

**Meeting:** Columbia River Crossing Task Force  
**Meeting Date:** January 4, 2006, 4–6:30 p.m.  
**Location:** WSDOT SW Region Headquarters  
11018 NE 51st Circle, Vancouver, Washington

**Members Present:**

Rich Brown, Bank of America  
Rex Burkholder, Metro  
Bob Byrd, Identity Clark County  
Lora Caine, Friends of Clark County  
Hal Dengerink, Washington State  
University Vancouver (Task Force Co-chair)  
Elliot Eki, Oregon/Idaho AAA  
Dave Frei, Arnada Neighborhood  
Association  
Jill Fuglister, Coalition for a Livable Future  
Lynne Griffith, C-TRAN  
Jerry Grossnickle, Columbia River Tugboat  
Association  
Brad Halverson, Overlook Neighborhood  
Association  
Fred Hansen, TriMet  
Henry Hewitt, Stoel Rives (Task Force Co-  
chair)  
Dean Lookingbill, Regional Transportation  
Council  
Dick Malin, Central Park Neighborhood  
Association

Larry Paulson, Port of Vancouver, USA  
Steve Petersen, Portland Business Alliance  
Bart Phillips, Columbia River Economic  
Development Council  
Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver  
Bob Russel, Oregon Trucking Association  
Art Schaff, Washington State Trucking  
Association  
Jonathan Schlueter, Westside Economic  
Alliance  
Steve Stuart, Clark County  
Jeri Sundvall, Environmental Justice Action  
Group  
Walter Valenta, Bridgeton Neighborhood  
Association  
Scot Walstra, Greater Vancouver Chamber  
of Commerce  
Tom Zelenka, Oregon Freight Advisory  
Committee  
Susie Lahsene for Bill Wyatt, Port of  
Portland

**Absent Members:**

Sam Adams, City of Portland  
Charles Becker, City of Gresham  
Dr. Wayne Branch, Clark College  
Serena Cruz, Multnomah County  
Brett Hinsley, Columbia Pacific Building  
Trades  
Eric Holmes, City of Battle Ground  
Monica Isbell, Portland Business Alliance

Ed Lynch, Vancouver National Historic  
Reserve Trust  
Mark McCloud, Greater Vancouver  
Chamber of Commerce  
Janet Ray, Washington AAA  
Karen Schmidt, Washington Freight  
Mobility Strategic Investment Board  
Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland

## **Project Team Members Present:**

Ron Anderson  
Katy Brooks  
Amy Echols  
Jeff Heilman  
David Parisi

Mike Baker  
Rob DeGraff  
Doug Ficco  
Jay Lyman  
Kris Strickler

## **I. Public Comment from Representative Deb Wallace**

Washington State Representative Deb Wallace (17th District, including areas of Clark County) submitted a letter (Appendix A). She stated the importance of the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) and the Bridge Influence Area's impacts to the region and encouraged the project to approach transportation in the area as a system. She requested more engagement of east and north Clark County citizens in the CRC discussion.

**Action:** No action required.

## **II. Opening Remarks**

After Task Force member introductions, Co-chair Hal Dengerink announced CRC Task Force Facilitator Katy Brooks' departure from the Task Force and her new position with the Port of Vancouver, USA.

**Action:** No action required.

## **III. Meeting Minutes**

**Action:** The November 30, 2005, meeting minutes were adopted with no discussion.

## **IV. Project Purpose and Scope**

Consultant Team Project Manager Jay Lyman presented the project purpose and scope. His presentation is available on the Web site.<sup>1</sup> The project is in the process of a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to select transportation improvements to address problems in the I-5 Bridge Influence Area. The Bridge Influence Area is the 5-mile segment between SR 500 in Washington and Columbia Boulevard in Oregon.

Ross Roberts, Metro, presented the history of regional transportation policy and planning as it relates to this project. David Parisi explained how the conclusions from the I-5 Trade Corridor Study and the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership led to recommendations to improve I-5 in the bridge influence area.

Jay explained that all alternatives were still being considered, and that information from prior studies as well as additional analyses would be used to evaluate alternatives. Hal stated that the Task Force's objective is to solve problems in the I-5 corridor and look at all alternatives. All alternatives that are proposed will be compared against each other to determine the options that best address the problems described in the problem definition.

Jay noted that the project scope was narrowed in the Problem Definition. Future alternatives will be measured against the Problem Definition. There will be regional transportation issues in the future that this Task Force will not be able to address, and which will be the focus of other

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org)

projects. Members stated that this is a federal bridge and stressed the importance of trade and commerce in the I-5 corridor.

**Action:** No action required.

## V. Public Comment

Comment received from six citizens; Travis Huennekens, John Charles, Kelly Love, Sharon Nasset, Jim Howell, and Vinton Erickson. Written comments are included in Appendix A. Summaries of verbal comments follow.

- Travis Huennekens stated his support for west side alternatives, including an I-205 beltway. He asked if the Task Force would consider specific options. Hal replied that the group would consider all alternatives.
- John Charles, president of Cascade Policy Institute, stated that the scale in the evaluation framework for measuring how well criteria perform should be quantitative. He also provided a comment to criterion 8, Cost Effectiveness and Financial Resources. He stated that cost effectiveness should be measured by the level of congestion reduced per dollar invested. He also suggested user fees to pay for facilities.
- Kelly Love, District Representative for Congressman Brian Baird, stated his staff will continue to monitor and communicate with WSDOT and ODOT.
- Sharon Nasset asked Task Force members to look at all options, including a west arterial. She would like addresses for Task Force members, and thinks that five to six groups composed of Task Force members are meeting outside the Task Force.
- Jim Howell, Association of Rail and Traffic Advocates, stated that he does not want an arterial-only option. He does not assume there will be a freeway bridge.
- Vinton Erickson emphasized the need for another corridor on the west side because Oregon Highways 26 and 217 are over-populated. He stated that corridors should be discussed, not a bridge.

**Note:** The full text of public comments is available in the meeting transcript posted on the CRC Web site.<sup>2</sup>

## VI. Report on Public Involvement Comments regarding Vision and Values Statement

Jeff Heilman presented the Summary of Scoping Comments related to the Task Force's Vision and Values Statement. His presentation is available on the Web site.\* Jeff summarized both consistent and contradictory comments for each value. Over 2,000 comments were received, the vast majority of those validating the values. The priorities chosen most often were reducing commute time, sound financial plan, and improving transit between Portland and Vancouver.

Results from a voluntary (not random) survey can be found in the Environmental Impact Statement Public and Agency Involvement Scoping Update distributed at the November 30, 2005 Task Force meeting.

<sup>2</sup> [www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org)

**Action:** No action required.

## VII. Evaluation Framework

Mike Baker provided an overview of the Evaluation Criteria. The evaluation framework sets the process by which the project team will screen and evaluate components and alternatives. Hal noted that specific concerns and comments would be received section by section.

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

### Criterion 1: Community Livability and Human Resources

- *Proposed a criterion that measures the impacts of transportation on land use.*
- *Is adding “prehistoric” to criterion 1.6 a requirement of NEPA?*  
(Measuring impacts on prehistoric cultures is a requirement.)
- *Requested that technical changes and changes based on opinion be noted as such.*
- *Task Force members requested that criterion 1.8 include “regional plans” since this is a regional issue.*
- *Requested positive language in criteria 1.1 through 1.7.*
- *Proposed that criterion 1.9 include a means of addressing the community’s interest in an architecturally significant bridge.*

### Criterion 2: Mobility, Reliability, Accessibility, Congestion Reduction, and Efficiency

- *Redundant language in the phrase “delay on I-5 in the I-5 corridor” in criteria 2.1 and 2.2.*
- *Requested that I-5 corridor be defined for clarification, and that “I-5 corridor” and “Bridge Influence Area” need to be used uniformly in both columns.*
- *Questioned the addition of criterion 2.6 specifying vehicle throughput.*  
(Task Force members wanted vehicle and person throughput separated. High occupancy vehicle lanes would increase person throughput, but not vehicle throughput. Need to measure both mass transit and cars.)
- *Requested better wording of criterion 2.4 because it only seeks to maintain accessibility in the Bridge Influence Area. The Bridge Influence Area connects people to other areas and facilities as well.*

### Criterion 3: Modal Choice

- *Expressed concern that criterion 3.4 is out of place because it decreases modal choice.*
- *Suggested that a distinction between discretionary and non-discretionary single occupancy vehicle travel be made in criterion 3.4.*

### Criterion 4: Safety

- *Requested clarification of criterion 4.3’s performance measure, because it was interpreted to be recommending further lift restrictions.*

(Staff does not intend to increase the hours of the day when bridge lifts are prohibited; they will assess lift restrictions as an outcome of possible alternatives.)

- *Task Force members asked if Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards are automatic.*

(Staff added ADA language to performance measure 4.2 for clarity.)

#### **Criterion 5: Regional Economy; Freight Mobility**

- *The language in criteria 5.5 and 5.3 should mirror each other.*
- *Similarities in criteria 5.2 and 5.4.*
- *Freight movement is important to ports.*

#### **Criterion 6: Stewardship of Natural Resources**

- *Asked that the words “enhance” and “maintain” be used instead of the current language.*
- *Confusion over grammatical changes made by resource agencies.*

(Resource agencies requested the language.)

- *Request that facility operations, in criterion 6.6, should not refer to vehicles consuming more energy.*

#### **Criterion 7: Distribution of Benefits and Impacts**

No changes.

#### **Criterion 8: Cost Effectiveness and Financial Resources**

No changes.

#### **Criterion 9: Bi-State Cooperation**

No changes.

#### **Criterion 10: Constructability**

- *Questioned criterion 10.3 because they wanted to accommodate future technologies, not expansion.*

(The criterion reflected the possible expandability of the project. Members replied that they were talking about technology.)

**Action:** No action required. Task Force members were requested to forward any additional comments to staff prior to the anticipated approval of the Evaluation Framework at the February 1 Task Force meeting. It was emphasized that, when measuring criteria, the outcome, rather than the words used, is what matters.

### **VIII. 2006 Meeting Schedule and Topics for February Meeting**

The schedule for meetings in 2006 was distributed to the members.

#### ***Next meeting Date/Location:***

Wednesday, February 1, 2006, 4:00–6:30 p.m.  
OAME, Main Conference Room  
4134 North Vancouver (at North Skidmore)  
Portland, Oregon

***Tentative Agenda***

Discussion and adoption of evaluation criteria. Introduction to project components.

*1-24-06*