

# Columbia River **CROSSING** DRAFT Meeting Agenda

**MEETING TITLE:** Community and Environmental Justice Group  
**DATE:** 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m., April 16, 2009  
**LOCATION:** Columbia River Crossing project office  
700 Washington St, Suite 300, Vancouver, WA 98660

Public access to the meeting will be available from the Washington Street building entrance and the first floor lobby (accessible from the parking garage). Staff will greet CEJG members and other guests at this entrance or in the lobby to provide access to the meeting room on the third floor.

Meeting Objectives:

- Check-in on:
  - Number of lanes recommendation
  - Media inquiries question
- Continue context sensitive design interactive discussion
- Begin public involvement discussion on context sensitive design

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
6:00 p.m.	Welcome, introductions, and review meeting materials
6:05 p.m.	Project update and next steps
6:15 p.m.	Group check-in on number of lanes and media inquiries
6:30 p.m.	Discuss options for public involvement activities on context sensitive design work
6:45 p.m.	Interactive discussion on context sensitive design
7:55 p.m.	Public comment
8:00 p.m.	Close meeting

# Columbia River CROSSING Draft Meeting Summary

**MEETING**      **Community and Environmental Justice Group (CEJG)**  
**DATE:**            March 19, 2009, 6:00 – 8:30 pm  
**LOCATION:**        Kenton Firehouse, 2209 N. Schofield Street, Portland, Oregon 97217

**ATTENDEES:**

<b>Group Members</b>	
John Benson	
Peg Johnson	
Steve Kayfes	
Dave Skagen	
Michelle Tworoger	
Marcia Ward	
Ralph Welch	
<b>Project Staff</b>	
Carley Francis	
Jeff Heilman	
Casey Liles	
Peter Markgraf	

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

Michelle Tworoger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves. Michelle went over the meeting objectives, agenda, and meeting materials.

Carley Francis gave a project update. The Project Sponsors Council (PSC) is interested having a Mobility Council to develop and monitor performance indicators to help ensure there is an efficient use of infrastructure once it is built and working. There will be a process on tolling that will kick-off at the next PSC meeting. Marcia added about the recent PSC meeting that Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart made a point of saying that the Mobility Council was how they were going to manage the asset of the Columbia River Crossing -- but in the private sector, we always manage our assets, and if we hadn't managed our assets with maintenance, the bridge would have already fallen down. Carley answered that the PSC is focused on the operations rather than maintenance with the mobility council concept. Casey Liles added that the project is building an enormous amount of capital, and the public wants to make sure that the project delivers the amount of relief or safety that has been promised – the DOTs have always tried to manage that, but not often with a bi-state project. They are trying to bridge the gap between the states.

Carley said that currently, the management of the I-5 and I-205 bridges is coordinated between Oregon and Washington. Casey added that if the bridge is not performing well, there are tools the Mobility Council could recommend to improve the corridor and bring it to the standards promised by the analysis. Marcia said that it seems like an extra, unneeded layer of bureaucracy.

Peg Johnson said that there is a lot of emphasis on using tolls as a management tool. Her impression is that the PSC is working with the project team, and there will be an iterative process to determine tolls and traffic patterns. Carley agreed saying that the goal of the group is to develop performance measures in advance so they are ready once the project is running. Peg said, because it has to do with tolling, it seems that the document on the Mobility Council should have room for CEJG type input, and we would be neglecting our duty if we left that out. Peg asked how the staff is thinking CEJG input will be integrated into the process. Carley answered that this is separate from the public process staff must use

to establish toll rates. Over the next year the public will see several different tolling scenarios. There will be a public process around these items, keeping in mind the revenue potential of the tolls. We will look at travel patterns and willingness to pay, and there will be several methods of looking at public opinion. People may be more tied to this crossing than facilities in other places because there are fewer options for getting across the river. We need to get a sense of what is really possible, and we will look at the tolling scenarios over the next year. The Mobility Council will have an active role mostly when the bridge is built.

Steve Kayfes asked if the Mobility Council would, in effect, be a tolling council. Carley answered that they will look at things besides tolling, and the document outlines several other points. Steve answered that he thinks tolling looks like it is going to be the chief tool to control traffic on the bridge. Carley answered that tolling is part of the tool set, but it is not the only part.

John Benson asked if the PSC would be meeting on a regular basis until the project starts. Carley answered that based on the tasks outlined for them by the governors, they will meet until the FEIS. After that, their fate is uncertain. Their next meeting is in June, and they may go more quarterly than monthly.

Steve added that Environmental Justice should be included in the Mobility Council. Peg expressed her hope that the project would monitor for CEJG issues.

Dave Skagen said that someone at the top would shove tolling down peoples' throats. Carley said that she does not know what tolling will be in the long term. Carley said that in other locations they have used the tolling revenues for things besides construction and maintenance, but that scheme is not allowed currently in this region.

Michelle added that if transit riders would not pay a toll. Carley confirmed that there would not be a toll for transit, or bicycling or walking across the bridge.

Carley introduced the Ped/Bike Advisory Committee (PBAC) comments on the Draft EIS. It is helpful to note that PBAC has been looking in significant detail at connectivity – they include visuals and maps in their recommendation. Also, there is a map of existing and planned facilities on both sides of the river. Carley said that this document may give CEJG an idea of PBAC's level of detail.

Matt Whitney said that PBAC has updated their recommendations, and they have brought up issues at neighborhood association meetings which could involve CEJG – how do we formally bring up issues for the CEJG to consider? Carley said that at this meeting we will look at a map and staff will discuss different issues with respect to what other groups are looking at, and we can figure out what makes sense to deal with on a case by case basis.

Carley added that PBAC is looking at the two bridge option – with transit, bicycles and pedestrians in the lower decks of the bridges. Dave Skagen asked if there are more emissions affecting the pedestrians on the lower deck. Jeff Heilman answered that some particulates might settle down, but he can't imagine that it would be worse than a path beside the bridge. Casey drew an explanatory diagram which showed pedestrians underneath the bridge deck. In a two bridge scenario, the pedestrian and bicycle facilities are currently envisioned under the driving deck on the north bound (east) bridge. Dave expressed concerns for pedestrians and bicyclists breathing auto emissions.

Michelle expressed the hope that the bridge design might encourage more people to be pedestrians across the bridge.

Steve asked how loud the under deck would be for pedestrians. Casey answered that there would be no joints, and those are major contributors to noise.

Matt Whitney asked about noise on the I-205 bridge, and there was general agreement that it is loud for bicyclists, and they are close to traffic on the same elevation.

Carley said that the design work has been moving forward. Aesthetics are influenced by technical feasibility. There are a lot of options for aesthetics, which has been kept as a separate discussion. UDAG looked at four different design motifs.

Matt Whitney said that a substantial architectural bridge will have an impact on the property values of North Portland, and residents are adamant that the bridge be a beautiful structure. He gave the contrasting examples of the I-205 and St John's bridge. Matt asserted that the difference in bridge design could mean 20% difference in their property values. Peg said that there are many factors which affect property values associated with this project besides the design of the bridge.

Carley pointed out the document with page numbers for the Draft EIS. It identifies the page numbers containing proposed mitigation. A link previously sent to the group had Draft EIS excerpts regarding mitigation.

### **Interactive Discussion on Contact Sensitive Solutions**

The CEJG group examined a project map. Carley explained the idea of Contact Sensitive Solutions. Peg asked why they are using the Contact Sensitive Design now – it seems like an established procedure. Jeff answered that projects have design guidelines, but a project may say they cannot do something because it is in the guidelines, so that was a way for the federal offices to give state offices leeway to be sensitive to the contexts that they are facing. The example of storm water is germane – there are overlapping rules – but sometimes the storm water management systems are visible from a neighborhood, so Contact Sensitive Solutions give leeway to, for example, use them as an aesthetic feature in a neighborhood.

There is only a map of the Portland project area at the current meeting. Because there will likely be many questions, they are looking at the project in sections. There may be three sections – Portland side, overwater, and Washington side. Or there may be a fourth section to consider the Washington portion in two parts.

Matt asked if the footprint on Hayden Island reflected the Hayden Island plan. He said that there is a major impact in his neighborhood as there is a new apartment building approved in the impact area. What that means is people are looking at the map and wondering how they will be able to get to Kenton. Also, people wonder how they get to the store on Hayden Island as bicycles and pedestrians. Casey explained that there are several alternatives going through the stakeholder process. Regarding the connection from MLK south to Denver – the alternative is to have a local street between Marine Drive and Denver Ave. The other comment – getting to Hayden Island – is one of the recommendations from PBAC. Matt said that there has to be easy, painless pedestrian access without climbing up to the high deck of the new I-5 bridge, and it could be connected to the continuation of the 40 Mile Loop trail. He would prefer to see a lower level crossing which would be friendly to pedestrians. There is an opportunity to join the neighborhoods with a lower-level bike and pedestrian bridge.

Casey showed the group an elevation profile, showing that the height difference between bridges around the point of discussion in the Bridgeton neighborhood is 20 feet. Matt said that we have to consider the bridge footprint, and we have the opportunity to connect Bridgeton to Hayden Island with a low-level pedestrian bridge, and they have looked at costs.

Ralph Welch said that they have talked about the view of the mountains. He suggested that a bike and pedestrian bridge on the East side might be better for the view.

Matt said that PBAC is most concerned with getting bikes across between Vancouver and Portland. Matt expressed concern about bike access to Kenton, and there is no easy access to Delta Park.

Peg asked for clarification of the Kenton access. Carley explained the route that Peg would take, using Mainline, to get to Kenton.

Matt asked if there is a height difference between lanes. Casey explained that yes, some of the lanes are quite a bit higher than others and some cross over each other.

Carley explained that there are several lanes which could be taken for local access without merging into through travel lanes.

John said that there were several Marine Drive plans at the last meeting and asked when coming from MLK to I-5 southbound, how the signaling would be arranged. Carley explained that the traffic operations of the signaling would be the same – single point urban interchange – that is the most efficient intersection you can put in. Casey explained that on all the current options for Marine Drive, there is not an additional signal being put in along Marine Drive.

Matt asked how traffic would traverse Marine Drive and Anchor Way. Casey explained the traffic patterns.

John noticed that the highest point of the section would be on a ramp. Matt asked if there was a minimum height requirement under the bridge for navigation clearance. Carley said that there may be problems with boat traffic if the project puts something lower than the current structures.

The group discussed bicycle access throughout the bridge area on the Oregon side.

John asked if they had discussed using Expo road for access to Kenton – it can be a mess if there is anything going on at Expo. Casey said that the primary focus would be more of a local road and the focus would be elsewhere. The area would have to be redone a little bit, incorporating the transit station and parking.

Matt asked about a merge lane between Kenton and Marine Drive. The group discussed the traffic patterns between Kenton and Marine Drive, which includes an add lane.

### **Next Steps**

Peg said that taking away the food at meetings is a cheesy thing to do for volunteers. Peg said that having no food or water is chintzy. There was general discussion about food at the meeting.

The group discussed that they had barely scratched the surface on mitigation in this section of map. Carley suggested that the group set a timeframe for a first pass through the project area, suggesting that it should be approximately 4 months, but it may be another period of time, and they could identify things to come back to.

Peg asked about a discussion of the number of lanes. Carley said that it is up to the group whether they want to make a recommendation on the number of lanes. They might also want to write a letter about the Mobility Council.

Carley asked if the group wanted to write a letter on the number of lanes. Steve said that he and Marcia had said at public hearings that the group reached a consensus around 12 lanes. Steve said that if they send a letter, one of the purposes will be to keep CEJG in the loop for the number of lanes decision. Peg added that it is CEJG's responsibility to keep EJ on the front burner.

Matt said that reserving the opinion on the 12 lane option leaves CEJG open to comment in the future.

Carley suggested that the motions on the table are to table the number of lanes letter and consider writing a letter on the Mobility Council. Carley said that for the Mobility Council there would be discussion on the performance measure by the end of 2009, and membership might be discussed in the next year.

Ralph suggested that conceptually, writing a letter sounds like a great idea, but he wonders who will be CEJG's conduit to the Mobility Council. Ralph said that instead of worrying about what they will be doing, we should lobby for access to at least one member of the Mobility Council.

Carley summarized that they are shelving the discussion of a letter regarding the Mobility Council.

For the future meetings, Carley suggested continuing to different areas of the project. There are parts of the map at the current CEJG meeting which they did not discuss.

John suggested that it would be a good idea to have the close-in visual, and a visual of the entire project would be helpful.

Michelle said that we have started a great dialogue with this section of the map, and she suggested keeping the focus on Portland for next meeting, then starting Washington after that and spending two meetings on the Washington side before revisiting.

Ralph said that there are a lot of things that he doesn't know are impacts. Ralph asked for a checklist of issues they were facing so they could come up with a more educated perspective.

Matt said that if Pier 99 access is taken away, there needs to be a public access to the water – it is a water based community. Matt noted that while Pier 99 is not technically public access, the community uses it regularly.

Steve asked how far away they were from getting a 3D presentation, maybe with PowerPoint or a 3D model. Casey answered that they will be at that point in the mid to late summer. They are not at the stage where they can invest in a physical model yet. Casey asked if the group would be satisfied with unfinished models. Peg answered that it was helpful to see what it would look like from a person's perspective. Peg said that she would like to see printed elevations. Casey said that he could bring a side view profile of the roadway for next time. The group generally agreed that it would be helpful – they need that information to help mitigation discussions.

Peg asked about the mainline being fill or a bridge structure. Casey answered that it is a pier supported structure over Hayden Island. There will be fill around the ramps at ground level, turning into structure at higher elevations – but the exact plans are not yet developed.

Dave asked where the floating homes would go. Carley answered that impacts to floating homes will be part of a negotiation between the directors of JBMI, the homeowners, and the project. Carley said that there are some homes or residents which will have to be permanently relocated. Dave said that people on water should not be treated any differently than people on land. Carley explained that relocation plans might have to consider a cost differential between water and land based homes, and there is compensation based on the amenities of the dwelling. There was general discussion about how living on the water has its own value which is not considered.

Dave asked if CEJG could support Michelle directly to get floating home owners more help with the resources we have available. Carley said that the recommendation can definitely be written into CEJG, but that ultimately specific compensations are negotiated between an individual (either home owner or JBMI as a legal entity) and the appropriate agency.

Jeff said that CEJG can make a recommendation on anything they want. But ultimately it is the people who are directly affected who will sign an agreement, but CEJG can make a recommendation. He added that a recommendation might be appreciated by JBMI.

Carley said for next time there will be:

- Full project map
- Information on Mainline Elevation
- Ongoing discussion about which section they will focus on in subsequent meetings. Michelle suggested that if they move back and forth they will lose focus, so they should continue on the North Portland area.
- A checklist of issues they should consider.

*The meeting was adjourned.*

DRAFT MEMORANDUM – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Memorandum

DATE: March 25, 2009  
TO: Project Sponsors Council  
FROM: Community and Environmental Justice Workgroup  
RE: Number of lanes option

---

The Community and Environmental Justice Group is made up of residents and community members from both Oregon and Washington.

With respect to the neighborhoods and communities we represent, our discussion at the January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, regarding the number of lanes option resulted in the following:

The majority of the group is in favor of the 12-lane option.

Concerns supporting this option centered on:

- maximizing safety on the highway with improved merging
- keeping local streets free of highway congestion making them safer for pedestrians and school kids and reducing the number of cars idling in low income areas
- economies of scale – cheaper to build it now than try to add on later
- desire for a project that will be good into the future
- 12-lanes will not lead to additional sprawl as it is not opening up new access to undeveloped land

The minority in support of the 10-lane option, expressed concerns regarding:

- the difference in improvements between 10 and 12 was incremental
- greenhouse gas emissions – wanted more information (depending on the data, was not against the 12-lane option)

The group did not express support for an 8-lane option.

Please note, the conclusions we came to at this meeting were made without detailed information about the effect of tolling, information on local street congestion, and additional data on greenhouse gas emissions. The number of lanes will continue to be discussed in future meetings as more information and input are received from all sources.

The “context” of a project can be viewed at many different scales, from the neighborhoods adjacent to the project to the city, region or nation where the project takes place. The potential benefits and impacts of a project can have relevance at each scale. For example, a project may have effects on air quality that could be viewed differently from the local level (improve or degrade air quality for adjacent neighborhoods), regional level (increase or reduce pollutant levels in a region’s airshed), or even global level (increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions that affect global climate change).

The following lists many of the issues typically considered when evaluating context sensitivity, especially at the local and regional scales. Not all of these issues will apply everywhere, and this list is not meant to be exhaustive. It’s a guideline to help prompt ideas and discussion.

For each of these areas, there may be other issues to keep in mind, like:

- Equity: Proportionate distribution of benefits and effects
- Energy conservation: Alternative energy sources, more efficient operations, efficient transit use, bicycling, walking, etc.
- Financial considerations: Tax impacts, new revenue sources, initial costs, long term costs and savings, etc.

Issue	Examples
<i>Consider Transportation Connectivity, Reliability, Efficiency and Safety for:</i>	
Drivers and passengers (cars, trucks, motorcycles)	Travel time reliability, transportation options, facility design and safety
Transit Riders	
Bicyclists and walkers	
Boaters/marine	
Mobility impaired	
<i>Consider Neighborhood and Regional Quality and Connectivity. This includes adverse effects, benefits and opportunities associated with:</i>	
Access	Connections and travel times to services, jobs, schools/colleges/other training, hospitals, health care, retail, restaurants, other neighborhoods
Parks	Park grounds, access or amenities
Recreation opportunities and access	Bike paths, open space, sidewalks, access to commercial recreation, or effects on free time (eg, shorter commutes)
Safety and security	Street crossings, bike paths, highway, on transit, in neighborhood

Issue	Examples
Air quality	Highway and roadway emissions, emissions during construction.
Noise and vibration	From highways or LRT, from construction
Scenic and aesthetic quality	Views from homes or sidewalks, views from roadways or LRT, public art, landscaping, materials, general aesthetics
Business activity and opportunities	Access types and locations, available land for development
Historic and cultural resources	Historic buildings, interpretive signage, art
Natural environmental resources	Wetlands, the river, waterways, birds, fish, vegetation
Direct land use effects	Business or residential displacement or preservation
Indirect land use effects	What kind of development would be supported by the changes the project introduces?

*CRC transportation improvements between **Victory Blvd and the Columbia River** comprise rebuilding the Marine Drive and Hayden Island Interchanges with I-5, as well as the replacement of the North Portland Harbor Bridge. There would also be the light rail extension north of the current Expo Center station and across North Portland Harbor to a new station on Hayden Island, as well as new pathways and connections for bicycles and pedestrians. This matrix provides an overview of potential project effects in this area and describes any project design refinements that have been or could be incorporated to avoid or minimize the effect, as well as the mitigation obligations for unavoidable effects.*

Effect	Do regulations guide or prescribe mitigation?	Project Design Solution (design refinements or identified mitigation)
<b>Impacts to historic properties:</b> Pier 99 Marina property is potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.	Yes	The Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation in the DEIS looked at potential measures to minimize harm to the Pier 99. We are exploring moving the impactful ramps to the west of the parcel but this may not be reasonable.
<b>Impacts to parks:</b> Potential temporary impact to the western strip of East Delta Park on the east side of I-5 immediately south of the Marine Drive interchange.	Yes	If a temporary construction easement is required from East Delta Park for more than 180 days, replacement property of at least equivalent property and recreation values would be identified, approved, and acquired.
<b>Noise Impacts:</b> Noise modeling in the DEIS indicated that there would be traffic and transit related noise impacts to floating homes in North Portland Harbor, and traffic related impacts to the Red Lion Hotel on Hayden Island.	Yes	The DEIS evaluated potential noise walls along the North Portland Harbor bridge structure to mitigate traffic noise impacts to floating homes, and potential residential sound insulation for those floating homes impacted by noise generated by light rail. Refinements to bridge alignment and additional displacements might reduce the impacts. No mitigation is proposed for the Red Lion Hotel.
<b>Local traffic movements:</b> The westbound MLK Jr Way to I-5SB to Denver Ave movement will be eliminated, as the Marine Drive to I-5SB and I-5SB to Denver Ave ramps will be braided.	No	Local roadway connections could be provided underneath the elevated Marine Drive Interchange, connecting the Bridgeton and Kenton neighborhoods.
<b>Commercial Impacts:</b> Displacement of 2 businesses near the Marine Drive Interchange. On Hayden Island, displacement of up to 5 businesses on the east side of the interchange, and up to 20 on the west side of the interchange.	Yes	Design was refined to avoid the displacement of Safeway, which was identified as a community resource for Hayden Island. Businesses receive relocation assistance. Additionally, local access improvements and area vacated following construction could provide opportunities for successful redevelopment on Hayden Island and near the Marine Drive Interchange.

Effect	Do regulations guide or prescribe mitigation?	Project Design Solution (design refinements or identified mitigation)
<p><b>Access Impacts:</b> Potential access impacts to Diversified Marine and Ross Island Sand and Gravel at the Marine Drive Interchange, and Safeway and the Red Lion on Hayden Island. Additionally, there could be potential access impacts to JBMI and Columbia Crossings moorage.</p>	Yes	Interchange areas, and what access are provided within them, are guided by ODOT's Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) process, which includes an Access Management Plan. Various ways of maintaining or providing alternate access are being explored.
<p><b>Residential Displacements:</b> Bridge and ramp construction would displace homes at Columbia Crossings, Jantzen Beach Moorage, and on the south side of the Harbor</p>	Yes	To reduce the number of displacements, the gap between the proposed parallel bridges is being narrowed from 50 to 15 feet. Also the selection of the adjacent transit alignment reduces the number of displacements. Relocation options will be explored.
<p><b>Stormwater runoff:</b> The new highway and transit facilities would increase the amount of impervious surface in the area, thereby generating a greater volume of stormwater run-off.</p>	Yes	Overall, the project would provide improved treatment facilities that would better capture and clean stormwater runoff from the highway - more than is treated under No-Build or existing conditions. This would reduce pollutants such as suspended solids, phosphorus, and zinc. But, the project would divert more runoff into the Columbia Slough, which would slightly increase dissolved copper and zinc into this waterbody. Various stormwater treatment options are being explored.
<p><b>Visual:</b> Introduction of more, and in some locations higher, bridge structures across the North Portland Harbor and Columbia River.</p>	No	The CRC Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) is currently exploring aesthetic treatments for the bridge structures in an effort to encourage elegant and appropriate design of the bridges and create pleasant and usable spaces beneath the bridge structures. High noise walls on the bridge structure would have negative aesthetic and view impacts as well and shorter walls will be considered.

*CRC transportation improvements between **Victory Blvd and the Columbia River** primarily comprise rebuilding the Marine Drive and Hayden Island Interchanges with I-5, as well as the replacement of the North Portland Harbor Bridge. There would also be the light rail extension north of the current Expo Center station and across North Portland Harbor to a new station on Hayden Island, as well as improvements to adjacent pathways for bicycles and pedestrians. This list describes the project benefits that go above and beyond mitigation for project effects.*

**Project Benefit**

**Improved local traffic movements:** Motorists traveling to of from the Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchanges will travel over the North Portland Harbor on collector-distributors separate from mainline I-5, essentially providing a separate non-freeway bridge connection between Hayden Island and Oregon mainland.

**Improved traffic safety:** The redesign of the Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchanges, as well as connections to Victory Blvd, will improve safety for motorists by eliminating conflicting movements (e.g. separating motorists leaving and exiting the freeway) and building the facility to modern highway design standards, such as including safety shoulders.

**Benefits for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity:** Bicycle and pedestrian connectivity in this area would be improved by providing more direct access east-west over and under I-5 at both interchanges, and by providing direct connections for cyclists and walkers traveling north-south between Vancouver, Hayden Island, and the Oregon mainland.

**Better transit connectivity:** The extension of LRT north of this area will significantly improve transit connectivity to destinations on Hayden Island and in Vancouver, and will increase light rail headways so that even travelers going south will benefit by reduced wait times at stations.