

**Community and Environmental Justice Group  
Meeting #15**

August 16, 2007  
5:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Vancouver Housing Authority  
2500 Main Street  
Vancouver, WA 98660

***Agenda***

Meeting Objectives:

- Review technical reports – Historical, Neighborhood and Population
- Plan air quality forum
- Review group membership, structure, and roles
- Review CRC outreach and public comment activities

Dinner	5:30 p.m.
Welcome, introductions and announcements	6:00 p.m.
Review meeting purpose and draft agenda	6:05 p.m.
Project Updates	6:10 p.m.
Technical Reports – Historical, Neighborhood and Population	6:15 p.m.
Air Quality Forum	6:45 p.m.
Review group membership, structure, and roles	7:15 p.m.
Review CRC outreach and public comment activities	7:50 p.m.
Public comment	8:20 p.m.
Close meeting	8:30 p.m.

**Meeting:** Community and Environmental Justice Group

**Date:** Thursday, July 19, 2007

**Location:** Vancouver Housing Authority, 2500 Main Street, Vancouver, Washington

**Members Present**

John Benson  
Dave Frei, Co-Chair  
Ed Garren  
Anne McEnerny-Ogle  
Dave Skagen  
Michelle Tworoger, Co-Chair  
Marcia Ward  
Nikki Williams

**Members Absent**

Diana Avalos  
Jonath Colon-Montesi  
Kris Long  
Connie Sherrard  
Matt Whitney

**CRC Staff Present**

Danielle Cogan  
Heather Gundersen  
Jeff Heilman  
Peter Markgraf  
Meg Matthews  
Kris Strickler

**Guests Present**

Debbie Elven-Snyder, C-Tran  
Jeff Gerritsen  
Peg Johnson  
Suzette Pump  
William Pump  
Carol Schuler

*Participants are identified by their full names in the first instance and their first names thereafter.*

**Introductions**

Dave Frei and Michelle Tworoger introduced themselves as the new co-chairs of the CEJG. All CEJG members, guests, and staff introduced themselves. The two CEJG co-chairs will alternate leading meetings, beginning with Dave Frei.

Dave Frei presented the agenda. CEJG will examine current and future roles in the project. There are multiple facets of the CEJG, and their role will change over the next several years. He wants to solicit help from CRC staff to determine CEJG's actions during the project's different stages.

**Setting Context and Goals for CEJG**

Dave Frei went on, saying that the CEJG will continue after the Draft EIS is released and the Task Force disbands. The Draft EIS creates the big picture, but it does not create the project down to the inch. Between the Draft and Final EIS, CEJG can have input on the details. After the Final EIS, issues will arise during design, so it is important that the community remain involved.

Dave Frei asked: What are CEJG's goals before the Draft EIS? Possible answers include:

- Guiding staff;
- Encouraging public involvement;
- Providing feedback on communication strategies. How is the communication occurring? Is public receiving and responding to information? Is the response being heard?

Dave Frei elaborated on the public involvement process, saying that it is important for the CEJG to monitor community involvement. Between now and next spring, CEJG can concentrate on facilitating quality connections between CRC staff and the community (e.g., by communicating hot button issues to staff).

Dave Frei said that he wants to identify CEJG objectives before and after the release of the DEIS. The post DEIS activities can go on the back burner at the moment, but CEJG might want to talk about specific mitigation details, such as intersections and sound walls.

Dave Frei had asked CRC staff to bring a project schedule to guide the CEJG in its decision making process and clarify when different decisions happen. Dave said it is not clear when specific decisions are made and finalized.

John Benson responded that a handle on specific timelines and decisions helps the groups that they represent by making the project less ethereal.

Dave Frei said that just because someone represents a group does not necessarily mean they speak for everyone within that group. CEJG's role should be to guide the staff communications process to be sure the right messages come through. Members should focus on how the project connects to the community and the players.

Anne McEnerny-Ogle said that the CRC was not communicating with the community.

Ed Garren asked about CEJG's role specifically on the Draft EIS. Would CEJG provide specific or general recommendations to the CRC? Ed cited the example of diesel particulate emissions. Because construction equipment uses high sulfur diesel, one of the mitigation requirements could be that all the construction vehicles use low sulfur diesel and employ technologies to reduce particulate emissions. Ed asked if CEJG can put that specific requirement into the DEIS.

Dave Frei answered that CEJG is not crafting the DEIS, and they serve in an advisory capacity. Mitigation measures will be included in the DEIS, and CEJG can offer community support to any of the mitigation measures. However, CEJG is not in a position to require it.

Ed answered that CEJG's role should be to raise every issue that affects communities, not to worry about how to pay for them. CEJG should try to get everything it wants.

Dave Frei added that CEJG's job is to make sure that all voices get out, but he questioned the value of simply listing issues. The groups need to ensure that community voices are heard and represented in the DEIS.

Danielle Cogan noted that air quality is a hot button issue. There will be meetings about specific issues in the Draft EIS, and the CRC suggests an air quality panel in November. These panels are one way for the community to be involved. The Draft Technical Reports Coordination Plan shows how CEJG can raise issues and influence the process.

Ed agreed, saying that most concerns can be consolidated into a few major issues. He stated that vibration, noise mitigation and diesel emissions will be the biggest issues on Hayden Island.

Danielle answered that it is important to look at each issue and see which communities have specific needs and concerns.

Anne asked what these issue meetings will look like. She doesn't want just one expert from the CRC on a panel. She wants to hear both sides of each issue, including both monitoring and modeling.

Dave Frei clarified that Danielle said the panels would include diverse opinions. CEJG could guide these panels and encourage discussion by opening them to the public and CVTV. A panel could be guided by the CRC. That is an example of what the CEJG could create so the community could be involved.

Anne suggested that CEJG should figure out who each member represents and keep account of where all the negotiations take place.

Dave Frei responded that CEJG's role is not to negotiate, but to see if messages are communicated and if underrepresented communities are heard. CEJG can guide public conversation, but elected officials are in charge of negotiations.

Anne asked Kris Strickler to repeat his comments from the Vancouver City Council meeting.

Kris answered that the project goal is to talk to as many communities as possible. He went on to say that the CRC needs to know what information different groups need. Although it is impossible to incorporate everything into the final design, the CRC must account for how they answer and deal with all the comments they receive from the community.

Kris added that the CRC appreciates help finding audiences they are missing. The CRC staff spends most of its time talking to the public. They also want to capture voices from people who don't attend neighborhood association meetings.

Anne said she went door-to-door at Vancouver businesses, and no one knew about the possible Main Street alignment, even though the City Council said that they were happy with the notification. Anne stated that the entire community knew nothing about mass transit on Main Street. She said that communication is a huge problem.

Anne suggested posting signs in potentially affected communities. Further, she suggested using GIS data to send postcards to everyone affected by the project.

Anne said people don't know there are mass transit options on Main Street, and if people don't know, they can't comment on a decision that will be made in 5 weeks.

Dave Frei clarified that there will be no decision in 5 weeks. Rather, there will be a presentation to the Vancouver City Council. He stated that the alignment will be decided in March. There will be a recommendation in November. The public should continue to comment on alignment issues.

Anne said that the people she talks to say that it is not right to wait several months for information. They want to know about options as soon alignment maps appear.

Dave Frei said that part of the discussion is whether people are hearing about alignment options.

Ed added that the CRC has been good at communicating about what is going on. However, all previous transit alignment maps were along I-5. When the alignment was planned for Main, Ed said that the City should have sent out a postcard. Ed said that another issue is the air quality monitoring versus modeling. He said that a WSDOT representative came to a Hayden Island meeting. After some questioning, she said WSDOT doesn't have any monitoring equipment, and what does exist is hard to use. Once that was on the table, the group understood why WSDOT was

selling modeling rather than monitoring. Ed said that the group wants WSDOT to get some equipment so that monitoring could be done. He stated that he doesn't want CEJG to write an Environmental Impact Statement that lets anyone off the hook.

Michelle asked if there has been a mailing to all business owners.

Danielle answered that CRC wanted to wait until the impacts were clearer; the type and extent of impacts varies by location. However, CRC staff met recently with project partners to develop effective communication strategies with those who might be affected.

Peg Johnson said that everyone would be affected by the Main Street alignment.

Danielle answered that there are many different kinds of impacts, and the CRC wants to work with groups to identify those impacts. For example, CRC staff met with the Uptown Business Association last month. CRC staff also attend neighborhood association meetings and speak about all alignment options.

Anne asked for clarification about CEJG's policy on visitors outside the CEJG table speaking.

Dave Frei answered that CEJG wants to keep discussion within the established group. Meetings include a public comment period for guests.

Anne said that she is not waiting for CRC staff to speak to the community, and she printed 150 invitations to people on Main Street. The invitations did not state potential impacts, but people could see the effects on their properties. Anne stated that people want to be involved and notified as soon as possible. Also, Anne said that candidates for elected office should be asked questions about the CRC before the election, not afterwards when the Draft EIS comes out.

Kris stated that they are trying to do outreach with the staff on hand. He requested an invitation for CRC staff if CEJG members hold meetings on impacts.

Anne said that people at her meeting did not know about Main Street, and people were surprised that they had not been told about it. She said that she had to go to RTC to get a City of Vancouver workshop schedule. Anne said CEJG's role was not to tell people the impacts, but to increase involvement in the process and to ask CRC why people had not been contacted. She asked why it should be left up to neighborhood associations, which are volunteer groups with limited resources.

Dave Frei said that these issues are at the core of the discussion. Dave suggested that Anne should guide CRC by working with them to highlight missing voices.

Anne added that the CRC should send a postcard to properties within 500 feet of potential transit alignments based on GIS data. She said the CRC website does not include maps from the Vancouver City Council meeting.

Kris answered that the website does not include every PowerPoint presentation, but it does offer all project maps, which form the basis of staff presentations.

Anne suggested that the maps should be dated because they are public documents. Ed added that maps should have revision dates, since the project is always changing.

Ed suggested that sending postcards to potentially affected parties would avoid making them feel ambushed.

Michelle said she went door-to-door on Hayden Island, because it's hard to reach some people otherwise. She relayed that people did not know about light rail alignments. She is willing to encourage people to attend upcoming meetings.

Kris agreed that it is difficult to reach everyone and communicate information when it changes frequently. They are trying to formulate a plan so all agencies understand who to contact about potential impacts. Notification about every change is not always plausible.

Ed said the process is a bureaucratic nightmare. He reiterated that CRC should utilize direct mail notification to tell people what's being considered. If bureaucracy prohibits that communication because impacts aren't final, it should adapt to the project's dynamic nature.

Kris said CRC is trying to address that issue. Office hours are one way to do so, and the project is generating right of way plan maps for mailing.

Anne asked when notifications will go out.

Danielle answered that notifications will go out in a month. However, she emphasized that because impacts vary by place, CRC needs to be as accurate as possible to avoid needlessly raising alarm. She expressed the desire to work with the CEJG to find the best way to talk to the community. She suggested meeting in a smaller group to discuss communication strategies.

Dave Frei asked the group to return to the agenda and to continue the previous discussion offline.

Ed suggested developing a postcard announcing an informational meeting about the Main Street alignment option. The postcard could include a link to relevant maps online.

Danielle responded that CRC would check with other project agencies and come back to CEJG.

Ed submitted a motion that such a postcard be developed.

Kris offered a proposal that the CRC put together a one page explanation of the proposal, possibly sending it on Monday or Tuesday of the following week.

Ed suggested that cards go out to people along every alignment. Danielle answered that cards will go to every alignment.

Anne asked where people would be able to see their house on a map. Kris answered that there would be several different opportunities to see the maps.

Anne asked if maps or notices could be posted in local businesses along Main Street, like Walgreens and Dairy Queen. CEJG represents low income people, some without computers or cars, so the group needs alternate ways of presenting information. Kris answered that some of these ideas are doable and added that it is helpful to hear them.

Nikki Williams recalled that EJAG volunteers went to each house along the Interstate Max alignment for four weekends in a row. She said that when someone from the community is doing the work, it becomes a partnership between agencies and communities, and the community can educate itself.

*[There was general agreement.]*

Anne said that City of Vancouver has a policy about the number of pages neighborhood associations can print in newsletters and asked how the CRC could address that issue.

Kris answered that fliers, postcards, and other material could be provided by CRC on a case-by-case basis. However, he cautioned that showing all alternatives takes 30 sheets of 11x17 paper, the size of which makes distribution cost prohibitive. He reiterated CRC's desire to help distribute information.

Ed suggested a simplified map showing alignments. The process needs streamlining, but it keeps reverting to a detailed, time-consuming procedure where CRC doesn't have all the answers, but is trying to inform people. Ed suggested that the CRC send Anne materials to hand out. He said that something should be done in the next 14 days.

Anne said that she copied portions of the Main Street section of the alignment map for her use. People care about the things in front of their business, home, or school.

Dave asked the group to pull back to the agenda. He said that there are at least three public open houses in the next month.

Anne asked if any meetings are scheduled in upper Vancouver. Danielle answered that the CRC would meet with the Uptown Village Association in September to talk about the transit alignments on Main Street and I-5. Anne said that Uptown Village Association is not an open meeting, and she suggested having an open meeting somewhere.

Dave asked to continue the discussion about the goals and objectives in the next 6-8 months. He said that there are two items to discuss, and he asked Heather Gundersen and Jeff Heilman from the CRC project team to describe the technical data coming out this summer and fall, and to relate it to the community.

### **Project Development Schedule**

Jeff referred to the Project Development Schedule which was distributed to group members. He explained that different phases of environmental decision making occur in 2007, 2008, and 2009. In 2007, the focus is on the Draft EIS, Locally Preferred Alternative, and potential mitigation. In 2008, emphasis will be on the one alternative put forward for the Final EIS, as well as design refinement and detailed mitigation discussions. The Record of Decision (ROD) should be issued in 2009, which includes specific impacts and specific mitigation. As the process continues, the public will be involved with design issues, and they can make suggestions about how different elements like transit stations should look. Design charettes could be used to refine the specific mitigation measures.

Anne asked about potential mitigation. If an individual claims there would be an impact to their business or property, does the DEIS have to address that?

Jeff answered that the comment must be addressed in the Final EIS. The DEIS will not have a formal written response to comments, but they will be considered.

Anne said that if people don't know about the project, they will not be able to make comments by November.

Jeff answered that the DEIS will be published in February, and the November CEJG meeting date is not a drop dead date. Anne reiterated that people must know what the project is before they can comment.

## **Draft Technical Reports Coordination Plan**

Heather discussed the Draft Technical Reports Coordination Plan which was distributed to group members. She said CRC was interested in helping CEJG find their role in this area. There will be approximately 20 technical reports, and CRC identified the ones where CEJG expressed interest in previous meetings. CEJG could have panels on key issues like air quality, bringing in relevant speakers. It will take a few meetings to decide on panel formats for issues like air quality. She stated that the CRC has heard from the CEJG that the air quality panel is important.

Heather summarized what CRC hoped to hear from CEJG on each panel:

- **Noise and Vibration:** The methodology to determine impacts is set. In October, CRC could present some of the potential impacts and show the methodology. Next month, they could bring a map of all the noise monitoring.
- **Neighborhoods and Population:** CEJG influence is critical. Some of the impacts have been identified. Heather suggested that CEJG could have substantial impact by telling CRC whether they are interpreting impacts correctly.
- **Environmental Justice:** The project has census data, but CEJG's input on demographics will help CRC be more accurate as it determines the baseline existing conditions. Environmental Justice is one of the last reports because it uses information from the other technical sections. CEJG could discuss Environmental Justice impacts in October or November.
- **Visual Impacts:** Existing methodology compares alternatives to existing conditions. CRC could bring photos and methods next month or wait until the preliminary impacts become available. Jeff added that they would like to develop drawings of visual impacts, including the potential bridge. Heather continued that findings can be subjective, and different perspectives help determine the best decision.
- **Land use:** CRC is comparing neighborhood plans, along with the Vancouver Central City Plan.

Anne asked where the CRC obtained the neighborhood action plans, because neighborhoods do not have to share the latest versions with the city. She suggested that the CRC obtain plans through the neighborhood associations. Anne also said that the City Land Use plan only extends to Fourth Plain Boulevard.

Heather said that land use is one of the disciplines that extends beyond the actual project footprint. The CEJG co-chairs could tell CRC what members would like to see.

Anne asked if the reports would include zoning maps. Heather responded affirmatively. CRC needs feedback from CEJG members and their broader neighborhoods.

Anne suggested using technology to distribute information to neighborhoods. She suggested videotaping presentations.

Kris answered that people might not be comfortable speaking on camera.

Dave Frei suggested that the group could decide how to make the information available.

Danielle said that the CRC is in the planning phase of constructing a two minute video about the project. She said the goal is to use as few resources as possible, and CEJG can help with the process.

Ed suggested that a CD or DVD could be mailed for use on personal computers. The technical end is simple.

Heather returned to the technical reports. On Historic Impacts, the State wants to know how the community feels about historical resources. There is opportunity to affect the process.

Anne asked Heather to distinguish between input and discussion on the draft collaboration summary table. Heather answered that input is where the public can have a direct impact, and discussion is data sharing.

Anne said that there would not be much direct input on several topics. Heather agreed that little direct input is possible in some areas. Methodologies determine whether there is a measurable impact. There may be more input on specific issues after the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative.

Anne asked for the noise monitoring data and the location of the monitoring on Main Street. Kris and Heather answered that they have the noise monitoring information. Kris and Heather added that there is short term and long term noise monitoring, and the short term consists of 15 minutes during peak periods.

Ed stated that when the CRC has committed to something, they should have public disclosure. He asserted that internal commitments are not always communicated to CEJG, and the CRC forgets to report back to CEJG when they have looked at issues.

Danielle noted that requests should be listed as action items.

Ed suggested that the website have a separate section for CEJG, along with other specific areas with tabs.

Danielle answered that the website has different group pages, and she agreed that more issue-specific details could be conveyed online.

Ed said CEJG might not need a panel on air quality. He would have appreciated if WSDOT had said upfront that they don't have air monitoring equipment. Ed said that he wants to make informed decisions rather than having to fight for something.

Anne stated that CEJG should fight for monitoring. Anne asked for information farther in advance of the August meeting in order to share it with communities beforehand. Anne asked if the technical reports would be presented at public meetings.

Kris explained that the public review process does not include technical reports.

Heather said that they could provide methods and data reports.

Anne asked for the wording from other Draft EIS's and a summary of the methods used to create technical reports.

Danielle asked the group if they want a summary of how technical reports are written, particularly on the hot button issues. The group replied yes.

*[The CEJG took a 5 minute break]*

## **Review of CRC Activities**

Danielle Cogan presented two documents summarizing public comments. The first document went to the CRC Task Force in June and summarized public comments from March through the Task Force meeting. The second summarized email comments from June to the CEJG July meeting and included a letter from the Shumway Neighborhood Association to the CRC co-chairs.

Anne noted that the Shumway Neighborhood Association letter came from the Neighborhood Association and not the chair.

Danielle summarized the public comments and letters written to the Columbia River Crossing staff.

Danielle distributed the list of CRC's Public Outreach Events for summer 2007.

Danielle distributed an open house meeting plan for two October events – one in Vancouver and one in Portland. Danielle asked CEJG if the key messages make sense.

Dave Frei suggested putting the key points on the agenda for August. Danielle also welcomed feedback before the meeting.

Dave Skagen asked if maps could be displayed in abandoned buildings. Danielle said she would contact City of Vancouver and others to see if there are any underutilized properties or businesses.

Dave Frei proposed discussing action items related to developing a communication strategy at the next meeting. He suggested creating a standing time block to evaluate whether communication needed improvement.

Ed suggested establishing minimum attendance criteria for group members.

Carol Schuler said that group members should be responsible for distributing information to their neighborhoods.

Anne added that Task Force members had not been notifying constituents of progress points. Danielle asked who she meant. Anne stated that Ed Lynch did not share information with his church. Anne suggested reminding Task Force members about their responsibility to share CRC information with their communities.

Jeff Gerritsen asked if CRC has a relationship with Metro. Danielle answered affirmatively.

Marcia requested a correction to the June meeting notes. Regarding the placement of I-5 in Vancouver, Marcia wished to add that she asked if anything positive came from the split.

Ed said, regarding the June meeting notes, that the chair's role is different from group to group. His intention was to say that the chair is less vocal in CEJG than in other groups.

Anne asked Peter Markgraf to correct the spelling of her name in the previous meeting notes.

Ed suggested that they could use the former Hayden Island Yacht Club as a meeting location. Danielle said that sometimes the bathrooms don't work.

*[The CEJG meeting was dismissed.]*

### **Action Items**

- Direct mail notification regarding project alignments and impacts

- Public display of project maps
- Air quality panel format
- Technical report methodology summary
- Noise monitoring data including the location of the monitoring on Main Street
- Review the key messages of the Open House Meeting Plan
- Establish a standing block of time to discuss communication strategy



## Columbia River Crossing DRAFT Right-of-Way Communications Approach

---

The project is in the environmental analysis and preliminary engineering phase. This is when we identify all the potential:

- routes for transit
- locations for the new bridge, if needed
- land for highway widening or interchange improvements
- temporary sites needed for construction staging

We are required to investigate more options than we will ultimately need in order to understand the various benefits and costs these alternatives may have on the surrounding community. The project team has been working hard to work within existing right-of-way whenever possible to reduce the number of land parcels we may require. However, on a project of this size, some property acquisition is unavoidable.

The project team has assessed all the potentially affected properties for all of the alignments being studied. These are properties along the alignments, not necessarily property acquisitions. Ultimately, the number of lots affected will be less, once the Locally Preferred Alternative is selected and right-of-way is needed to construct the project.

### *Proposed approach:*

- Host up to eight meetings: two for each category of acquisition, i.e., transit south, highways north.
- Invite each person/household to a meeting regarding the project and its potential impacts. These meetings will focus on common issues relating to ROW process.
- Follow up with individual meetings.

### *Purpose of the meetings:*

- To provide people with information that is common regardless of individual circumstances:
  - about the project and potential alignments
  - about the project schedule and process
  - about the ROW schedule and process
- To introduce people to the ROW staff with whom they may be working.

- To answer questions.
- To set up individual follow-up meetings with people to begin discussions regarding individual circumstances.

*Proposed 2007 timeline*

<b>July</b>	Identify specific parcels potentially affected by the project alternatives.
<b>July- August</b>	Prepare meeting invitations, letters and mailing lists of potentially affected parcels.
<b>August</b>	Schedule a series of meetings for property owners - highways north, highways south, transit north, transit south.
<b>August</b>	Mail invitation letters to property owners.
<b>September- first two weeks</b>	Hold open house meetings for property owners.
<b>September- October</b>	Hold individual meetings with property owners.

DRAFT



700 WASHINGTON STREET  
SUITE 300  
VANCOUVER, WA 98660  
360-737-2726 | 503-256-2726

August 16, 2007

Dear Property Owner,

Columbia River Crossing (CRC) is a bridge, transit and highway improvement project sponsored by the Oregon and Washington departments of transportation. The project is designed to improve the safety and mobility problems on I-5 between Portland and Vancouver. When completed, it will expand people's options for improved travel on I-5 between SR 500 and Columbia Blvd.

The project is in the environmental analysis and preliminary engineering phase and the staff is identifying all potential solutions including:

- routes for transit
- potential locations for a new bridge
- land for highway widening or interchange improvements
- sites needed for construction staging

The project is required to investigate all feasible options in order to understand how they will affect the adjacent communities and environment. We are studying five alternatives, and have included a fact sheet with additional information about them. We hope to have a preferred alternative and alignment by summer 2008, although we will begin findings discussions on some of our analysis by the end of this year. The project team has been working to stay within existing right-of-way whenever possible to reduce the number of land parcels we may require. However, on a project of this size, some property acquisition is unavoidable. This process will be governed by state law and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policy Act of 1970.

At this point, your property has been identified as one that may be impacted by one or more of the highway or transit alignment alternatives we are investigating. We won't know with certainty whether your land will be impacted until a preferred alignment is recommended in spring 2008.

We feel it is important to notify you early in the process about potential impacts to your property and to provide you with an opportunity to review the current alignments and proposals. This will also enable you to ask questions and understand the options available to you if a portion or all of your property is required in the future.

We will hold meetings in your community to answer common questions about the project, discuss how and when we will determine specific property needs, and work together to determine how we can stay in communication with you as decision-making moves forward. We also anticipate being able to hold one-on-one meetings if we aren't able to answer your questions satisfactorily during the public meetings.

Right-of-Way Property Owner  
August 16, 2007  
Page 2

Please attend either of these meetings to learn more about the potential impact to your property:

Sat. Sept. 8, 10 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.  
Hayden Island Yacht Club  
12050 N. Jantzen Drive  
Portland, OR 97217

Mon. Sept. 17, 6 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.  
Hayden Island Yacht Club  
12050 N. Jantzen Drive  
Portland, OR 97217

We understand the uncertainty and potential worry this letter can cause. For more information you can visit the CRC project web page [www.columbiarivercrossing.org](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org). If you can't wait until the public meetings, please call our office at either 503-256-2726 in Oregon or 360-737-2726 in Washington and ask to speak with Lynn Rust, the project's engineering manager. We can arrange for a one-on-one meeting if needed.

Sincerely,

John Osborn, PE  
CRC Project Director, ODOT

Doug Ficco, PE  
CRC Project Director, ODOT

JO: DF: lm

Enclosure  
cc: Project Controls

DRAFT

# Property Purchases and Easements

Columbia River Crossing (CRC) is a bridge, transit and highway improvement project for I-5 between Vancouver and Portland.

## The project will improve conditions on I-5 by:

- Preventing congestion from spreading to 16 hours each weekday by 2030
- Providing reliable high capacity transit service
- Improving safety on the I-5 bridge and highway
- Moving goods more efficiently for a healthy economy
- Providing safe access across the Columbia River for pedestrians and bicyclists

To make these improvements CRC will need to make room for a new bridge, a transit line, and additional lanes on I-5 across the Columbia River. The project team is working to stay within the existing right of way, but some land acquisition will be unavoidable.

## How will CRC decide which properties need to be acquired?

The team is in the process of evaluating property needs for the various bridge, transit and highway alignments for the alternatives being analyzed. Some alignments will be taken out of consideration by fall 2007, more in spring 2008. The final decisions will occur during the engineering design phase in 2008 and 2009. CRC will keep in touch with all potentially affected property owners as the decision-making process proceeds.

In addition to property purchases, CRC may seek to gain a property easement (right to use) or enter into a lease with a property owner. Easements are sought when access to an area through public streets is not possible. Leases are typically entered into when property is needed for a short term use. Examples may be for construction equipment storage or utility relocation.

## What is the process for purchasing property?

The process typically involves several steps:

- A real estate expert from the project team will prepare an appraisal, with input from the property owner, to determine the fair market value of the property.
- The appraisal is reviewed by a second appraiser from the project team.
- An offer is made to purchase the property.
- The owner is given time to consider the offer and discuss their concerns with the project team.
- The project team purchases the property and provides relocation assistance to owners and tenants according to state and federal law.

## When will the purchases occur?

Properties will not be purchased until funding becomes available. The soonest we anticipate this occurring is 2009 or 2010.

## What if a property owner doesn't want to sell? Or, if the owner and state can't agree on a purchase price?

If someone does not want to sell their property, the state will work closely with them in a cooperative manner to negotiate mutually agreeable terms. In extreme cases, the state may exercise eminent domain although this rarely occurs.

The compensation paid for properties is the result of an independent appraisal process that ensures the owner receives, and the taxpayer pays, no more and no less than the fair market value of a property.

## Types of property purchases:

- Full purchase – The state acquires an entire property.
- Partial acquisition – In some cases, the state only needs a portion of a property to meet the project needs and will make an offer to purchase part of the property.
- Easement – An easement is the limited right to use someone else's land. In the case of CRC, the state may request a temporary or permanent easement to gain access to the construction site or to relocate utilities.
- Lease – It is possible that the project team will only need temporary access to a site. In that case, the state may enter into a lease until the land is no longer needed.

## How can I get involved?

- Visit the website at [www.ColumbiaRiverCrossing.org](http://www.ColumbiaRiverCrossing.org) to sign up for updates
- Attend an advisory group meeting
- Invite CRC staff to your group to discuss the project

## How can I comment on the project?

Email: [feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org)

Mail: 700 Washington St, Suite 300  
Vancouver, WA 98660

Phone: 360-737-2726 or 503-256-2726

Fax: 360-737-0294

For more information on Property Purchases and Easements, please contact:

Lynn Rust: 360-816-2177

*July 31, 2007*



**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) INFORMATION** Materials can be provided in alternative formats: large print, Braille, cassette tape, or on computer disk for people with disabilities by calling the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) at (360) 705-7097. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact OEO through the Washington Relay Service at 7-1-1.

**TITLE VI NOTICE TO PUBLIC** It is the Washington State Department of Transportation's (WSDOT) policy to assure that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin and sex, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise discriminated against under any of its federally funded programs and activities. For language interpretation services, please contact the project office at (866) 396-2726. Any person who believes his/her Title VI protection has been violated, may file a complaint with WSDOT's Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO). For Title VI complaint forms and advice, please contact OEO's Title VI Coordinator at (360) 705-7098.

**DRAFT: POTENTIAL QUESTIONS FOR Residential Survey**

This survey is intended for Hayden Island residents in order to supplement CRC's current income data, which is based on Census information. The survey will also provide detailed environmental justice information about the community.

*(Please have every adult in your household complete a survey.)*

**What do you consider to be your ethnic background?**

- Hispanic       Native American       African American  
 Asian       Alaskan Native       Middle Eastern  
 White       Other \_\_\_\_\_

**How many members are in your household including yourself?** \_\_\_\_\_

**What was your total household income in 2006?**

(Please report your full salary, wages, tips, etc before taxes.) Less than \$10,000

- \$10,000 to \$19,999
- \$20,000 to \$29,999
- \$30,000 to \$39,999
- \$40,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to \$74,999
- \$75,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 or more

**Do you own a car, truck or van?**

**How do you usually get to work?** *(If you use more than one method of transportation during the trip, mark the box of the one used for most of the distance).*

- Car, truck, or van
- Bus
- Streetcar
- Light Rail
- Amtrak
- Taxicab
- Motorcycle
- Bicycle
- Walk
- Work at home
- Other method
- Not applicable

**How many times per week do you ride public transit?**

**What would have to change to make it more desirable for you to ride transit?**

**What are your top three concerns or desires for transportation in your neighborhood and in the region?**

**Have you received information on the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project?** Yes or No



## **CEJG**

EMAIL PUBLIC COMMENTS, 07/17/07 – 08/10/07

### **Wednesday, July 17, 2007**

Fix the Delta Park bottleneck now!

### **Wednesday, July 17, 2007**

I just wanted to tell you that I enjoyed your presentation at our neighborhood meeting. Rose village (Rosemier) neighborhood. I'm sorry there were rude people there.

What I really want you to know is that I like both plans for the light rail.

People need to plan for the future, not hang back for picky reasons. The plan looks good and I'm sure with the people you have on your task force and all the grips the public has had that you'll work out the kinks that come up.

We need light rail. Portland has gotten a lot of use out of theirs and the neighborhoods have improved around the rail.

Of course I can remember when we had street cars all over Portland and it's too bad they were removed.

### **Friday, July 20, 2007**

I was looking up the address since I'm coming down to the CRC office for a meeting later today and notice in the Title VI information paragraph that Paul Krueger's name is listed as a contact for language interpretation services. That does not make sense to me. Paul is the environmental manager for the SR 520 Bridge Replacement project.

I don't see how he could be a contact for language interpretation services for CRC.

### **Friday, July 20, 2007**

My husband and I own a home and a small business in downtown Vancouver. My job is in downtown Portland. I travel across the I-5 bridge every day and catch the light rail train at Delta Park for my commute into downtown Portland. I have been watching the Columbia River Crossing progress closely. I am a big advocate of sustainability and a strong believer in public transportation. I would love to see the light rail brought across the river into Vancouver for numerous reasons. One being I could eliminate the need for a car entirely in my commute each day. Which would be one less car traveling across the I-5 bridge. There are many other fellow Washingtonians who ride the light rail every day who would agree with me.

Keep up the good work. I am enjoying reading the updates on the website.

### **Monday, July 23, 2007**

I am trying to locate who would be able to provide data for the date and time of I-5 bridge lifts.

**Tuesday, July 24, 2007**

On the East Coast commuter trains include Amtrak. Have we considered the option of partnering with Amtrak? On the Portland side - the rail station is in a perfect location for bus/max transfers. On the Washington side there is an underutilized parking area and CTran could easily make that a major transfer station.

**Thursday, July 26, 2007**

I sincerely appreciate receiving a reply to my inquiry and will make use of the information provided. From that information I understand that the project's current phase is now largely a closed-door process. Yet I am encouraged that the fifth alternative may still be open to public input. As such, I will prepare my "no build" idea for public submission and scrutiny, and will look for the effective way(s) to get it *seriously* considered by the project team. I would hope to change their current view that this alternative necessarily "...does not meet the project Purpose and Need....," but only "...establishes a baseline for comparison with other alternatives." My research suggests there is a way to save taxpayers *billions* while providing them a much more immediate amelioration to the traffic congestion problems being addressed.

**Thursday, July 26, 2007**

Have you guys taken into consideration, tunneling under the river? you could start the tunnel south of the slough extending into Vancouver. Refurbish and retrofit both of the existing bridges. One for the new light rail line and the other for local access. Have you ever taken into consideration that maybe, one of the reasons we have such a bad traffic problem is because we have no local access bridges into the city's, by far, largest suburbs? Remember, its not just Vancouver anymore. Battleground, Camas and Washougal are now growing with Vancouver. The light rail line could continue north in Vancouver to SR-500. At SR-500 head east to I-205. Then South on I-205 and connect back onto the main line at the Airport interchange.

P.S. When are you gonna start planning the new MAX line down Barbur blvd. (99-W) to Tigard?

**Thursday, July 26, 2007**

As a daily commuter, please be aware that to me light-rail would be a wasted investment. I wouldn't use it and I don't know of any others who would. It's not worth the hassle of slow trains, crowded cars, and smelly people that seem to be part and parcel of light-rail.

**Friday, July 27, 2007**

I am a cyclist and would like to make sure that the bike lanes are adequate for allowing increased bike traffic. I think an alternative bridge should be just a supplemental bridge for Light rail, bus, 3-person carpools, cyclists and pedestrians. This would substantially reduce the cost (less lanes) and provide an incentive to carpool or use public transit options.

**Friday, July 27, 2007**

I have lived in Portland for 35 years. I visited downtown Vancouver for the first time last month. I was very impressed with the nice park and coffee shops, the small-town feel and the overall pleasant experience. I would come back, but...

You don't have light rail. I won't waste my time fighting traffic to get there, when I can hop a speedy and efficient MAX train in Portland and take my family downtown without the hassle and expense of fighting for road space, for parking. I can read, talk with my children, experience my community - something difficult to do when stressed out behind the wheel of a car, trying to avoid aggressive, rude or stupid drivers.

Vancouver's loss, I say.

**Friday, July 27, 2007**

On a recent trip to Disney World I could not help but notice that Disney has not extended the monorail to it's new parks or resorts.

When it built MGM and Animal Kingdom and all the new resorts it invested in fleets of clean, efficient buses and runs frequent trips to get the job of moving people -- lots of people. Even though it has seemingly endless pools of money and a well-documented desire to spend it on the latest, greatest, best and fastest -- Disney has decided that light rail and the monorail are too expensive!

Let's just think about that.

Buses can be clean and even green, (environment friendly), can be run more frequently when needed, can be rerouted when needed; and, most importantly, they can be express buses! (people's time is precious to them, the max is fine to go to a ballgame, but it's slow --too slow. You need express trains or buses to get people out of their cars!)

I speak as a person who has used public transportation and does not resent it -- I believe it's essential, but light rail is just not going to get volumes of people out of their cars.

Sorry, but please -- if Disney can admit they may have been wrong about it maybe here in the Portland-Metro area we can learn to admit it too.

**Friday, July 27, 2007**

I had doubts about light rail when first proposed for Portland. My commute was from the Bonneville Power Administration offices at Lloyd Center to Vancouver. No light rail was coming north and south and the small fortune I paid in taxes to Oregon could be spent elsewhere. I recall that one of the Oregon Governor candidates referred to it as "WPPSS on wheels."

Not anymore. While capacity factors could be better, it is an integral part of transportation alternatives for the "Portland metropolitan" area.

I say "Portland metropolitan" with purpose. We are, in fact, the "Portland-Vancouver" metropolitan area but not so when it comes to transit. Our forefathers should have drawn State boundaries based on geography (east-west) and not on a river. But that is yesterday's news and history's mistake.

That having been said, I do not think it is only the commuters who get to rule the day, especially today's commuters. There are a lot of us non-regular commuters too. This is

really a leadership issue and it will take leaders to educate both commuters and noncommuters alike.

From an economic viewpoint, I don't judge transportation issues based on today's world. I try to take a longer term view. What I see when looked at this way is a connection to the entire of the "metropolitan area" and now south toward Salem being accessible to the "Vancouver metropolitan area" at a pittance of its actual cost.

From a political viewpoint, the question is whether Clark County is ready to make the commitment that we actually live in a "Portland-Vancouver" metropolitan area or whether we don't. I cast my lot with the larger metropolitan area, and in truth no matter how "I vote" that is reality.

At stake is really the view Clark County leaders' view of government's role. Generally speaking, northern Clark County leaders may see little value and not feel as connected to the metropolitan area, while "new Vancouver" east of 205 and "older Vancouver" west of 205 would probably benefit quite a bit. Politically, the 49th legislative district and the 17th leadership probably see value that many in the 18th do not. Note, however, that this too will change as the residential corridors along I-5 continue to grow and the commute gets longer.

Without hopefully undercutting my own argument, even Seattle is moving in this direction. Seattle passed on a – if I recall correctly – 95% subway funded initiative and has since lived to resist it. That sort of Federal largesse is not possible, but they are now exploring and adopting their own full range of transportation alternatives, including light rail.

Finally, I draw from my expertise in the energy area. The Pacific NW-Pacific SW Intertie was built in the early 1960's despite protestations that it would be a colossal waste of money and an activity that government should not undertake. The Intertie is now full; there is no firm power capacity and we are planning for another such transmission line. Billions of barrels of oil have been saved taking advantage of diversity between California and the Pacific Northwest, including substantial benefits for Clark Utilities.

The same diversity is available for transportation, including light rail. But if leaders decide based upon today's world and not that which our grandchildren will inherit, it may not happen and we will have the same regret that Seattle has as it reflects on the subway that could have been.

Best regards, enjoy your columns.

**Friday, July 27, 2007**

I Googled "Columbia River Study" and could not find your web site. You may want make your web site searchable using this term.

**Sunday, July 29, 2007**

I commute to NE Portland, south of the airport via hiway 14 (I get on at exit 10) and 205 bridge. My commute takes about 25 minutes on a slow day, and 15 with light traffic. Typically the worst traffic is on 14 westbound until I reach the 205 on ramps.

Light rail on I-5 would be totally useless to me in my commute. Light rail on 205 would not be much better, as I would have to either take a bus or drive my car to reach the boarding site, and then to the same on the other end. My commute would be longer than it is now. Further, I need to use my car periodically during the work day. Also, since the worst traffic for me is on 14, light rail would do little to moderate it.

Light rail is a prohibitively expensive project, with few redeeming advantages over express busses. Just because much of the money comes from the Federal government and appears to be 'free', it is still taxpayer money. Don't do it.

### **Sunday, July 29, 2007**

I have not kept up real well with the CRC project, but I do have a couple of questions/comments about it. I live in Vancouver and work in NW Portland so I do have a stake in this project.

My questions:

- 1) What % of traffic crossing the I-5/205 bridges at rush hour is just passing through the Metro area?
- 2) Has a Portland/Vancouver bypass route been studied?

My opinion: Regardless of the improvements or the addition of bridges in the Metro area, traffic will continue to worsen. It just seems that adding a short freeway or bypass route from Longview (or Woodland, Salmon Creek) over to the North Plains/Hillsboro area eliminates a bunch of 'passing through' traffic that wouldn't care one way or the other if they went through Vancouver or Portland- they are just looking for the fastest way through. A plus of this is the current commute does not get interrupted for construction.

Before we grow to Seattle like proportions and a new stretch of freeway is not a viable option, I'd look real hard at getting something like this- which to me builds a better logistical infrastructure in the NW and would promote growth to the outlying areas of the bypass route.

If this study has been done, ignore me.

### **Monday, July 30, 2007**

I am interested in, and look forward to, getting involved with the Columbia River Crossing project. Until recently, I was a 5-year resident of Hayden Island, so I am familiar with the CRC project impact to the area. What committee meeting would best serve as a conduit for voicing an opinion and learning more about the project to-date?

### **Tuesday, July 31, 2007**

I need some clarification on the location of the Open House (Drop-In session) for August 11 at Jantzen Beach SuperCenter.

The instructions say outside the mall entrance at the carousel and Target. Will you be at both mall entrances? The carousel entrance is in the middle of the mall. The Target mall entrance is in the north end of the mall. There is no one entrance with both the carousel and Target.

I am sorry that you distributed many postcards with this verbiage on it. Perhaps you can change it on your website to be more specific.

Thank you for your attention.

**Tuesday, July 31, 2007**

I am very excited that there is talk about increasing the through-put (or as we say in the tech field : More Bandwidth) for crossing the Columbia River.

I want to offer an opinion. We all live in a different world now. Our gasoline prices have gone through the roof. There are many new alternatives to fuel that are in the works. I've seen the wind-farms in easter Oregon and Washington going up.. It is a wonderful and exciting sight. One new idea which is of great excitement is "Wind2H"2: It uses the power generated by wind-turbines and uses it to extract Hydrogen and Oxygen from Water.. River Water !!! This is a way of producing mass quantities of Hydrogen for hydrogen powered cars, trains and buses. Internal Combustion Engines can be easily retrofitted to run on Hydrogen, and some day they'll run on water. Trust me I know this, these are secrets about to come out.

We all need to think long and hard, and look well beyond the immediate 10-20 years. We DO need light-rail, we DO need to connect with the ever expanding MAX lines in Portland, and we DO need to stop wasting resources. We Americans are changing, we need to be more in harmony with our environment, or it will die on us for being ignorant. This is the future. To all the people with gas-guzzling vehicles: The party is nearly over.

What we all need to seriously keep in mind, is that the ONLY protection we will have against the activities of the Islamic Jihadist is to fully cut off our need for mid-east oil. This is going to take a few years. But, just imagine, if we cut off their way to finance the trouble they make, then we win, not by force or war, by "Good Old American No-How and Entrepreneurial Spirit". That is where we SHINE! It is what made the U.S.A. the great country is once was and will be again. It is TIME to reclaim our heritage, be smart, and stop thinking only of ourselves and our pocket books and excessive greed. Take care of each other.

Also, we need to have 'enforced' recycling, no excuses.

What kind of city/county/state/country are we leaving to our kids our grand-kids and theirs. Please, I implore you, people. Be SMART, think to the future generations. Let them be proud that we put aside our egos and greedy ways, and bite the bullet and make our future the BEST in the world. We've had our party, and now is the time to buckle down and make history. We Can Do It!!!

Thank you, and God Bless you all, and may He guide us all to what do what is is good and just and visionary. This world is our own creation, let's respect it and all of its inhabitants.

**Tuesday, July 31, 2007**

Out of curiosity, I was wondering how the CRC group will predict the environmental effects of the project on North Portland. Specifically, I was wondering how you will go about quantifying the effect on air quality for locations near I-5 south of Columbia Blvd.

On an unrelated note, I was also wondering when such aspects as the design of the pedestrian/bicycle paths are considered. As far as pedestrian accommodation's are

concerned, I would imagine that minor details take on much greater importance than in other aspects of the bridge project. For example, it seems an extra foot of width on the pedestrian path would have a much more noticeable effect than an extra foot of width in a breakdown lane. Furthermore, such elements as benches or closely-spaced decorative lamps--though unimportant from an engineering perspective--could make an enormous difference in the usefulness of the bridge for pedestrians and downtown residents. Overall, I would guess that designing for the human scale will require an entirely different mindset than engineering for trucks and automobiles.

**Thursday, August 02, 2007**

I would like to start my comments by saying "it's about time" our community leaders are moving in this direction. We had a perfect opportunity many years ago to integrate light rail in our community and did take advantage of available federal funding.

I am one of those Portland commuters that Elizabeth Hovde from the Columbian speak so poorly of in her articles. As a full-time nurse manager at one of the large Portland hospitals for the last 20 years, I do have to cross the river each day. I would love the opportunity to take light rail to work each day. Living in the Salmon Creek area, my true preference would be to have it one day extend up to the 134th interchange, but I would be willing to take a bus down to your proposed site.

Today, I have to either take an express bus all the way into downtown Portland and then hop the Max to Providence Portland Medical Center OR have my husband take me to the Delta Park Max station. The latter is more convenient for my journey but does not reduce car traffic. While we are planning this, we also need to seriously consider the companion "next step"--making a light rail extension to the airport Max line down the 205 corridor. This route is becoming as critical a bottleneck as the I-5 corridor.

This is the kind of topic that will raise strong opinions. I work with change management everyday, so I know these dynamics well. Our community leaders simply cannot base this key decision on those resistant ones that cannot proactively respond. They must move on this and, believe me, soon those resistant citizens will be using the light rail after they see how easy and convenient it is. The fears are unfounded.

Thanks for your hard work on this effort! I personally look forward to riding it in the very near future.

**Thursday, August 02, 2007**

I really enjoyed on your project processing on Columbia River Crossing Study, so I would like to make my behalf comment to this people in Columbia River Crossing. Please share with official person would like taking my comments with them.

I liked your excellent work on your project that better five to six lanes each directions like 10 or 12 lanes included Light Rail and Express Bus. I liked Replacement or Supplement Bridge on your final decision, plus Transit Alignments: I liked N. Jantzen Beach Center downstream or upstream bridge, downtown Vancouver that I think beautiful street name is "Broadway" with 2-way, but I understand either Washington with 2-way. Please do not use one-way! I endorsed for McLoughlin and I-5 that is very beautiful view while people drive their vehicles notice side of Light Rail car runs. Also, I like a "39th Street" or Kiggins Bowl or what do they decide on Light Rail's Destination Sign.

I endorsed subway for light rail in downtown Portland in the future along with Columbia River Crossing Endorsements to allow transportation addresses to release with them for sharing communication information. I ask many people to support for Subway for light rail in Downtown Portland as ask your all organizations write lot of ton letters to TRIMET for NOW as I allow Vancouver and Portland in campaign for Subway Endorsement for fast travel time for allowing people get in home from work or get in work from home both that ease.

I sent email to TRIMET for Orange MAX line separate Yellow MAX line: Orange MAX travels on I-5 with non-stop in North Portland because of people in Vancouver needs getting home early from work, from home to work, too, in adding to Rose Quarter TC for event reasons will be ok. Yellow and Orange MAX lines merge in N. Jantzen Beach go to Vancouver.

In adding to that my endorsement would allow for Tolling Road on I-5 and I-205 both recommendations. I want Tolling Road install on I-5 and I-205 NOW.

I want RED MAX expands to Vancouver MALL with minor adjustment on I-205 recommendations NOW.

Thank you for ensure passage of helping with legislation address.

**Thursday, August 02, 2007**

Please get on with your work and skip the lemonade. You're not going to hear anything you haven't already heard or considered. Speed it up!

**Friday, August 03, 2007**

The first thing you need to do is get a FEDERAL SALES TAX, THEN A STATE SALES TAX TO PAY FOR ALL OF THE STUPIDITY.

The Minn. collapse should have showed you something.

You need to REDUCE the number of vehicles that use bridges.

To do this, reduce the number of people in the UNITED STATES.

To do this, remove all illegals & all IMMIGRANTS that has not been in the UNITED STATES for twenty '20' years.

You people may not realize it , but you are destroying the UNITED STATES the same way as OVERPOPULATION has ruined most of the world.

If the SO CALLED LEADERS cannot do this, then MOTHER NATURE WILL.

It will be by FLOODS, STORMS, DROUGHT, & whatever else MOTHER NATURE has in store for the earth.

Even though I am an ATHEIST, I understand how GOD works.

The EARTH cannot sustain the huge increase in population that is coming. The shortage of OIL & WATER will control the population wither you leaders like it or not.

**Friday, August 03, 2007**

How about e-mail comments? May not be able to attend the events you have planned.

Our daughter Cathy rides C-Tran to school at St. Mary's Academy in downtown Portland daily from the downtown transit center. There are about 60 kids in Clark County who attend St. Mary's so public transportation is important. Currently the bus departs from the downtown transit center and deposits the students at the front door of St. Mary's as the first stop. Returning in the afternoon the bus makes two stops enroute to Vancouver. We hope this service will continue.

**Friday, August 03, 2007**

Do you know if there has been any discussion of replacing the railroad bridge across the Columbia?

My understanding is that it is even older than the 90-year-old northbound I-5 span. I would guess that if any bridge in this region were to collapse, it would be the railroad bridge. The economic implications of such an event would be disastrous.

My impression is that there has been much more emphasis placed on the I-5 bridge than on the railroad bridge. Yet, the railroad bridge seems like it must be equally economically vital and equally in need of replacement.

Is this correct?

**Friday, August 03, 2007**

For the transit alternative that would run along I-5 to Kiggins Bowl, you should consider placing the Kiggins Bowl station on the *east* side of I-5. It could still connect to a park and ride on the west side of I-5 via the recently-completed Burnt Bridge Creek pedestrian bridge.

This scenario would eliminate the need for the light rail to cross I-5 south of Kiggins Bowl. It would also allow for a future extension to the north without the need for a second overpass north of Kiggins Bowl. Thus, it would potentially eliminate the need for two overpasses and significantly reduce costs.

**Saturday, August 04, 2007**

- the combination of the maps and a professional, well-informed staff on Saturday August 4th, Esther Short Park, was well done & informative
- I believe any conversation about the crossing **MUST** include a discussion of the plans to widen I-5 through the Delta Park area; otherwise, anything done to the bridge will be meaningless
- to the non-engineer, I'd pick the least expensive option that:
  - provided light rail
  - took future (15-25 years) traffic density into consideration.

Hope this is helpful

Saturday, August 04, 2007

Has there been consideration of routing "through" traffic that is not stopping in Portland, via I-205 from the I-5/I-205 merge north of Vancouver, and the merge south of Portland?

Especially big trucks? It's possible much of the current traffic volume would be reduced by routing this traffic on I-205 rather than I-5. Long-term, perhaps the highway names could be interchanged, making I-205 the "new" I-5, and make it the preferred route for traffic not stopping in the Portland area.

### **Saturday, August 04, 2007**

Thank you so much for all your knowledge and information this morning as we visited you at the booth in the park. You are very professional and we appreciate all the interfacing you are doing with the community.

In all the rush, we forgot to actually take a comment form with us so here are the questions we had:

1. Why is the light rail only going to go 40 blocks into Clark County and not into the north county or east county where all the growth is?
2. We understand the largest park and ride lot or structure is in the Sunset area of Portland and it is 1/3 of the size proposed for our Lincoln neighborhood!! Why the concentrated size for this park and ride--3 times the largest one in the Portland area--and not more dispersed lots?
3. We are concerned about air quality if a park and ride of this scope is put into our neighborhood. Is there a form of air filter that would be employed for exhaust fumes?
4. What is the length of most light rail lines in Portland? Is ours to be the "shortest"?
5. We note that the church on the north side of the proposed park and ride has a playground just a few feet from the WaDot property line. How would this affect children's health?
6. Is this huge park and ride an "overkill" for the longterm, since planners are aware that the lines would need to extend further north and east? Extension of the lines could make this enormous structure underused and obsolete, leaving a blight in the neighborhood.
7. Have you interviewed residents along the light rail lines in Portland and also at the park and ride terminal areas to determine if the impact has been favorable or unfavorable? What is the effect to the property values?

### **Sunday, August 05, 2007**

Hi. I haven't studied the alternatives in any detail yet. However, I'd still like to make a few comments as a resident of Portland who does not own a car, does now want to own a car for environmental and financial reasons, and who either bicycles or takes TriMet or Amtrak pretty much everywhere he goes.

1) Trying to figure out how to bicycle from Portland to Vancouver is a nightmare. I chose to do this recently, I think Sunday 7/29, in order to race in the Vancouver Courthouse Criterium. Even though I had looked at all the maps I could on the internet, including special ones designed for this purpose, I almost missed my race. Faced with various confusing alternatives, I chose to ride to the TriMet Expo Center train stop, which is the end of the Yellow Line, because one map showed a bike path leading to the bridge starting from there. It was very difficult to even find the path out of the train stop, which is adjacent to the huge Expo Center parking lot. I did not see one single sign there pointing to the path. Luckily, a cyclist arrived who had been on the path, and said 'just ride up there,' etc.

2) What I then recall is that it was very difficult to follow his directions the few blocks I had to go to get on the continuation of the path. I recall going over a highway or

something like that, perhaps I-5, then guessing I should make a certain right turn, perhaps near a ramp, where I found a path.

3) What I next recall is that when I got near the bridge, perhaps the base of the bridge on Jantzen Beach, where there is a huge hotel, there were one or two little green signs pointing to the left for 'bike path' or whatever, and I couldn't find the bloody thing. I tried both the little road the sign was on and going into the hotel parking lot or something like that. I rode around for 5-10 minutes panicking because I didn't want to miss a race I had been training for and planning on for weeks. Finally I gave up, wheeled my bike into the hotel lobby, and had to rudely interrupt several clerks trying to help people so they could try to point out the path. What I recall then after one young man was nice enough to walking outside with me (I insisted on this rather than his pointing in some direction) is that he finally said 'the path is through that tunnel or archway.' I then found it – which now that I think of it is kind of weird, because I can't fathom what the connection was between the lousy little sign for it and the actual path to the path, as it were.

4) Riding over the bridge was half a nightmare. After barely being able to overcome the fear resulting from being able to see the water far below while trying to negotiate a very narrow path, I reached the top and then, on the way down, actually slowed to a crawl and put one bike cleat near the ground because I didn't want to go too fast on my 'racing bike' in between the railing and the girders. But even this creates a very dangerous situation, especially if you are in bike cleats which would have no traction on the ground. And getting off and walking is a very undesirable option for me because I don't want to wear out expensive shoes designed for cycling, not walking. I then arrived at the last minute for the race, had to get on a waiting list, and was barely able to enter it.

5) On the way back, I started on the right side of the bridge, because common sense would indicate that as the thing to do. And then, lo and behold, I found myself led by the path down into what I finally realized was the Jantzen Beach area. How was I supposed to get back to Portland? I HAD NO IDEA! I rode around for a bit behind or in front of some big box stores, then came back and flagged down a few cyclists. I think they told me I needed to get on the path on the left side of the bridge going south (i.e., the same path I took going north) in order to get back to Portland. I found this path with their help and made it back. It was a frustrating nightmare from beginning to end. I couldn't believe that with hundreds of millions of dollars invested in infrastructure for cars, including gigantic costly signs helping them find their way on and off the highway and bridge, all that was delegated to cyclists was either a big pile of nothing or a few measly and confusing signs.

I hope that, long before bridge construction/reconstruction begins, that your group works together with other relevant agencies to make sure that we cyclists can find our way from Portland to Vancouver without getting continually lost, getting an ulcer, and putting ourselves in unnecessarily dangerous situations riding around looking for the way.

The neglect of cyclists in this regard and many others reminds me of racism. Not because the suffering of cyclists is even a drop in the bucket compared to the suffering of Black people in the course of this country's history, but because favoritism of cars and neglect of cyclists' needs is so institutionalized in our society. Thankfully, some people, including perhaps some of you, and including many people in places like Portland, are taking steps to give us some kind of equity. Such steps should also be integrated with

much stronger efforts to get people out of dependence on cars so that both our lungs and our planet have some chance of surviving.

To the latter end, I ask, if vaguely, that the redesign of the bridge carry out as its FUNDAMENTAL, and not a secondary, purpose the enhancement of alternatives to single-occupancy automobile traffic. Yes, cars must cross it, and certainly trucks and some buses. But light rail and other enhancements might be included in such a way as to build toward a day when I-5 is not primarily an artery clogged with pollution and CO2-spilling vehicles. It is shameful that, as concentrated as West Coast populations are near the I-5 corridor, from southern California to Canada, that more people do not or feel they cannot abandon their cars for Amtrak and/or some kind of I-5 light rail.

### **Monday, August 06, 2007**

As a Jantzen Beach Moorage resident I implore you to PLEASE NOT destroy my home! Our moorage is a unique lifestyle enjoyed by singles and families alike which now is in the midst of being completely devastated in the name of greed. Why do I say greed? Well, we already face taking out two rows of homes for the sake of relieving I-5 bridge traffic. This is a bitter pill to swallow for sure and it looks like we are losing the battle even tho there are still a few alternatives. No one goes away unhurt no matter what is decided. However, losing half the moorage in the name of monetary gain to a few is despicable! Revamping the super center, while a delightful idea, is a RISK with no guarantee that it will attract buyers long term, and having the MAX depot in the center of your grandiose idea IS NOT NECESSARY. Do you realise that for convenience of *shoppers* you are **wrecking my life?**

You have alternatives. I, and my neighbors, want you to use any of them, we demand you DO NOT DESTROY OUR HOMES!

### **Monday, August 06, 2007**

Is there other significant planning being done for a more comprehensive freeway/Columbia River bridge to connect the west coast states/Canada corridor being done at this time? If not, then I would say your alternatives for the Columbia River Crossing at Jantzen beach are not realistic in meeting future traffic congestion needs. They would barely suffice now.

If there are no other plans to build a large freeway/bridge system (say from about Ridgefield circling the Portland metro area as far out as say Hillsboro and Gresham), then I believe the crossing you are proposing now should, at minimum, contain BOTH a bus rapid transit and light rail AND, at minimum, 5 to 6 car lanes each direction (N & S). Why would you build something now that will barely handle current traffic levels, much less by the time it is completed, handle even greater traffic numbers? The current plans will be outdated before completed???? Makes no sense? Unless, of course, there are other plans for a larger freeway, but I have no indication this type of planning is even on the table??

Why not build supplemental bridges on both sides of existing? (Then replace center bridge at some future date) Are you allowing for pedestrian and bike crossing as well? Are there accommodations being made for EASY access for peds/bikes? That is, if one is walking or biking from Jantzen Beach or downtown Vancouver to the Expo or Delta Park light rail, it is currently very difficult to do so and cannot be done from the west side of the existing freeway.

How do I know my suggestions are being considered and taken seriously?  
Please don't forget the walkers and bikes and, PLEASE more lanes—build supplemental on both sides of existing. California, Canada, and Washington should have tremendous input on this project.

**Wednesday, August 08, 2007**

We are writing in lieu of attending the Columbia River Crossing open houses for bicyclists and pedestrians scheduled for August 4 and August 11. We wish to provide input and comment on bike and pedestrian facilities that we believe need to be a much bigger component of an effective, efficient, and equitable solution to the problems the CRC project claims to address. In addition we feel that greater attention on developing world-class bike and pedestrian facilities will address problems posed by increasing energy costs and human-caused climate change. The dual challenge of rising energy costs and reducing greenhouse gas emissions are not being addressed by CRC's current "solutions" that focus on dramatically increasing transportation capacity for single occupancy vehicles.

Bike and pedestrian facilities appear to be dramatically under-scaled in all the proposed alternatives for the DRAFT EIS. In both the freeway bridge and supplemental bridge options the alternatives call for drastically expanding automobile lanes while making relatively minor improvements to bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. The new bridge proposal is inherently anti-pedestrian and anti-bicycle since its size and steepness will disfavor these modes. Moreover it is our understanding that staff currently favors a 15-foot wide, 1-sided, multi-directional, mixed bike and pedestrian path for the new bridge. This "solution" should be unacceptable not only to bicyclists and pedestrians but to a public that expects CRC solutions to anticipate the inevitable future expansion of these bicycle and pedestrian modes in the face of rising energy costs and the imperative of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The supplemental bridge alternative simply calls for "wider bicycle and pedestrian lanes would be included on the existing bridges." We are very curious and concerned what will constitute "wider" lanes given the extremely narrow bike and pedestrian routes across the existing bridge. We strongly recommend dramatically expanded, world-class bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to accommodate both the growing interest in bicycle and pedestrian modes and the growing need- due to energy and environmental trends- to provide these alternatives to the region's population.

Finally, developing state-of-the-art bike and pedestrian facilities for all CRC alternatives that create rich human-scale connections between North Portland neighborhoods, West Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver make these communities more walkable and more livable. This is critical in producing an equitable solution. The over-emphasis on new freeway lanes in CRC's current alternatives primarily benefit commuters and real estate development interests in suburban Clark County at the expense of local residents living in Vancouver and North Portland. North Portland residents in particular are likely to experience more congestion and increased air pollution from shifting traffic bottlenecks farther south. Creating easy-to-navigate, human-scale connections for bikes and pedestrians between local neighborhoods around the Columbia Crossing would go a long ways to remedying this imbalance by making these communities more accessible and more livable for the entire population.

**Wednesday, August 08, 2007**

We live in the Lincoln neighborhood, so the issue of the proposed park and ride lots and the rapid transit alignment are front and center for us. My husband's suggestion is to have the I-5 alignment, but instead of crossing over the freeway to Kiggins, have the station on the east side of I-5, have a park and ride at Kiggins, and have a foot bridge for people to walk from Kiggins to the station. Parking could be included at the station site for handicapped and drop-off. Then the rapid transit could later extend up Highway 99 and east out SR 500.

As for the WSDOT property, that is some prime property and there are other uses that might serve the community better than a parking lot.

Thanks for the opportunity to give feedback!

**Thursday, August 09, 2007**

Good article in last night's Columbia about mass transit over the I-5 bridge. Basically the article was saying mass transit to a single park and ride will not help Clark Co. We need to be working toward a connection going through Clark Co. and connecting back with Portland via the I-205 Bridge. How can you sell the crossing ideas to the public without addressing a longer range plan? This maybe a little out of the scope of the present crossing project, but without discussing the potential I think you folks are missing a big boat.

There is also the potential of tying in the 33 mile rail spur to a mass transit system. Again, I think you should be presenting some visionary concepts as to what may come in the future. I personally believe having a mass transit system across both bridges is essential to alleviate the current congestion. However, without the Clark Co. and Portland systems working as one, it will never be as successful as it could be.

**Friday, August 10, 2007**

There is something important (and, at least in the US, still new) that must be taken into account when designing any new bridge across the Columbia.

Due to their much lower fuel/operating costs and adequacy for short trips/errands/commutes, the popularity of alternative vehicles such as NEVs (neighborhood electric vehicles) and street-legal three wheel internal combustion vehicles (officially licensed as a motorcycle) will almost certainly dramatically rise soon.

The internal combustion three wheelers have been mainstream in Asia and Mediterranean Europe (ex: Italy) for years. NEV popularity - though still in its infancy - is rising in the US and Europe.

**A SEPARATE LANE FOR LOW-SPEED/NEIGHBORHOOD "ALTERNATIVE" VEHICLES MUST BE PROVIDED IN ANY BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA** because these vehicles are too big to cross a bridge in the bike lane, and too slow (they mostly top out anywhere from 25-45 mph) to be in car lanes.

Due to their smaller size and lower pollution output, these vehicles are desirable from several standpoints, including traffic management, reducing urban pollution, parking, etc. I think it's critical we accommodate/encourage their use with a lane in any design for a bridge.

# **CRC Open Houses – October 2007**

## **Meeting Plan - DRAFT**

### **Background**

The Columbia River Crossing project team is working to define and refine the details of each of five alternatives that will be included in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS), to be published in February 2008. As part of the Draft EIS process, several additional congestion-relief elements will be included in each of the “build” alternatives. Each alternative will then be thoroughly analyzed to determine how well it relieves congestion and improves safety and mobility.

A formal public comment period is expected in the spring of 2008 on the selection of one alternative. The public is encouraged to review and comment on the recommendation. A broad outreach effort has begun to solicit public comment on the alternatives to be advanced for detailed analysis.

### **Purpose/Objectives**

- Set the groundwork and prepare the public for the release of the Locally Preferred Alternative and Draft EIS
  - Present current information on transit and highway alternatives being analyzed in the Draft EIS
  - Introduce the trade-offs related to upcoming choices and decisions
  - Introduce relevant information about draft findings for technical areas in the Draft EIS, such as right of way, noise and vibration, and visual and aesthetic impacts (if available)
- Provide preliminary cost ranges with trade-offs
- Provide a forum to connect with the community about the project, alternatives, LPA, and DEIS
  - Hear and collect public comments on the alternatives
  - Enlist ongoing participation in the CRC project
  - Respond to questions and concerns from the community
  - Highlight ways that the community has influenced the project development process
- Present project background and next steps

### **Schedule**

Two open houses are scheduled tentatively for mid-October 2007:

#### **Wednesday, October 17**

**5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.**

Former Hayden Island Yacht Club  
12050 N. Jantzen Drive  
Portland, Oregon

#### **Saturday, October 20**

**10 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

Lincoln Elementary  
4200 NW Daniels  
Vancouver, WA

## **Audiences**

- Policy makers and decision influencers
  - Elected officials, business, and freight community
  - Media
- People who will benefit from the project
  - Bridge Influence Area residents
  - People who drive on I-5
  - Transit users
- People who live in the Bridge Influence Area
  - Residents
  - Neighborhood associations
  - Community associations
  - Members of advisory groups

## **Format**

The events will be friendly, informal opportunities for guests to drop in at any point and learn about the project, discuss their questions with staff, and provide comment on the recommendation.

## **Key Messages**

All display boards and distributed materials at the meeting will be geared to offer the following key messages to attendees:

- Each alternative features bridge, transit and highway options designed to improve the mobility and safety problems in the five-mile project area.
  - Replacement bridge with bus rapid transit
  - Replacement bridge with light rail
  - Supplemental bridge with bus rapid transit
  - Supplemental bridge with light rail
  - No build
- Decisions on highway and transit design are interconnected and involve tradeoffs. We want you to understand the tradeoffs and help us with decisions that affect how you use the transportation system.
- Our communities are growing and changing. You have a unique opportunity to shape that change by helping the project design transit that meets your needs, respects the character of your community, and enhances livability for you and your neighbors.
- We are sharing the best information and the latest results with you as they become available. The work to analyze the five alternatives is ongoing.

## Displays

The following stations will be set up around the room at the open house, emphasizing the key messages:

1. Welcome Station – Sign-in, handouts, event map/schedule
2. Background Station – This is a bridge, transit and highway improvement project. Will repeat quite a bit from January Open House, but will add latest information since February 2007.
3. Transit Alternatives Station – (mode and alignment information)
  - a. Rollout map station #1 – alignment choices
  - b. Mode choices
4. Highway Alternatives Station - Rollout map station #2
5. Environmental Findings to date
6. Cost Estimates, Funding Strategy and Tolling (includes Value Engineering results)
7. Next Steps Station – Draft EIS review process, LPA decision, Final EIS
8. Recap of Alternatives - brief review to aid in public commenting
9. Give Your Input Station – public input to date; how decisions are made; how to stay involved with the project; and, how to provide comment
10. Information about related projects from project partners – ODOT, WSDOT, RTC, etc

## Advertising

These open houses will be advertised by:

- Direct-mail postcard to residents of the Bridge Influence Area (database mailing list, roughly 10,000 total pieces. 3,500 extra postcards will be printed for other distribution – plan to be attached)
- Display advertisements in regional and community newspapers in Clark County and Portland (English only per request of newspaper specifications)
  - St. Johns Sentinel
  - Senior Messenger
  - The Reflector
  - The Skanner
  - The Columbian
  - The Oregonian
  - El Hispanic News
  - Portland Observer
  - The Asian Reporter
- Broadcast email to the project listserve (2,500 total contacts)
- 11 x 17 Posters, distributed to locations in Bridge Influence Area at appropriate locations: coffee houses, community centers, community fairs and festivals (in house printing)
- 8 ½ x 11 newsletter inserts in neighborhood newsletters(17,000 estimated)
- Short announcements in C-Tran and TriMet newsletters
- Conversations at upcoming community and organizational briefings

- Phone call/email to appropriate task force members and elected officials, and their staffs (as needed)
- Press release sent to regional news outlets
- City of Vancouver, WSDOT and other community calendar of events.

All advertisements are anticipated to contain: open house dates/locations, purpose of the open houses, and how to give input on the project, in addition to ADA and Title VI information.

### **Non-English Language Advertising and Outreach**

Outreach will include

- Spanish, Russian and Vietnamese information on the project Web site
- Opportunities for translation services (including sign language) at the open house events with advance notice

### **Methods for Public Comment**

(To be reviewed with Environmental Team) During this time period, members of the public are can give input to the project in the following ways:

At the event:

- Handwritten comment forms: At the open houses, comment forms will be available. Comment forms will also have the project mailing address on the back, so that attendees mail back at a later date.
- Electronic comment forms: Computer terminals will be set up to take comments in electronic format.
- Flip charts: Flip charts will be in the room to capture comments and allow other attendees to see what people are thinking.
- Oral comments: A court reporter will be present to transcribe public remarks.

Following the events:

- Email: [feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org)
- Mail: Columbia River Crossing Input | 700 Washington Street, Suite 300 | Vancouver, WA 98660
- Phone: 360-737-2726 or 503-256-2726
- Web: [www.ColumbiaRiverCrossing.org](http://www.ColumbiaRiverCrossing.org)
- Fax: 360-737-0294

### **Staffing**

The following staff are assumed to be present at those meetings:

- Communications Staff
- Project Directors
- Task Managers – Transit, Transportation, Design, and Environmental

*October 2007 CRC Open House Meeting Plan Updated: 07/17/07*

*DRAFT – for Internal Discussion Only*

*Page 4 of 5*

- Interpreters
- Additional staff from each team (to be determined by Project Directors and Task Managers)
- Project partner staff

Information regarding logistics for the meetings, anticipated public questions, and station assignments will be sent out a week before the first public meeting.