if we're going to talk about marine we also  
21 need to talk about rail. That's part of the sort of multi  
22 modal equation that works in that area.

23 Just the generic term "freight", in my mind, to  
24 cover all the modes, that maybe someone would like to put in  
25 multi modal freight traffic or something like that to indicate

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 certainly that we're going to consider the rail as well as the  
2 marine transportation of freight.

3 JAY LYMAN: We could certainly add it again in  
4 the introductory stuff, the relationship between the two  
5 bridges and how that affects both marine traffic and rail. I  
6 think we probably do want to be clear that the intent of this  
7 project is not to solve the rail problem except to the extent  
8 that we create an issue for the rail by changes in the  
9 upstream bridges.

10 HAL DENGERINK: Jay, though isn't it true that  
11 the rail issue on the north side of the river has some impact  
12 on the bridge influence area itself, disregarding the railroad  
13 bridge downstream?

14 JAY LYMAN: Yes, that's a good distinction,  
15 Hal. The BN bridge -- the BN tracks that parallel the north  
16 shore, along the Vancouver shore, are just yards away from the  
17 shoreline and they are a -- at the minimum a significant  
18 design challenge to work around as we bring any kind of new  
19 bridge across the river. We'll have to make that sure we  
20 don't impair the rail.

21 BOB RUSSELL: Another aspect of that rail  
22 bridge is the barge traffic, particularly in the wintertime,  
23 they have to go under the center span of the Interstate  
24 Bridge, then they have to make that S turn to get under the  
25 turntable which is on the north side of the rail bridge.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   So you can certainly improve barge traffic if you  
2 deal with the railroad bridge, which will have an impact on  
3 the Interstate Bridge because you won't have to lift it. So I  
4 think it would be an omission if we did not consider that  
5 railroad bridge as part of the total freight equation.

6                   JAY LYMAN: I think again, Bob, the goal as  
7 we're looking at this is if we can figure out a way to safely  
8 address the highway and river navigation in the I-5 corridor  
9 without touching the rail bridge itself, that will be a lot  
10 less costly and complex of a solution.

11                   If, on the other hand, we decide -- conclude from  
12 our analyses that we can't do the first two things, make sure  
13 that it's safe for barge traffic and address the I-5 problem  
14 without doing something to the rail, then we're going to have  
15 to elevate that as part of the problem -- as part of the  
16 solution.

17                   BOB RUSSELL: I guess from my perspective I  
18 just didn't want it to be excluded from the mix because it is  
19 very much part of the mix.

20                   JAY LYMAN: Okay. Well, we can certainly  
21 address it in the explanation of the function of the rule.

22                   I'm stepping forward for two reasons. One, it  
23 seems like a heck of a long ways back there, and second, my  
24 head's all plugged up with a cold so I can hear you better if  
25 I actually get closer.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   Other comments about this first statement? We  
2 pretty much -- oh, I'm sorry. Walter.

3                   WALTER VALENTA: Well, it's not about the  
4 first statement but if this is the definition of the problem  
5 and these are kind of the big bullet points, there's too much  
6 congestion, transit's bad, pedestrian access is bad, safety's  
7 bad, to me another bullet point needs to be and the bridge  
8 lifts up.

9                   Like not trying to have it -- well, not trying to  
10 sluff it off as a non -- I think it's a significant problem  
11 and when you live where I live it's a significant problem and  
12 it plays into what Bob was saying because you either do the  
13 jog or you do this and to me it's just -- it should be another  
14 bullet point rather than pretend that it's handled in one of  
15 the side notes.

16                   JAY LYMAN: Okay. Thank you.

17                   Hal.

18                   HAL DENGERINK: I guess I'm a little confused  
19 about that. It seems to me the fact that the bridge goes up  
20 and down in and of itself is not a problem. The fact that it  
21 goes up and slows down traffic and creates, you know, a backup  
22 for an hour because it's up for ten minutes, that's a problem.

23                   So it is one of the causes of the problem that  
24 we're trying to solve, is how I see it. Clearly we can't  
25 ignore it. There's no question about that, because it causes

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 part of the problem.

2 WALTER VALENTA: Sure, but too many people  
3 driving on the road causes the problem too and we decided that  
4 was a bullet point, so if we just had fewer people drive then  
5 we wouldn't need to make -- you know, we're describing the  
6 problems and to me a very specific problem is that it is a  
7 lift span and one of the most fundamental things we have with  
8 this, is it going to lift or is it not going to lift.

9 It's a fundamental question we're wrestling with  
10 and I think it should be a specific problem that we are  
11 identifying.

12 JAY LYMAN: I think Hal's probably on the  
13 right track to say that the lifts are a problem because of  
14 congestion, because one of the traps we don't want to fall  
15 into, Walter, is implying a solution in our statement of the  
16 problem.

17 WALTER VALENTA: Okay. I agree with that. I  
18 agree.

19 JAY LYMAN: I think it's real clear that we  
20 don't have the fact that the lift span contributes to  
21 congestion throughout the day. That's a good point.

22 Other comments on the first statement?

23 If not, we'll move on.

24 Second one:

25 "Transit service between Vancouver and

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1           Portland is constrained by the limited  
2           capacity in the I-5 corridor and is  
3           subject to the same congestion as  
4           other vehicles, affecting transit  
5           reliability and service."

6           Comments?

7                   BRAD HALVERSON: I'd like to say thank you for  
8           reworking this because the original statement last time wasn't  
9           nearly as effective as this one is.

10                   JAY LYMAN: Thank you. That was a rough draft  
11           and there was a fair amount of work to try to get to this  
12           language so I appreciate that comment.

13                   Lynne.

14                   LYNNE GRIFFITH: I too want to thank you for  
15           correcting it and the fact that we're no longer inefficient or  
16           ineffective is helpful, and I just want to state -- and I know  
17           you're continuing to work on it.

18                   One of the things that I think would really help us  
19           if we distinguish the transit markets where you have very  
20           clear commuter needs and performance of a system, and then you  
21           have local, which when we look at the language here and also  
22           in point seven, you get into the travel time and we're kind of  
23           mixing the descriptions of a commuter service and then using  
24           the delay factors associated with a local service.

25                   So I think it would be helpful if we made some

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 decisions about bridge influence area or is it, you know,  
2 Clark County to downtown Portland, is it a.m. or p.m. peak, is  
3 it commuter or local, is it -- you know, and get some clarity  
4 there because I think we've got a mixture and it paints a  
5 picture that's not quite accurate and I think it will raise  
6 questions and challenges.

7 JAY LYMAN: I think you raise a good point.  
8 We are working on right now trying to do a better job of  
9 defining markets and by the time we come back with the next  
10 version of this there will be a better definition.

11 The second point you brought up is really a  
12 challenge because while this is a project level discussion for  
13 the bridge influence area, it's really easy to think about  
14 that on the highway side, it's much more difficult when you're  
15 thinking about transit service because most of the transit  
16 patrons crossing the river aren't stopping and starting in the  
17 BIA, they're going somewhere else, they're coming from  
18 somewhere else, so we have to figure out how to appropriately  
19 define that.

20 LYNNE GRIFFITH: You know, and it can be, you  
21 know, from downtown to downtown or from park and ride to  
22 downtown. I just think we need to kind of look at it the same  
23 way in each of the descriptions so that you've got accurate  
24 travel time considerations because that's an important point  
25 in the evaluation.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1 JAY LYMAN: Very good.

2 Any other comments?

3 All right. Let's go on to number three. I want to  
4 make sure we have -- this is where technology gets challenged  
5 here.

6 Okay. Number three deals with freight.

7 "The access of truck-hauled freight to  
8 the ports of Vancouver and Portland and  
9 to regionally significant industrial  
10 and commercial districts is impaired  
11 by congestion in the I-5 bridge  
12 influence area."

13 Yes, sir.

14 BOB RUSSELL: While I appreciate this  
15 statement very much I think it's a little bit narrow and a bit  
16 parochial. In the pages leading up to this you certainly  
17 identify that I-5 is a major freight corridor along the entire  
18 west coast, from Vancouver to Tijuana, and this seems -- this  
19 statement seems to limit that to regional and ports and that  
20 stuff.

21 I think that that needs to be expanded a bit, again  
22 in recognition that that route is key to the entire west  
23 coast, not just Portland, Vancouver or the region.

24 JAY LYMAN: It's an interstate corridor then  
25 so that's missing.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 BOB RUSSELL: Yes.

2 JAY LYMAN: Okay. Very good. So far so good.  
3 We're moving pretty fast. Any --

4 Oh, I'm sorry.

5 MONICA ISBELL: I just want to echo that. I  
6 think we need to realize that -- I think we do need to realize  
7 this -- even though we're talking about a very limited piece  
8 of land, it is a freight corridor all the way down -- up and  
9 down the coast.

10 JAY LYMAN: Okay. So the previous comment  
11 will work for you? Okay. Very good.

12 Have I missed anybody else?

13 Okay. Number four:

14 "The I-5 bridge crossing area and its  
15 approach sections experience crash rates  
16 up to 2.5 times higher than state-wide  
17 averages for comparable urban freeways  
18 in Washington and Oregon, largely due to  
19 substandard design. Incident evaluations  
20 attribute crashes to congestion, closely  
21 spaced interchanges, short weave and merge  
22 sections, vertical grade changes in the  
23 bridge span, and narrow shoulders."

24 Yes.

25 BRAD HALVERSON: Echoing Walter's concern

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 here, do we want to have bridge lifts in this particular  
2 section? Because the congestion that comes from a bridge lift  
3 is a definite potential for accidents.

4 JAY LYMAN: I think we have to think about  
5 that one because what we can do with this -- we have the  
6 accident histories for both DOTs that tie the history -- that  
7 tie the accident records back to probable causes and we can  
8 identify congestion as one of the factors.

9 To put bridge lifts specifically in here, other  
10 than as it relates to the congestion, might not be supportable  
11 on the face of the evidence we've got. But I take your point  
12 that if you're all backed up that you're more likely to have  
13 rear-enders and whatnot because of the bridge lifts.

14 BRAD HALVERSON: Especially if the congestion  
15 is at an off peak hour, which is when the bridge lifts are.

16 JAY LYMAN: True. Why don't we take that  
17 under advisement and see if we can't put something in there.

18 Yes, sir. Jerry.

19 JERRY GROSSNICKLE: I'm sorry to have missed  
20 so much of the meeting. Just got here. But I realize that  
21 we're talking about congestion problems involving the lifts.  
22 We're also talking about marine traffic and this happens to be  
23 the most dangerous spot on the whole river for any man-made  
24 structures, and so I think that somehow we need to consider  
25 the marine traffic when we're talking about bridge lifts.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   JAY LYMAN: Can you help us find an accident  
2 history for the marine?

3                   JERRY GROSSNICKLE: We have an accident  
4 history, yeah.

5                   JAY LYMAN: Okay. I think we could get that  
6 in here under this one because that would be very relevant.  
7 Good.

8                   HAL DENGERINK: Can I ask a question? The  
9 statement here, you know, attributes the accidents to certain  
10 kinds of things which implies that it's -- weave and merge  
11 sections, vertical grade changes and so forth ought to be  
12 addressed in the ultimate design.

13                   By doing that are you starting to approach the  
14 solution as part of the problem statement here? I'm going  
15 back to the same issue about the lift span, if you will.

16                   JAY LYMAN: I don't think so. What we're  
17 doing is stating the factual analysis of the accident  
18 histories and what they have been attributed to, so I don't  
19 think we're on shaky ground there, Hal, but it's an  
20 interesting question.

21                   HAL DENGERINK: Yeah. Okay.

22                   JAY LYMAN: Sam? Eric. I'm sorry.

23                   ERIC HOLMES: That's actually happened to me a  
24 few times before. Going to give him a bad reputation. Just a  
25 question.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   JAY LYMAN: I just assumed you're from Oregon  
2 if you're --

3                   ERIC HOLMES: Trying to mix it up here. The  
4 crash rates being two-and-a-half times higher than comparable  
5 freeways in Washington and Oregon, given some of the earlier  
6 discussion about this being kind of a north U.S. border to  
7 south U.S. border corridor, is there data that illustrates the  
8 problem in a larger context, thinking in the long-term that  
9 will be going to a federal level for funding?

10                   Is there data that supports that being more than  
11 just an Oregon and Washington problem but maybe a national  
12 scale or certainly a west coast scale?

13                   JAY LYMAN: Can we take that under advisement  
14 and get back to you?

15                   ERIC HOLMES: Sure.

16                   JAY LYMAN: Okay. Monica, you were next.

17                   MONICA ISBELL: Just a question. We talk  
18 about the narrow shoulders. What about the narrow lanes? Is  
19 there data that supports that crashes are caused because, you  
20 know, we've got -- are the lanes more narrow than normal, I  
21 guess is my question?

22                   JAY LYMAN: I'm going to ask -- we can either  
23 do two things. We've got Dave Parisi back in the back. I'm  
24 going to invite him to come up and help with this one.

25                   Do we have any accident history that -- David, to

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 give you a chance to think on your feet while you're walking  
2 up here, is there anything in the accident histories that  
3 leads us to point to the narrow lanes as a cause of the  
4 accidents?

5                   DAVID PARISI: We haven't found anything  
6 regarding narrow lanes yet although we have recorded over  
7 4,000 accidents that we're looking at more or less in detail  
8 to try to understand how they attribute to each of these  
9 factors. So we'll come back to you with more information on  
10 that probably -- maybe next time.

11                   JAY LYMAN: That's a great question.

12                   DICK MALIN: I think the time is going to come  
13 to where we're going to have to have some definition of design  
14 standards since we're referencing some design standards here.  
15 For example, are we talking about influence area design  
16 standards that an engineer will accept or are we talking about  
17 interstate design standards that would leave us with the only  
18 place in the nation that has a lift yet?

19                   And by the same token, the question here of widths,  
20 the seismic, I'm getting feedback from two different sources.  
21 One says seismic inadequacy here, the other says it's  
22 seismically adequate, some of the substructure we're working  
23 with.

24                   So I'm starting to feel uncomfortable with not  
25 knowing what level of excellence or design standards we're

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 looking for.

2 JAY LYMAN: Okay. As we start to develop  
3 alternatives the freeway ramps and lanes will be designed to  
4 essentially national standards. Both Washington DOT and  
5 Oregon DOT have similar freeway standards that are basically  
6 the national standards with small refinements.

7 So it won't be anything less than what you would  
8 expect from a brand new freeway, at least to start with, and  
9 so we'll be working from that perspective.

10 As far as the seismic issues, we are right now  
11 working from the conclusions of one of the elements of the  
12 partnership study which was done in 2001-2002, and the bridge  
13 engineers at that point did look at the bridges and said that  
14 there are two things that affected the seismic reliability of  
15 the bridges in case of an earthquake.

16 The superstructure is -- the elements above, the  
17 piers that go into the water, that at least conceptually could  
18 be retrofitted to be up to standard. It would be very  
19 expensive. What they said couldn't be feasibly retrofitted  
20 was the substructure, the parts that go down into the water.

21 So in essence the conclusion from that study was  
22 you couldn't take the existing bridges and bring them up to  
23 full current standards for seismic reliability. Did that get  
24 to your question, Dick?

25 And we are going to be reviewing that and making

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 sure that dots all the T's and crosses all -- dots all the I's  
2 and crosses all the T's. It's the head cold, I think. And  
3 we'll be coming back with a lot more information about the  
4 reliability and cost of keeping the existing bridges going.

5 Yes, ma'am. Karen.

6 KAREN SCHMIDT: My question is in that same  
7 vein. Using the term "substandard" sounds like Washington and  
8 Oregon DOTs designed a substandard bridge and I think what  
9 we're trying to say is that the -- it's an antiquated design,  
10 it is not up to current standards, but this sounds like they  
11 deliberately did something below the standard.

12 JAY LYMAN: It may be better to say they do  
13 not meet current standards because certainly when they built  
14 them it was the best judgment at the time. Good call.

15 BOB RUSSELL: Just a point of clarification.  
16 When I look at this statement that says crash rates are  
17 two-and-a-half times for comparable freeways, the accident  
18 statistics that I've seen for I-5, for example, or on the  
19 Fremont bridge or the junction of I-84 and those areas are  
20 very, very high as well. Is that statement accurate?

21 JAY LYMAN: It's based on comparing the rates  
22 particularly at the BIA compared to the state-wide averages  
23 compared for Washington and Oregon. So there certainly will  
24 be other places where the accident rates are higher than  
25 average but I believe that's correct, David, right?

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1                   DAVID PARISI: Right, it's like looking at  
2 I-84 in Oregon or I-5, I-405 up in the Puget Sound area, based  
3 on those kinds of comparisons.

4                   JAY LYMAN: Did that answer your question,  
5 Bob?

6                   BOB RUSSELL: I think I understand how that  
7 was calculated, yeah.

8                   JAY LYMAN: Wally. I'm sorry, you're behind  
9 me.

10                  WALLY MEHRENS: That's okay. In your response  
11 to David's question out there and the questions earlier, I'm  
12 agreeing with I think everybody here and I'm concerned about  
13 words -- I've got a concern about wordsmithing, the due to  
14 substandard design. If we've got a substandard design there  
15 and we're trying to get up to it and get away from it and we  
16 leave the substandard design alone, I don't think anybody's  
17 going to like that.

18                  JAY LYMAN: Yeah, I think what the comment was  
19 is that we probably need to say that it doesn't meet current  
20 design. Doesn't mean that we necessarily continue to live  
21 with it, but I take Karen's point, that we don't want to say  
22 that the folks that did it the first time did it wrong. They  
23 did it to the level that was appropriate at the time.

24                  Any other comments on this one? All right.

25                  JERI SUNDVALL: Jay?

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 JAY LYMAN: Yes, ma'am.

2 JERI SUNDVALL: I just had a question. Did  
3 you say -- where did I put my note -- that it's the only lift  
4 bridge on the entire interstate system in the nation?

5 DICK MALIN: I think that's correct.

6 JERI SUNDVALL: Okay. That's all.

7 JAY LYMAN: You know, we've talked around that  
8 quite a bit. Nobody can really answer that for sure but what  
9 we can say for sure, it's one of the only -- it's one of a  
10 very, very, very few lift spans on the interstates. That's  
11 probably the safe place to land.

12 Okay. Number five:

13 "Bicycle and pedestrian facilities  
14 for crossing the Columbia River in the  
15 I-5 bridge influence area are not  
16 designed to promote non-motorized access  
17 and connectivity across the river."

18 Which is a goal for, you know, both sides of the  
19 river.

20 Any comments on this one? Not very controversial.

21 HENRY HEWITT: I can't imagine Rex doesn't  
22 want to add something.

23 REX BURKHOLDER: I was going to use  
24 Anglo-Saxon to describe them but I won't.

25 JAY LYMAN: Are we okay with this one?

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 MONICA ISBELL: Jay?

2 JAY LYMAN: I'm sorry. Monica.

3 MONICA ISBELL: In the description you talk  
4 again about substandard and maybe we need to be consistent  
5 about based on national -- current national standards or  
6 something.

7 JAY LYMAN: Good catch. Thank you.

8 Any other comments on this one?

9 All right. You guys are a pretty efficient group  
10 today.

11 There's our bike pictures.

12 Okay. Number six. We talked about this briefly.

13 "The I-5 bridges across the Columbia

14 River do not meet current seismic

15 standards, leaving them vulnerable to

16 failure in an earthquake."

17 Can't argue with that, I guess.

18 Okay. And nice historic pictures of when the first  
19 one was built. Just for fun, that first picture is actually a  
20 rendering of the day that the new bridge opened and the last  
21 day that the ferry service went between Portland and  
22 Vancouver.

23 JONATHAN SCHLUETER: Do we know if any of the  
24 bridges in the Portland Metro region meet seismic standards  
25 currently?

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   JAY LYMAN: I would leave that to the DOTs to  
2 answer but I do know, for example, there has been investment  
3 in the Marquam Bridge to bring it up to standard.  
4 Specifically I don't know. Maybe that's one we need to get  
5 back to you, Jonathan, on.

6                   JONATHAN SCHLUETER: I don't know if I'd want  
7 to be there when it came.

8                   JAY LYMAN: All right. This is the one that I  
9 mentioned, that there was a recommendation from this group  
10 last time that we -- it was an oversight that we didn't  
11 include so here's what I've done. I've shown it in strike out  
12 and edit mode.

13                   "As the Portland/Vancouver region  
14 grows, mobility and accessibility for  
15 automobile, vehicular freight, and  
16 transit will decline unless,"

17 and here's the change:

18                   "The disparity between demand and capacity  
19 in the I-5 influence area is addressed.  
20 The increasing disparity between demand  
21 and capacity will lead to longer delays,  
22 increased accident rates, and diminished  
23 quality of life and economic opportunity."

24                   SERENA CRUZ: Well done.

25                   JAY LYMAN: I didn't want to get in trouble.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   Bob.

2                   BOB RUSSELL: You know, even though I  
3 represent trucks, which are vehicular freight, I think that  
4 maybe we ought to make this a little broader in terms of  
5 freight because it could very well affect marine freight, rail  
6 freight. I mean it depends on what we do, what we don't do,  
7 what impacts out of there most. So recognizing that all of  
8 our modes are important. To take care of freight, maybe we  
9 just strike the word vehicular.

10                  JAY LYMAN: Well, that could do it. I think  
11 we wanted to make sure we didn't miss the idea that we're  
12 talking about trucks across the bridge but it is beyond that.

13                  Any other comments? Jonathan.

14                  JONATHAN SCHLUETER: Question about the  
15 population trends of the Portland Metro region. I suggest  
16 that these may be understated. I think that new evidence  
17 suggests that the population of our region has been growing,  
18 it will continue to grow by a higher number than what may be  
19 represented here and I question whether or not the projections  
20 and demand --assumptions for this bridge affected area are  
21 current and accurate to the new knowledge that we think we  
22 have. Perhaps Rex Burkholder could address some of that.

23                  REX BURKHOLDER: I don't remember the number  
24 because I don't know the combined totals that we're looking  
25 at. I do know that we're looking at 1.1 million more people

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 on the Oregon side of the river in the next 20 years or less.  
2 But I think we can find that out because we've done  
3 projections.

4 And also this Regional Transportation Commission --  
5 Council on this side of the river has also done some  
6 projections and the issue, it's kind of interesting, is that  
7 our projections on population agree but our projections on  
8 jobs don't agree.

9 So I thought what I would like to see adding into  
10 this description of an issue is decisions -- are land use  
11 decisions made by the governments on both sides of the river  
12 that will affect where people live and where their jobs are  
13 located and that will have a big impact, especially on how  
14 many people need to cross the river.

15 And, you know, the key to that is if there's a lot  
16 of job growth on the north side of the river relative to  
17 population growth, you will have less travel required, versus  
18 if it's continuing historical transfer, the job growth is  
19 south of the river and the population is on the north side of  
20 the river, you will have, you know, a worse problem.

21 I don't know how to put that in there but I think  
22 those land use decisions, and I think they need to go in the  
23 Evaluation Criteria too, will have big impacts on the future  
24 demand on this facility and the future size of it.

25 JONATHAN SCHLUETER: But Mr. Chairman, if I

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 may follow, we're talking about an I-5 trade corridor from  
2 Canada to Mexico, we aren't talking just about the Portland  
3 Metro region. Sure, we can be concerned about our own  
4 population growth and projections but we also have to look at  
5 the population growth trends for the whole west coast and how  
6 much traffic that's going to impose on this area.

7 My question was the numbers that we have for our  
8 own neighborhood, for our own piece of the equation, have been  
9 shown to be wrong and have been shown to be low and we need to  
10 adjust that accordingly. If those same trends hold true for  
11 the rest of the west coast, we got an issue.

12 JAY LYMAN: We are working right now with  
13 information from the last study which forecast out to the year  
14 2020. We're building the process right now to look to the  
15 year 2030 which will include the adopted population and  
16 employment forecasts for both sides of the river.

17 So we are trying to do the very best we can to get  
18 that future look, and ultimately what we will base the  
19 analysis alternatives on will be those -- will be the travel  
20 demand that results from those adopted population and  
21 employment forecasts for both sides of the river.

22 Henry.

23 HENRY HEWITT: I really like that last point.  
24 You know, I'm not sure it goes in here but putting aside the  
25 point that there is all of this traffic in the larger

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 corridor, the shorter corridor is driven by where jobs are,  
2 warehousing is, where the difference in land use and land  
3 availability and the tax structures in both regions. And I'm  
4 not sure, it's probably way beyond the scope of our issues,  
5 but in order to effect the demand over time those issues also  
6 ought to be addressed.

7 JAY LYMAN: So if I can come back to Rex, what  
8 I thought I heard you suggest was that in the explanatory text  
9 we go into further background but not necessarily try to  
10 change this overview statement?

11 REX BURKHOLDER: No.

12 JAY LYMAN: No. You were looking to change  
13 the overview statement as well?

14 REX BURKHOLDER: No, no, in the explanatory I  
15 think we just need to reference the effect of distribution of  
16 jobs and housing, lands, and so land use decisions by  
17 governments on both sides of the river and their impact. I  
18 think that's an explanatory statement.

19 JAY LYMAN: All right. Thank you.

20 Any other comments? Bob.

21 BOB BYRD: I just wanted to address that whole  
22 question of accurate growth. I think what Jonathan was  
23 probably getting at was it seems like the adopted growth rates  
24 consistently have not reflected reality, and are you  
25 addressing that or are you just accepting the adopted growth



1 rates?

2 JAY LYMAN: That's a very hard challenge in  
3 this kind of process because on multiple levels, for example,  
4 this is a federal process and we have to demonstrate that  
5 we're planning -- we're building a project around an adopted  
6 growth forecast so that's a challenge.

7 What we can do in that process is do some  
8 sensitivity analysis to say what if we're off by 20 percent,  
9 what does that do to the kind of project we might want. But  
10 that has to be sort of part of it on the side. We can't head  
11 on and say we don't believe the forecasts. So it is a  
12 sensitive issue and I appreciate where you're coming from on  
13 that.

14 Jill.

15 JILL FUGLISTER: It seems like somewhere  
16 embedded in here is kind of the idea that, you know, there's  
17 these different travel markets and they're going to change in  
18 different ways as growth occurs and so it feels like one of  
19 the problems has to be about or is about the type of facility  
20 and improvements that are made being connected to those  
21 separate markets that are going to change over time. I don't  
22 know if I'm articulating that well. You're looking confused.

23 JAY LYMAN: It's the head cold. Forgive me.

24 JILL FUGLISTER: No, I'm sure it's me too but  
25 I just -- it feels like we have to make sure that there's --

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 like maybe there's a problem right now with the kind of  
2 facility you have, the kind of markets that are trying to be  
3 served with the facility and that, you know, as we look  
4 forward and how we grow. Somehow I don't know really what I'm  
5 suggesting but in the details and background it seems like  
6 that there might be a piece in there about how to better  
7 integrate the types of improvements and facilities that are  
8 needed with the projected specifics around the markets, not  
9 just broadly growth.

10 JAY LYMAN: We can try to add something to  
11 target specific --

12 JILL FUGLISTER: That's a challenge for you.

13 JAY LYMAN: -- forecast markets. Okay. We'll  
14 give it a shot.

15 Other comments? Bob.

16 BOB RUSSELL: In the explanatory portion of  
17 the statement, we're basically talking about freight and  
18 anticipate that it's going to grow by about 50 percent between  
19 now and 2020, and you make the statement, "A substantial  
20 portion of freight will be moved by truck."

21 Oregon figures indicate that about 72 percent is  
22 now moved by truck and that will go to 74 to 76. I'm sure the  
23 figures are similar in Washington. To make the statement that  
24 a substantial amount will be moved by truck I think underplays  
25 the significance of that and I think that we should have a

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 more definitive statement in this particular sentence so that  
2 people don't have a misconception about how much truck traffic  
3 in fact there's going to be.

4 JAY LYMAN: Can you help us with that  
5 background information?

6 BOB RUSSELL: Absolutely.

7 JAY LYMAN: We can either put in percentages  
8 or describe it as a significant majority or something like  
9 that.

10 KATY BROOKS: Jay, could you paraphrase for  
11 me?

12 JAY LYMAN: The background text -- the  
13 explanatory text in this refers to a significant amount of the  
14 projected freight traffic will appear by truck but Bob's  
15 comment is that we probably have not adequately addressed the  
16 preponderance of freight that will be by truck and he will  
17 help us with some data for that.

18 KATY BROOKS: Okay.

19 JAY LYMAN: Bob -- Rex. Sorry.

20 REX BURKHOLDER: And I don't know where this  
21 goes except as a trend that is somewhat troubling and somewhat  
22 difficult to predict is the volatility of prices and supply of  
23 fuel and how that might affect peoples' decisions about how  
24 they travel. It's kind of an unknown right now but we have  
25 seen some changes in behavior already just with going up --

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 you know, not even historic highs yet.

2           So it's kind of an unknown there and it's basically  
3 I see it as do we make a smart public investment if we invest  
4 in something that becomes not viable to a lot of people  
5 because of increasing costs. And so it's an unknown but an  
6 issue I think that we see a lot more discussion about in  
7 trying to figure that one out.

8           JAY LYMAN: Yeah, that's a challenge because  
9 we're looking at the future with a whole set of assumptions  
10 about demographics and income and all of that. I think  
11 probably it's similar to the comment that I made to Bob is  
12 that we ought to be looking at sensitivity analysis.

13           What if we're off on the upside, what if we're off  
14 on the downside? Does that change our investment --

15           REX BURKHOLDER: Well, something that might be  
16 helpful, as part of the Oregon Transportation Plan Update they  
17 did some scenario planning including one that had a fuel price  
18 increase scenario. It leveled off. I can't remember the  
19 exact numbers but it did have some effect on travel patterns  
20 in the state-wide level.

21           Of course, I don't think it went across the river  
22 but there's -- the basic assumptions are there and it might be  
23 something we look at is probably the EIS in terms of what an  
24 outcome might be that we may not be predicting right now.

25           JAY LYMAN: We can try to refer to that.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   Jeri.

2                   JERI SUNDVALL: I just did -- I requested that  
3 last meeting so I just wanted to say yeah, can we get that  
4 information.

5                   JAY LYMAN: So specifically what information  
6 did we miss, Jeri?

7                   JERI SUNDVALL: The oil forecast. If you  
8 could do it on fuel forecasting, if it increases, and Rex had  
9 told me there was some information available.

10                  JAY LYMAN: Why don't we try to dig out --  
11 it's an ODOT study then.

12                  REX BURKHOLDER: Yeah.

13                  JAY LYMAN: Okay. Lynne.

14                  LYNNE GRIFFITH: Just wanted to make sure we  
15 pulled in the transit bullet there with the other larger  
16 discussion on transit markets, travel time, so we don't  
17 forget.

18                  JAY LYMAN: Did you catch that one?

19                  KATY BROOKS: No. Could you say that again.

20                  LYNNE GRIFFITH: Under deteriorating traffic  
21 conditions there is a travel time transit bullet, to make sure  
22 that we pull that into the discussion that we had on item two,  
23 looking at travel markets, transit markets and travel times  
24 and being consistent.

25                  JAY LYMAN: I think -- any other comments on

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 this one?

2 LARRY PAULSON: I have one more.

3 JAY LYMAN: Sure. Larry.

4 LARRY PAULSON: In the sense of -- and I think  
5 Bob mentioned it too. A substantial portion of freight moved  
6 by truck could be -- the estimates here of growth of freight,  
7 where did you get those estimates from?

8 JAY LYMAN: I believe the text is from our  
9 2020 -- the partnership study; is that right, David?

10 DAVID PARISI: No, it's from the Portland  
11 Freight Plan.

12 JAY LYMAN: Portland Freight Plan is the  
13 comment.

14 LARRY PAULSON: I'm concerned that that might  
15 be low based upon some things I've seen at least in the State  
16 of Washington. I just mention that just because I think it  
17 could impact the differences for the perspective and I can  
18 provide that information to Katy.

19 JAY LYMAN: If you could that would be great.  
20 We'll double-check our references.

21 Monica.

22 MONICA ISBELL: Two quick points. Dovetailing  
23 on what Larry's saying, I'd like to make sure that we have  
24 considered what's going on in the import market and not just  
25 freight up and down the coast. What's coming in from Asia is

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 going to be exploding in terms of volume. That's what the  
2 projections are and that's important for this because some of  
3 it --

4 LARRY PAULSON: May I add to that, projections  
5 I've seen, container traffic -- container traffic increasing  
6 by three-fold at least by 2025 and other traffic by two-thirds  
7 and so that's why I think they're low.

8 JAY LYMAN: I think it would probably help the  
9 explanatory information if we had the forecasts from both of  
10 the ports referenced in there, so that would be good.

11 MONICA ISBELL: The second point is, based on  
12 what Rex said, that if the price of fuel goes up and people  
13 convert to mass transit, you can't do that with freight. It's  
14 not going to go on a bus or a MAX line so we still have to  
15 recognize that.

16 JAY LYMAN: Very good. Two more. Okay.

17 First Eric. And I'll continue to apologize for  
18 missing that one.

19 ERIC HOLMES: Just more a question than  
20 anything else. Is it worth calling out maybe in this bullet  
21 the air quality implications of the traffic delay?

22 JAY LYMAN: The Problem Definition, like the  
23 federal purpose and need, is intended to focus specifically on  
24 the transportation problem that you're trying to solve.  
25 They're so closely related. The air quality issue is a result

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 of poor travel conditions. Can we take that under advisement  
2 and chew on it? I'm not sure how to go on that one.

3 Jerry.

4 JERRY GROSSNICKLE: Under deteriorating  
5 traffic conditions, we had a study done by WSDOT and ODOT  
6 during the study that we did for the river, traffic through  
7 this area, talking about the bridge lifts, and it was  
8 determined that within -- was it eight years or something we'd  
9 have nearly a gridlock situation, well, as you're pointing out  
10 here, during peak hours, from 9:00 o'clock in the morning  
11 until 7:00 o'clock at night.

12 I mean it got really bad. Add to that a bridge  
13 lift. You've got a tremendous problem which isn't identified  
14 in this statement and it really ought to be. During some  
15 years when we have high water we have a tremendous amount of  
16 bridge lifts. We haven't had one in about five years, a year  
17 of high water. So this should be reflected somewhere here on  
18 curative conditions.

19 JAY LYMAN: Can I paraphrase for you? If we  
20 move our peak periods past 7:00 o'clock, that's into the  
21 period where the Coast Guard does permit lifts and it's going  
22 to -- the marine traffic needs to start happening then and  
23 it's going to further exacerbate the peak period problem.  
24 Does that --

25 JERRY GROSSNICKLE: Bear in mind that that's

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1 also during the middle of the day.

2 JAY LYMAN: Right. Yeah, right. Just for  
3 those that don't know, right now there's two short periods  
4 during the day, it's 7:00 to 9:00 and 4:00 to 6:00 when bridge  
5 lifts are not -- is that right?

6 JERRY GROSSNICKLE: Close enough.

7 JAY LYMAN: Close enough. Sorry, I don't  
8 quite have it right. But right now the Coast Guard has given  
9 ODOT, who operates the bridge lifts, an exemption to not lift  
10 during those peak periods. Normally on a bridge it's a  
11 24-hour operation. So, you know, that's a very good point.

12 Whoops. Excuse me. Dick.

13 DICK MALIN: Before we're done we might want  
14 to categorize, of all the factors we've addressed, those that  
15 are relevant, material, and those that we identified and  
16 rejected. So we're looking at seismic and traffic capacity.  
17 We're not worried about spotted owls or terrorism or some  
18 things. We know they're out there but we've ground ruled them  
19 out for purposes of addressing our problem.

20 JAY LYMAN: I think it's fair to say that when  
21 we're talking about the transportation problem we're not  
22 worried about spotted owls. If we had -- if we ended up with  
23 a spotted owl nest on the bridge we'd have to deal with that  
24 when we start looking at solutions.

25 DICK MALIN: How about terrorism?

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   JAY LYMAN: How would you -- it's not a  
2 transportation problem per se but I don't know how to address  
3 that. We're going to have to struggle through that, Dick.  
4 That's very good.

5                   BRAD HALVERSON: How about salmon?

6                   JAY LYMAN: Salmon definitely will be  
7 something that we'll have to consider under any construction  
8 scenario. Absolutely. We are pushing our time on this.

9                   HAL DENGERINK: Yes, we are.

10                  JAY LYMAN: So if no more comments then I  
11 think I'll just do the wrap which is that the -- again the  
12 purpose of this was to get your comments. We will do a  
13 retooling. It will go to the open houses and we've already  
14 had at least twice those dates explained to you so I won't say  
15 them again, and then we'll come back to you with the comments  
16 from the public and the revised draft hopefully for adoption  
17 at the end of November. Thank you. That's a very good  
18 discussion.

19                  Hal.

20                  HAL DENGERINK: Let me kind of get a sense of  
21 the group here. Really the big question is whether or not  
22 your transportation issues are addressed in this Problem  
23 Definition. Obviously this is going to be flushed out with  
24 the public comments and with our meeting in November, but can  
25 I get a sense from folks about how you're seeing this?

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1           As we went through this it sounded to me like the  
2 Problem Definition was getting reasonably close to what you  
3 folks were seeing. Any major concerns at this point? Part of  
4 my reason for asking is that if in fact we're going to be able  
5 to adopt this in November then we may, if we are at some  
6 distance from resolution on this, need to have some kind of a  
7 work session or some kind of a subcommittee in the meantime.  
8 But my sense from the discussion here is that in fact we are  
9 reasonably close. Nobody's seeing a need for -- Jill.

10           JILL FUGLISTER: All I want to say is that I  
11 guess I'm sort of -- I don't know how to respond because I  
12 feel I really need to see what comes out of the public  
13 process.

14           HAL DENGERINK: Oh, absolutely.

15           JILL FUGLISTER: Right. So my response would  
16 be I can't respond to that question at this point.

17           HAL DENGERINK: Well, we may want to make that  
18 decision after we have the public comment. There may be some  
19 things that arise there, Jay, that we'll want to spend time  
20 with you talking about and do we need to put some intensive  
21 time around this, this sort of thing, in preparation for the  
22 November meeting.

23           JAY LYMAN: Certainly if we see a -- comments  
24 that lead to a major shift in direction we'd want to have --  
25 we wouldn't want to drop that on you cold.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   HAL DENGERINK: Okay. All right. Good. Then  
2 we need to move onto our discussion about the Evaluation  
3 Criteria. I think Jay put in the -- or maybe it was Rob, a  
4 definitive description of the various steps here that we're  
5 going through as we put these together and where the  
6 evaluation framework fits within that.

7                   And this is a document that's really going to  
8 provide the template by which we are going to measure and  
9 evaluate each of the alternatives that we talked about. It's  
10 a rather complex piece and we're going to spend a great deal  
11 more time later on talking about it.

12                  We at least need an introduction here to talk about  
13 what some of these measures are going to be and to kick this  
14 off Kris Strickler is going to identify this for us and I  
15 think Jay, you're going to step in and participate in this as  
16 well.

17                  KRIS STRICKLER: Jay will be jumping up also.  
18 Thank you. The evaluation framework essentially provides a  
19 process by which to narrow the list of alternatives. It does  
20 this, as mentioned before, by establishing criteria that will  
21 allow us to measure the effectiveness of components and  
22 alternatives as they're advanced.

23                  It measures these against the Problem Definition  
24 that you've just been described. Ultimately, just as a point  
25 of explanation, this evaluation framework will serve as a

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 basis for the selection of a locally preferred alternative.  
2 So with that I want to take a quick description of the process  
3 and schedule and then I'll hand it over to Jay for the  
4 Evaluation Criteria.

5 As you can see up on the board, through the  
6 remainder of this year our initial development and collection  
7 of components will occur. That will carry us up into the  
8 first major milestone of which there are five, as you can see.

9 The first one is to confirm the universal project  
10 components. We're anticipating that we'll receive components  
11 from a myriad of different places as well as components that  
12 will address specific portions of a solution but may not  
13 actually address all of the problem all together so we may  
14 receive a transit component or freight component, etcetera,  
15 but it may not be an entire package.

16 So what this process will do is it'll actually  
17 collect all those components to move them forward into the  
18 next step. So the first step is just confirming all of the  
19 components that have been collected.

20 The second milestone up there is to screen those  
21 components individually on a case by case basis. Jay will  
22 actually discuss in further detail how that will be done but  
23 as a broad brush overview, this will take the individual  
24 components that are brought forward and evaluate them  
25 specifically to determine whether or not they meet a portion

1 of the Problem Definition, and that will be a pass/fail type  
2 situation. Either they meet it or they don't in a certain  
3 process.

4 The ones that don't won't be advanced further in  
5 the discussion, the ones that do we'll move onto step three.  
6 And just as a quick note, February-March time frame, 2006, so  
7 coming up very soon is when we anticipate hitting the second  
8 milestone there.

9 So the third milestone is assembling all of those  
10 components that I just talked about into specific project  
11 alternatives that cover the entire purpose and need and from  
12 the mission statement so it's taking the freight and the  
13 transit and the highway portions, combining them into one  
14 project solution that can be advanced further into the  
15 process.

16 The next bar there is alternative development and  
17 screening. The project alternatives that have developed and  
18 pulled together in step three, they'll be flushed out as we  
19 move along through 2006 and evaluated again in another round  
20 of screening in milestone four.

21 The screening alternatives for the evaluation of  
22 the DEIS will occur late 2006, and essentially the hope there  
23 is to reduce the range of alternatives to something that's  
24 reasonable to carry forward with a draft DEIS. The  
25 performance measures that were previously used will be

1 modified and updated with the current information at the time  
2 to help us advance through that phase.

3 Through late 2006 and 2007 we will be preparing the  
4 draft DEIS based on the alternatives that came through  
5 screening step number four.

6 So the final step as far as the screening is  
7 concerned is step five and that is the selection of the  
8 locally preferred alternative and we're looking for 2008 for  
9 that. The specific criteria that Jay will discuss in just a  
10 minute, along with more detailed performance measures, will  
11 all be used to compare the alternatives against each other,  
12 against the Problem Definition, and they will support the  
13 selection of the locally preferred alternative.

14 Once that is done and the selection of the LPA, or  
15 locally preferred alternative, has been made then we'll move  
16 into or the project team will develop the final guidance and  
17 take it forward and solicit signatures from our federal  
18 partners, FHWA and FTA, for the record of decision.

19 So that's a broad overview of the process and  
20 schedule and what I'd like to do now is hand it over to Jay to  
21 talk more specifically about the criteria themselves.

22 JAY LYMAN: Well, Kris just did the fly over.  
23 It's all perfectly clear and we can forget about the details,  
24 you guys understand it perfectly? I introduced this to my  
25 wife last night. She just happened to be in the wrong room at

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 the wrong time. And as I went through it she said how many  
2 times are you going to give folks a chance to get their arms  
3 around this stuff and so way more than once so this is an  
4 introduction tonight.

5 This is your chance to get your first look at it  
6 and we'll be coming back as we go forward in your next  
7 meeting. So those five steps that Kris just went through in  
8 summary, I'm going to go back through in a bit more detail  
9 because what we're talking about is process and framework.

10 Framework is one of those buzz words, it's kind of  
11 hard to go your hands around, but it's the steps we're going  
12 to go through. We're right now starting to build alternatives  
13 based on the results of the partnership study which had very  
14 specific recommendations which involved -- seen them at least  
15 a couple times now.

16 In addition to those that we're working on, we  
17 expect that when we go out to the community, starting in  
18 October and then again early next year, we're going to hear  
19 about other ideas that people want us to evaluate. So that's  
20 -- that combination of the work that came from the  
21 partnership, plus the work that comes from the community  
22 outreach, is going to become our universe of components.

23 I'll stop and explain components here. We expect  
24 that any solution in the corridor, in the bridge influence  
25 area, is going to have a bunch of different facets that have

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1 to be there or else it won't be a complete solution. It's  
2 going to have a transit element, it's going to address  
3 freight.

4 We're going to figure out somehow how we're going  
5 to get across the river. We're going to figure out what we're  
6 going to do with the roadways, particularly I-5 north and  
7 south of the river. We're going to have a demand management  
8 and a system management element and hopefully we'll have time  
9 tonight so that we'll demystify that jargon for those folks  
10 that haven't dealt with that.

11 And finally we're going to have to make sure that  
12 bicycles and pedestrians can safely get through the bridge  
13 influence area. Those are the components that we've  
14 identified and we expect that as we start to build things  
15 through a partnership and as comments come in, that folks will  
16 have -- that they'll be focused on one or more of those  
17 components.

18 So the idea's just to make -- this first step is  
19 really getting out there and making sure that we've got  
20 everything on the table.

21 The second step is where we will do an initial  
22 screening of those components, and as Kris mentioned, there's  
23 a pass/fail element where one of the screening tests will be  
24 does this component that's been identified address some part  
25 of the Problem Definition.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1           If it doesn't address any of the Problem Definition  
2       it's a fail, it's going to fall off the table. But if it  
3       addresses one or more parts of the Problem Definition, it's  
4       going to pass through that.

5           The second part of the initial screening will be  
6       using criteria and performance measures that are based on the  
7       Vision and Values, and I'll talk more about how we do that in  
8       a bit. So two-step screening at this process, at this stage,  
9       and again this is February-March where what we call the  
10      universe of ideas will be screened down to a smaller set still  
11      in component mode.

12          Then we get to have some fun. We start to say all  
13      right, which of these elements seem to logically come together  
14      into alternatives. One example, if you're talking about  
15      express bus as a transit solution then it probably makes sense  
16      to consider HOV lanes so that way you get the highway element  
17      and the transit element start to match up and into pairings.  
18      Well, that's just one.

19          So that's a step. All we're saying here is we're  
20      going to take those things that have made it through the first  
21      screening and put them into alternatives, and we don't know  
22      how many are going to be there but we expect there will be  
23      eight, ten, 12, some number that we will have to evaluate over  
24      the spring and summer.

25          At the end of that time and as we go through the

1 spring and summer we're going to be analyzing them, of course,  
2 developing them, and ultimately the next screening where this  
3 group and the Project Sponsors Council and others will weigh  
4 in will be to say which of these alternatives that we've been  
5 looking at over the summer are really promising and we should  
6 study in more detail when we write our Draft Environmental  
7 Impact Statement.

8           So that's what this screening is all about, is just  
9 saying now let's take the ones that we've been working on over  
10 most of 2006, pick the best of them and move them forward into  
11 the DEIS. It's likely that as we look at them over the summer  
12 we may find that elements that we've combined into these  
13 different alternatives are going to get reshuffled so we'll be  
14 sort of picking the best parts of them and moving forward.

15           After the DEIS is completed, which is going to take  
16 most of 2007, and published, there will be another screening  
17 in which we will take the criteria -- and again I'll come back  
18 to that -- take the criteria and performance measures and say  
19 all right, now we've got our range of alternatives that have  
20 been formally studied, which is the one -- which is the one  
21 alternative that we want to move forward with as a region.  
22 That's the selection of the locally preferred alternative. So  
23 that's a very important step.

24           So each of those steps that I just went through has  
25 the process of applying criteria to measures. So I just

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 talked about process. Now I want to talk about how we get to  
2 those criteria and measures.

3           You folks just adopted the Vision and Values  
4 Statement and that really is the bedrock, the foundation, for  
5 how we build our Evaluation Criteria and our performance  
6 measures. The Evaluation Criteria come directly from the  
7 Vision and Values Statement and they will remain constant  
8 throughout the project.

9           The performance measures are specific measures that  
10 we then use to test -- to report back on the criteria, and one  
11 of the things that happens in a process like this, as we learn  
12 more and more about alternatives, is that our performance  
13 measures get more and more refined.

14           So what you will see next -- early next year when  
15 we do the first screening will be fairly broad level  
16 performance measures and by the time we get into late fall of  
17 2006 and into 2007 with the DEIS you'll be seeing much more  
18 detail in how we measure things. And I think it will make  
19 sense as I go forward and explain how this builds here. I  
20 hope it makes sense.

21           So Evaluation Criteria built on performance  
22 measures or built on the Vision and Value Statement, excuse  
23 me. We talked about the first screening being in step two  
24 when we evaluate components so the Evaluation Criteria are  
25 going to be essentially asking the question in step two how

1 well does the component address project Vision and Values.

2           When you get to steps four and five it's going to  
3 be how well does the alternative address the project Vision  
4 and Values. As you'll see in a minute, each value statement  
5 will probably have several Evaluation Criteria to help us  
6 understand and measure it, and each criterion will have one or  
7 more performance measures.

8           This is all perfectly clear, right? So what you  
9 have in front of you in this material that's both in your  
10 packets on the table and was mailed and e-mailed out to you,  
11 is our first cut at taking the Vision and Value Statements and  
12 adding to them the kind of things that -- the kind of criteria  
13 that we would expect to be able to report back on about those.

14           So for example, your first value statement is  
15 titled Community Livability and the three things there are all  
16 about avoiding and minimizing displacements, impacts to  
17 neighborhood cohesion and quality, and impacts to historic,  
18 cultural, and public park and recreation sources.

19           The second one, mobility, reliability  
20 accessibility, congestion reduction and efficiency. I'm not  
21 sure we get any points for efficiency on that title but it  
22 works. Again the three criteria under that, improved travel  
23 times on I-5 for passenger vehicles, trucks, and transit.

24           The second one, reduce delays for passenger  
25 vehicles, trucks and transit along I-5, and third, reduce the

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 number of hours of daily highway congestion. We can come back  
2 to these at the end. I just want to get through so you see  
3 how they all fit together.

4 Your third value is modal choice. What we've  
5 posited as a direction for criteria is number 3.1, promote  
6 transportation choices. Improve service to target markets is  
7 3.2. Improve bike/pedestrian connectivity. And fourth,  
8 decrease the percentage of SOV travel in the project area.

9 Okay. Fourth, safety. Enhance vehicle and freight  
10 safety, maintain bike and pedestrian safety, maintain marine  
11 safety, enhance aviation safety, provide sustained life-line  
12 connectivity.

13 Fifth, regional economy; freight mobility. Improve  
14 travel time between key freight generators and destinations.  
15 And second, maintain or enhance marine navigation and  
16 efficiency. And this is the text I was thinking about that  
17 was causing me to not remember which document it was in.

18 Six, several criteria under stewardship of natural  
19 and human resource. All are avoid or minimize air quality  
20 impacts; noise impacts; impacts to fish, wildlife and  
21 protected plant species; impacts to wetlands; and impacts to  
22 water quality.

23 And seventh, distribution of impacts and benefits.  
24 Avoid or minimize disproportionate adverse impacts to low  
25 income and minority populations, provide for equitable

1 distribution of benefits, and the third one, avoid or minimize  
2 disproportionate adverse impacts from construction activities.

3           Next to last, cost effectiveness and financial  
4 resources. Insure cost effectiveness and insure a reliable  
5 funding plan for the project.

6           And last, bi-state cooperation. Support adopted  
7 growth management plans in both states and support balanced  
8 job growth.

9           So that was our first cut at criteria. The real  
10 test will be the performance measures. Each of those criteria  
11 will have specific measures that we will use one or more  
12 methods to report back on. The -- each criterion will have --  
13 and as I mentioned, it will become progressively more  
14 detailed.

15           As I said, the first level, component screening, we  
16 used broad performance measures, and then the alternative  
17 screening and evaluation will be much more detailed,  
18 progressively more detailed.

19           So where we are on this is that these too will go  
20 out for comment as we go into the open houses and largely  
21 around values and issues that folks want to address. We will  
22 come back to you in November.

23           Our target has been to get this adopted along with  
24 the Problem Definition when we meet at the end of November.  
25 We'll have to take a sense of this group whether that's going

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 to be feasible or not. Frankly, if it takes us into January  
2 that won't hurt the overall schedule. We'll be able to keep  
3 moving on on other parts of it.

4 So that's a very broad overview. Any questions  
5 about structure? And we do have a few minutes. We can go  
6 back and talk about specific criteria if you like.

7 Fred.

8 FRED HANSEN: I just want to make sure I'm  
9 understanding. On the table one, it's going to be pass/fail.  
10 You don't indicate on table two what metric. Give me a sense  
11 of what you're thinking. I know you're not trying to be able  
12 to refine it yet but just give me a sense of the metric.

13 JAY LYMAN: Table two will -- when we come  
14 back at the end of November we'll have performance measures  
15 tied to each of the Evaluation Criteria that we will apply in  
16 table two as we move into that first stage. So the  
17 February-March we'll be showing you and asking for comment on  
18 performance measures next time that will apply in  
19 February-March.

20 One specific example, if you think about a design  
21 level analysis, eventually we're going to want to know  
22 specifically the number of properties, the types of  
23 properties, the number of displacements. We won't be at that  
24 level in February-March so we're going to have to find some  
25 surrogate that's less than that.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1                   It will probably be loosely described as number of  
2 affected parcels or something like that. We're still working  
3 on that and it's hard to say specifically.

4                   FRED HANSEN: The only thing I would tell you  
5 is that I think that as you develop that it will be very  
6 important for us to be able to have enough -- enough range  
7 within whatever those metrics are to be able to really help us  
8 sort through, and obviously it's not going to be pass/fail.  
9 But, you know, it's only, you know, a three level metric.  
10 It's not going to tell us very much as opposed to maybe a ten  
11 level or some other kind of metric.

12                  JAY LYMAN: So try to take it as detailed as  
13 we can to just --

14                  FRED HANSEN: That probably will happen over  
15 time. Lastly, just one small item and that is on number four,  
16 safety, 4.2. I'm not sure that you want to think about just  
17 maintaining bike/ped safety. Seems to me that you want to be  
18 able to enhance ped/bike. Am I reading it correctly?

19                  JAY LYMAN: Yes, you are.

20                  FRED HANSEN: Minor issue.

21                  JAY LYMAN: Let's do Jeri and then Rex.

22                  JERI SUNDVALL: One other minor issue. Just a  
23 tiny thing. When you're talking about mobility or safety or  
24 cost effectiveness and cooperation, it's all about support and  
25 provide and promote and enhance, and when you're talking about

1 the community and the fish and the natural human resources  
2 you're talking about avoiding and minimizing.

3 Can we find another word? Some other way, because  
4 it's like you talk about the people and all of them are avoid  
5 and minimize, avoid and minimize, but all the others are  
6 improve and increase and promote and enhance. Can we find a  
7 different word for that?

8 JAY LYMAN: Let us work on that. I know  
9 that's -- that's actually parallel to a discussion we had when  
10 we did this three years ago, Jeri, isn't it, or four years  
11 ago.

12 JERI SUNDVALL: Exactly. So you give me  
13 flashbacks, Jay.

14 JAY LYMAN: Serena. No, I'm sorry, I had Rex  
15 in the --

16 REX BURKHOLDER: This one I don't have a real  
17 suggestion for but I'm wrestling with the land use which is --  
18 really I guess comes down to jobs, housing, balance issue, and  
19 I'm not quite sure where it fits in here. And the question  
20 really is is this just responding or is it actually going to  
21 try and inform.

22 Because I think some of the information coming out  
23 of this process will give us some insight into how we would  
24 like to distribute jobs and housing, at least through land  
25 additions to the urban growth boundaries of both parts of the

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 region. I'm wrestling with that because this is not in  
2 isolation.

3 This is such a major facility, combined with 205.  
4 It has a huge impact on locational decisions of both  
5 individuals and businesses. So I'm not quite sure how to  
6 throw that in as an evaluation factor, how we respond to that,  
7 or is this just going to accept the growth management  
8 decisions on both sides of the river and try to accommodate to  
9 it.

10 So I want to put that out as a challenge for us  
11 because these are connected issues and how do we connect them  
12 I don't know. And so I want to put this as just a challenge  
13 in terms of evaluating decisions that should be -- I know it's  
14 down here under bi-state cooperation, but I guess the question  
15 is is how effective or how much we should go the other  
16 direction, instead of being just responding, actually  
17 informing on those decisions.

18 JAY LYMAN: We will certainly be measuring the  
19 -- using a little jargon, the secondary cumulative land use  
20 impacts of any alternative, and I think from a NEPA  
21 perspective we know we have to do that. It doesn't show up in  
22 here and that's at least where we need to go and you're saying  
23 we maybe need to go father than that.

24 REX BURKHOLDER: Both sides of the river right  
25 now, Clark County and the Oregon side of the river, are both

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 looking at making decisions in the near future about urban  
2 growth boundary expansions and where our jobs lands are going  
3 to be located, where our housing lands are going to be  
4 located.

5 I think this here is affected very strongly by both  
6 of those decisions and to me it's which way do we go and I  
7 don't know the answer to that, whether -- something here could  
8 have a big effect. I think that's the difference between our  
9 two models. One model assumes a new -- a bigger facility, one  
10 doesn't, and the results are quite different.

11 The question is is that the future we want and how  
12 does this affect those decisions. And again I'm just putting  
13 it out there as a challenge because you have governments on  
14 both sides of the river that are trying to make these  
15 decisions and this would provide them with some information.  
16 It would be very enlightening, possibly helpful.

17 JAY LYMAN: Thank you. We'll have to work on  
18 that.

19 HAL DENGERINK: Jay, under your number five,  
20 we talked about regional economy and then the items there are  
21 all related just to freight mobility, and actually similarly  
22 in terms of the community livability issues, it seems to me  
23 that there might be a number of things in terms of say how the  
24 facility is ultimately built, if we assume we're going to be  
25 doing a new bridge through here, is going to change some

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 things in terms of providing access to different parts of the  
2 region, providing new alternatives for additional say retail  
3 or those kinds of things.

4 In other words, affecting some of the land use  
5 pieces, okay, that might have an impact on the economy or  
6 might have an impact on the community livability here. That  
7 ought to be looked at in a sense, it seems to me, under those  
8 two categories.

9 JAY LYMAN: So if I'm getting that, Hal, that  
10 if we're building something it will have land use implications  
11 that we need to make sure we address, both the positive as  
12 well as the negative.

13 HAL DENERINK: Sure. Yeah.

14 JAY LYMAN: Is that a good summary? I think  
15 that's -- I see that at a couple of scales. There's the  
16 immediate land use implications from adjacent to the project,  
17 if there is a project, and there's a larger -- I believe what  
18 Rex is referring to is sort of the regional scale, the  
19 decision about where jobs and housing goes. So at two levels.

20 Serena, you were next.

21 SERENA CRUZ: I'd like to go back to Jeri's  
22 comment and expand for just a bit. I guess I'm a little  
23 confused because I thought we were really careful in the  
24 Vision and Values Statement about using specific terms about  
25 enhancing and improving, avoiding terms of modifying a wide

1 variety of issues, and so it is surprising to see that kind of  
2 disregarded, it seems, in this screening criteria.

3           And just one kind of odd example stands -- I mean  
4 there are a bunch but one really odd example stands out to me.  
5 Under safety it says maintain bike/pedestrian safety. That's  
6 under number four. And it's just kind of -- I mean clearly  
7 the value statement said enhance, but also the problem  
8 statement describes that there is -- that the bike and  
9 pedestrian facilities don't meet current design standards.

10           So if that's the case why are we -- why would we  
11 want to maintain something that doesn't meet standards? So it  
12 just -- I think there's some -- I would like to see a better  
13 connection between the language that was used in the Vision  
14 and Values statement, the Problem Definition, and how this  
15 language comes out.

16           In particular, with the support and improve  
17 language that's there. Then there are things that were left  
18 off and I don't really know why they were left off, like the  
19 public health concept in livability, the aesthetic concept in  
20 livability, was left off.

21           TDM is not incorporated in the mobility and  
22 reliability, and maybe it was just because it was put in  
23 someplace else but it's there.

24           JAY LYMAN: Are you writing that fast, Katy?

25           SERENA CRUZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   KATY BROOKS: I got to the part where we need  
2 to make sure the language matches and maybe do a quick check  
3 with the Vision and Values list to make sure all the  
4 subheadings under the value statements match some of the  
5 subheadings underneath the --

6                   SERENA CRUZ: Well, the modifying language,  
7 the enhance, improve.

8                   KATY BROOKS: Okay.

9                   SERENA CRUZ: And then there were -- so there  
10 were two items on the community livability that I noticed so  
11 I'd like -- I mean I guess I would appreciate it if there was  
12 a check that was kind of in each area, what didn't get carried  
13 forward and maybe an explanation as to why it didn't get  
14 carried forward, or maybe it didn't mean to not get carried  
15 forward, like the public health and the aesthetic components  
16 under community livability, or maybe they're someplace else  
17 and I'm --

18                   JAY LYMAN: No, I think those are great  
19 comments. I think we're looking at, you know, this is a  
20 working draft. We came to you guys and this is the kind of  
21 feedback we're looking for.

22                   SERENA CRUZ: Oh, okay.

23                   JAY LYMAN: Other cards up there?

24                   I'm sorry. Tom.

25                   TOM MILLER: Yeah, Serena I think caught my

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 primary concern. I think -- fortunately I think there's a  
2 really simple solution here which is to identify all the  
3 things we want and aspire to enhance the things that we want,  
4 and if we can't enhance them then we'll at least aim to  
5 maintain the status quo again of the things we want, and then  
6 try to aspirationally reduce the things we don't want.

7           So in other words, you can go through each one of  
8 these sub bullets and say okay, should we enhance this? If  
9 not then you minimize or you enhance -- at least maintain and  
10 so forth. So it's just a -- it's a simple linguistic change  
11 but an important one.

12           JAY LYMAN: Okay. We will work on that and  
13 try to come back with a better version.

14           I'm sorry, Eric, you were next.

15           ERIC HOLMES: I stepped out for a second and  
16 may have missed this but what does 4.5 mean, what is life-line  
17 connectivity?

18           JAY LYMAN: That's language that we tried to  
19 get in there relating to the seismic vulnerability of the  
20 bridges. If they go down that's a major impact to the region.  
21 The bridge is defined as a life-line route. I-5 is a  
22 life-line route. Thanks for that request because we didn't  
23 explain that. That's good.

24           Rex, you've got your card up.

25           REX BURKHOLDER: Well, I was assuming that was

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1 something else so I think there's something else missing which  
2 is the issue of emergency vehicle movement across the bridges  
3 and, you know, it's in the safety piece but I thought  
4 life-line connectivity was that so I thought you had it. I  
5 didn't understand it.

6 And then under 7.2 on distribution impacts and  
7 benefits, I would like to see us add about equitable  
8 distribution of costs and it's something that we're talking  
9 about in the Oregon Transportation Plan Update about the  
10 beneficiary pays concept, and it's not just user pay, it's  
11 actually beyond.

12 It looks at -- it also looks at people who own  
13 property near the facility or something like that that have  
14 improved access, how do you capture the value that you've  
15 increased.

16 JAY LYMAN: Try to capsulize that. Include  
17 something about the concept of beneficiary pays?

18 REX BURKHOLDER: At some point equitable  
19 distribution of costs and benefits. We don't have anything  
20 about how we recover the costs and who we should aim at  
21 capturing that increased value.

22 JAY LYMAN: Let's see. Dean. I'm sorry if  
23 I'm not getting everybody just in order.

24 DEAN LOOKINGBILL: Again recalling back to our  
25 earlier conversation on Vision and Values. Number two, we

1 talked about a lot of things in that one. We recognized the  
2 congestion reduction and sort of accepted that it stayed there  
3 but we also sort of said fast is going to be kind of a  
4 relative term when we talk about this corridor.

5 So just a note to say that this set of criteria,  
6 knowing that, you know, you're going to look at more, really  
7 all are -- are all about how fast you travel through that  
8 corridor. So we might be thinking about criteria that address  
9 reliability. For example, I know incident management ability  
10 in a corridor like this is going to affect reliability.

11 Accessibility, we talked a lot about the trucks.  
12 Maybe there needs to be some criteria that could look  
13 specifically at accessibility and it might be for some of the  
14 freight issues. So I think just expanding this one to get  
15 past how fast we travel through the corridor.

16 JAY LYMAN: Good comment.

17 Lynne.

18 LYNNE GRIFFITH: Maybe it's buried here  
19 somewhere. Capacity, vehicle and person through-put. Am I  
20 missing it?

21 JAY LYMAN: Is it buried?

22 LYNNE GRIFFITH: I think at least from a  
23 transit standpoint person through-put is important. I would  
24 think on the highway side, vehicle through-put.

25 JAY LYMAN: Why don't we go back and look at

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 that and make sure the concept of person through-put in  
2 addition to the vehicle capacity is addressed.

3 Bob, do you have anything further?

4 BOB RUSSELL: Consistent with the earlier  
5 discussion about the problem statement, item number five, and  
6 does it recognize the importance of the I-5 to the entire west  
7 coast. It just talks about the regional piece so if it's  
8 consistent with our earlier discussion I think that works.

9 JAY LYMAN: Okay. We are running out of time.  
10 Wally's had his card up here for a minute. I guess one  
11 question I would ask perhaps our chairs, if we want to refer  
12 the TDM discussion and let this go or move on. We're running  
13 out of time.

14 HAL DENERINK: I want to ask the group that.  
15 Do you want to get Wally's input first.

16 JAY LYMAN: Sure.

17 WALLY MEHRENS: One of the things that I would  
18 like to know where I would submit it, I guess, is we've been  
19 talking about livability without defining what livability  
20 means and my definition may be different than somebody else's.  
21 I just want to know where I can put my definition in of  
22 livability and standard of living as a screening criteria  
23 evaluation.

24 JAY LYMAN: We have the first category,  
25 community livability, and that's a challenge for us. We put

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 things up there that we know we can measure but that's almost  
2 certainly not a comprehensive list, so if you have other  
3 suggestions. The challenge before us is to figure out how to  
4 measure it and report back.

5 I know you've got your card up, Jeri, but I want to  
6 defer to Hal here for managing time.

7 HAL DENGERINK: Let me ask a question though  
8 first, Jay. I thought I heard you say at the beginning of  
9 this presentation that you saw us as potentially adopting the  
10 Evaluation Criteria at our November meeting. My expectation  
11 had been that we would adopt the Problem Definition in  
12 November and the Evaluation Criteria in January.

13 JAY LYMAN: That's probably the realistic way  
14 to do it. Ideally we would love to have it adopted in  
15 November but this discussion is just really getting started.

16 HAL DENGERINK: Right. Exactly. This is  
17 really the first time that we've done it and it seems to me  
18 that we're going to have to not only get the input from those  
19 public meetings but we're going to have to spend a fair amount  
20 of time in November talking specifically about these kinds of  
21 things, and perhaps at that point decide that we need some off  
22 meeting time devoted to it as well.

23 With that as background, we have scheduled here in  
24 the 20 minutes that we have left two major pieces yet. One is  
25 a discussion of transportation demand management that Serena

1 had asked for. I'm fairly hesitant to put that discussion off  
2 without Serena's approval of our delaying that at this point.

3 But even if we -- even if we did that we would  
4 still run up against our public comment time piece. Is there  
5 any major thing we have to say at this point about the  
6 Evaluation Criteria?

7 TOM ZELENKA: Mr. Chairman, if we're going to  
8 actually come back to this in terms of decisions in January, I  
9 think that's fine. If we're going to push and have decisions  
10 in November I think we need a fair amount of discussion on the  
11 factors.

12 So I mean this has been a useful kind of  
13 preliminary discussion but there's an awful lot of meat to the  
14 bone that is yet to be placed there and I don't want to be  
15 pressured into a quick decision in November. So I'm perfectly  
16 willing to kind of say, you know, let's have the other stuff  
17 so everything can keep moving.

18 HAL DENGERINK: Well, that was sort of a  
19 subtle way of saying we ain't going to do this in November.

20 TOM ZELENKA: I just appreciate the clarity.

21 HAL DENGERINK: I don't think we can do that.

22 Okay.

23 JAY LYMAN: The chair has spoken.

24 HAL DENGERINK: But I think we have to be  
25 committed to doing this in January. I don't think there's any

1 alternative.

2 By the way, and I'll try and repeat this later, our  
3 meeting in November is being rescheduled for November 30th,  
4 not for November 28th. We're having some difficulty  
5 scheduling this one, when people can be here. It's  
6 rescheduled for November 30th, okay, at -- you say at OAMI  
7 over at Portland then. All right.

8 Let's move on to talk about TDM. Can we do that in  
9 no more than ten minutes?

10 JAY LYMAN: Mr. Parisi, your challenge is to  
11 do it in ten minutes.

12 HAL DENGERINK: Can you do that, David?

13 JILL FUGLISTER: Can I ask a question? Is my  
14 watch right? Is it 6:15? Did we say we were going to go  
15 longer so we can ensure public comment?

16 HAL DENGERINK: We're going to ensure public  
17 comment.

18 JILL FUGLISTER: So we're going to go longer?

19 HAL DENGERINK: Yeah, not terribly much  
20 longer.

21 JILL FUGLISTER: Aren't we supposed to have 15  
22 minutes for public comment? I was thinking maybe we could  
23 table TDM until next time so we could do the public comment.

24 HAL DENGERINK: Let me get a point of  
25 clarification here. Serena.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1                   SERENA CRUZ: I would support tabling TDM  
2 because Sam isn't here and that was part of -- you know, it  
3 was for new folks but I included it -- it came up during our  
4 bi-state meeting when Sam was at bi-state so --

5                   HAL DENGERINK: Okay.

6                   SERENA CRUZ: I don't know that that would  
7 cause problems in next month's agenda though.

8                   HAL DENGERINK: Does anybody object to us  
9 putting off the TDM discussion until --

10                  HENRY HEWITT: Just as long as we get it.

11                  HAL DENGERINK: You're chairing the meeting  
12 next time, Henry, so you can ensure that. Fine. Okay.

13                  If that's the case, David, we'll give you your full  
14 15 minutes at the next meeting.

15                  DAVID PARISI: I'll be here next time. Thank  
16 you.

17                  JERI SUNDVALL: Thank you, David.

18                  HAL DENGERINK: Okay. It might be very  
19 helpful if with the materials in preparation for the next  
20 meeting we in fact do have your slides so that people can look  
21 at that ahead of time. That might help that discussion as  
22 well. Okay.

23                  Let's move on to public comment. Okay. We have  
24 three people who have asked to talk. I would ask that the --  
25 your comments be directed at our agenda, particularly in terms

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 of the Problem Definition or the Evaluation Criteria, or if  
2 you think we've missed something major in terms of our Vision  
3 and Values to let us know.

4 Okay. The first person is Sylvia Evans.

5 SYLVIA EVANS: Good evening, everyone. My  
6 name is Sylvia Evans and I'm from Portland. I represent  
7 Humboldt Neighborhood Association and also the Plaza Neighbors  
8 Association.

9 I've been a resident of Humboldt for over 20 years.  
10 I live one block from I-5 freeway. Over the past 20 years  
11 I've seen the health impact due to that freeway, negatively  
12 impact my neighbors and myself. At 32 years old I was  
13 diagnosed with congestive heart failure. I have three  
14 children and all three have asthma.

15 Because of this I started looking more into my  
16 neighborhood. Who else has these same issues that I have and  
17 what's the cause and what can we do about it. For the past  
18 three years, with --in partnership with Lewis & Clark College  
19 and Portland State University, we have performed air quality  
20 testing, on both sides of the I-5 freeway, in and around the  
21 plaza, and what we found is that the air toxins are extremely  
22 high.

23 We also have an ODOT air testing station on  
24 Roselawn within Humboldt. So what I was able to do was I was  
25 able to look at the numbers that we were receiving directly

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1 from I-5 freeway, located one block, and then also the numbers  
2 from the DEQ station on Roselawn, which is just up the street  
3 from my apartment complex. The numbers are much higher the  
4 closer you are to the I-5 freeway, and I know that most of you  
5 should understand this.

6 This impacts our livability. The problem is just  
7 not asthma and other upper respiratory conditions, it is also  
8 cancer, because we are definitely a cancer cluster. Four  
9 years ago we decided to put in community gardens within  
10 Humboldt in a food stabilization project.

11 Three years ago we found out that we are not able  
12 to grow leafy green vegetables, the vegetables that you would  
13 have to eat the skin, due to the air toxins forming a silver  
14 sheen over our vegetables.

15 So for the past two years we've been growing things  
16 that would scrub toxins out of the air and prevent them from  
17 settling on our produce, which we haven't been very successful  
18 with, because other than putting cloches over all seven of our  
19 beds, that's the only way that we are going to be able to do  
20 any kind of gardening along the I-5 freeway.

21 I then looked at the Patton home which also has a  
22 community garden which is also one block from the I-5 freeway  
23 that is also having the same problem. The Patton home is home  
24 to our elderly and some mentally disabled folks who like to  
25 garden, like to go outside, like walking around the community,

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 but because of the air toxins we were unable to do that.

2 We used to have a walking tour up and down Albina.  
3 PCC is one block from my apartment complex. We're unable to  
4 do that because of the increased air toxins from the freeway.  
5 So I'm hoping that any decision that you make about the bridge  
6 and about expansion of the freeway you take into consideration  
7 our health. Thank you very much.

8 HAL DENERINK: Thank you.

9 Okay. Sharon Nasset.

10 SHARON NASSET: Hello. My name is Sharon  
11 Nasset and you've heard me speak here at a few other meetings,  
12 and what I would like to say is I'm trying very, very hard to  
13 involve myself in an open process, and an open process is a  
14 two-way situation and I don't feel that it's that way.

15 I am not in any way trying to annoy anybody by  
16 being a participant in what is supposed to be an open process,  
17 and I am having a very hard time, a very hard time, with the  
18 fact that lots of information's missing. The meeting notes  
19 you had today did not show your deliberation, who said what,  
20 what they meant, and you represent people.

21 Then you have the citizen comment period and you  
22 name off the individuals who spoke. This gentleman spoke.  
23 His name wasn't there. Not only are our names the only thing  
24 that is printed but usually we are given a paragraph, a  
25 statement. For those people who can't be here to speak so

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 they can hear what's being said and being a part of the  
2 process, saying our names and not what we said is extremely  
3 disturbing and does not meet the letter of the open meeting  
4 laws or the spirit of it.

5 I am really trying to be a tolerant person and not  
6 think that there's like some kind of conspiracy. But my  
7 goodness, there is. If you go to the web site you will see  
8 Serena, Rex and Lora Caine's e-mails are missing. You will  
9 find that there was citizen comment in the May, that the  
10 meeting notes for May were on the web site with the citizens'  
11 comments, and they're missing.

12 You will find all kinds of things missing. Like  
13 the fact that this board or group is called the I-5 Bi-State  
14 Transportation and Trade. It is not on the web site, the  
15 official web site. It has never been on any of the paperwork.

16 The Columbia River Crossing is a project of it, it  
17 is not the name of the group, and when you call the federal  
18 government and ask them has the charge changed? No, the  
19 charge is the corridor. Has the area changed? No, the  
20 governors have not come out with anything new.

21 And when you go to your web site your web site not  
22 only does not have the study area, which is exactly the same  
23 as the two groups before you, but the maps don't even show the  
24 full area.

25 You talk about seismograph, every single bridge in

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 the area does not meet current standards, and do you say that?  
2 No. And it's not a vacuum, it's a system. I really believe  
3 that this can be worked out in a tolerant way and that hearing  
4 people will further the process. The fact that I have people  
5 calling me and people that didn't come here tonight because  
6 they're protesting and they are asking for us to contact the  
7 state attorney general and to stop the process, and Jeri can  
8 tell you she's got them coming in there, it's just appalling.

9           There is no reason not to have an open process  
10 unless you want to appear as dishonest. Do you really want  
11 your integrity -- I respect the people in this room. See you  
12 all the time. I think you're doing a pretty good job. You're  
13 hanging in there.

14           Do I really want to see your names in the paper as  
15 being participants who signed off on things that don't go  
16 along with open meeting laws? I don't want to see it. I  
17 don't want to be involved in incidents like that. That's not  
18 my direction.

19           And here I go down the road and that's the only  
20 options you're giving me, and it's getting old. So meet the  
21 commissioners, go down to Salem, have them have an arbitrator  
22 come in. It's not getting us where I would like to see us go.

23           I do have an agenda and I've been open and honest  
24 about it. It would be nice to see if your agenda is open and  
25 honest. I'm going forward because I plan on polishing our

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 economic gem and our economic gem here is transportation and  
2 we need goods coming in and out of here in the biggest form we  
3 can and providing jobs now and for the future, and anything  
4 short of that is not good enough.

5           And I'm not trying to annoy anybody but I'm not  
6 going away. And I'm trying to be as nice as I possibly can  
7 but I'm tired of hitting the wall. So I wish you good luck.  
8 I cannot believe that you passed this meeting notes today as  
9 meeting notes and if I weren't stuck on I-5 getting here I  
10 would have been here in time and I probably would have held up  
11 a sign that said what is going on.

12           It takes a lot to frustrate me but I'll go the  
13 legal route if I have to and there's a lot of people that  
14 will, and I think that would be disgusting and it would show  
15 that we can't work together as states or as citizens or as  
16 representatives.

17           And I'm sorry that this is what I had to say  
18 tonight but boy, oh boy, oh boy, and I'm not the only one  
19 saying it, and anybody that's got their ear to the ground  
20 knows it. Thank you.

21           HAL DINGERINK: Thank you.

22           Jim Howell.

23           JIM HOWELL: Hard to follow that. I'd like to  
24 talk about bang for the buck. This project has been estimated  
25 to be one to two billion dollars. Now, I think that there's a

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 possibility of a solution that would meet probably 90, 95  
2 percent of your criteria. That may be 400 million dollars,  
3 you know, one quarter of that.

4 But this screening criteria I see as a way of  
5 eliminating -- well, I guess you throw out the baby with the  
6 bath water. You could say well, it doesn't meet one of the  
7 finer points of one of these criteria and therefore it fails  
8 and therefore we're not going to look at all our cost option.

9 So I have a problem with this screening criteria.  
10 I really think that you should be looking at a lower cost  
11 option to start with and if it does not meet enough of these  
12 criteria, then go to the next step to the mega project.

13 But this being a mega project right from the  
14 beginning I have a problem with, and it means a lot more  
15 study, a lot more costs and study, a lot more time when in  
16 fact you might be able to solve 90, 95 percent of these issues  
17 much faster at a far lower cost if they are not screened out  
18 early, and I just see how this matrix here could possibly  
19 screen out some good ideas. Thank you.

20 HAL DENERINK: Thank you.

21 VINTON ERICKSON: I just want to say first  
22 though --

23 HAL DENERINK: Say who you are.

24 VINTON ERICKSON: I'm Vinton Erickson from  
25 Vancouver. I've been a farmer all my life and I guess we also

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 develop land. We've done a couple hundred lots and we're  
2 doing a couple hundred more. But I would say in defense of  
3 livability, I guess I should be dead because I've always used  
4 chemicals all my life on the farm, but that's just a -- for  
5 the good word.

6 I guess I would like to give compliments to a  
7 couple of fellas that really talked about the freight mobility  
8 and trucks and what's happening in the -- well, the realm of  
9 things that if the trucks can get through that's going to be a  
10 real rough idea.

11 But what I would like to -- the last time I talked  
12 about the Lonnie study, the west side bypass, and also Duvall  
13 who was from the -- I've got the deal -- the paper that he  
14 published, The Oregonian put in The Oregonian about the bypass  
15 deal.

16 Now, if the bypass was built today, you know, right  
17 now there's about 300,000 cars and trucks a day going down I-5  
18 and 205, but if we had all three corridors -- much of us  
19 talked about the corridors, instead of having 150,000 more or  
20 less on each one, you'd have -- you'd have 150 -- you'd have  
21 50,000 cars and trucks a day off this corridor right here  
22 which you wouldn't have to do a blooming thing to it because  
23 you -- it just -- bypass and it really makes sense if you'll  
24 study it. I've got -- it just does. Thank you.

25 HAL DENGERINK: Okay. We're at 6:30.

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

1 Anything else for the good of the order?

2 Jeri?

3 JERI SUNDVALL: Just one thing I forgot last  
4 time. In the last meeting we had we had a discussion about  
5 the fact that we wouldn't vote on anything unless we allowed  
6 the public to comment before we voted and we actually didn't  
7 do that in this vote.

8 I just want to bring that to the attention that  
9 maybe we could do that next time before we vote. We did say  
10 we would include public comment before we voted.

11 HAL DENGERINK: We did have public comment  
12 last time after we discussed the Vision and Values. Certainly  
13 at that meeting.

14 JERI SUNDVALL: Correct, but I believe that --  
15 my understanding was that people would be allowed to comment  
16 directly before we voted and that meant there should have been  
17 one right before we voted today. That was my understanding.  
18 I could be wrong but that's what I proposed.

19 HAL DENGERINK: That wasn't mine. But  
20 actually, remember for the next one, we do have three  
21 different sessions for public comment and I encourage task  
22 force members to go to those as well.

23 We have all the information about those and as I  
24 say, I do encourage you to do that. Remember that our next  
25 meeting is November 30th in Portland at OAMI and there will be

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111



1 on the agenda opportunities to evaluate the Vision and Values  
2 Statement there as well.

3 Okay. Thank you all.

4 (At 6:31 p.m. hearing concluded.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

## 1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
 4 COUNTY OF CLARK ) ss.

5

6 I, Karen M. Smith, a Notary Public for  
 7 Washington, certify that the proceedings here occurred at the  
 8 time and place set forth in the caption hereof; that at said  
 9 time and place I reported in Stenotype all testimony adduced  
 10 and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that  
 11 thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting under my  
 12 direction; and the foregoing transcript, Pages 1 to 97, both  
 13 inclusive, contains a full, true and correct record of all  
 14 such testimony adduced and oral proceedings had and of the  
 15 whole thereof.

16 Witness my hand and notarial seal at Vancouver,  
 17 Washington, this 18th day of October 2005.

18

19

20

21

22

23

Karen M. Smith, CSR #1925  
 Notary Public for Washington  
 My commission expires: 8-6-2009

24

25

Rider & Associates, Inc.

360.693.4111

