

MEETING TITLE: Freight Working Group
DATE: Thursday, November 20, 2008
INVITEES: Distribution
LOCATION: 10:00 AM to 11:30 PM at the CRC Project Office, North Conference Room

AGENDA:

1. Introductions	5 minutes
2. Update on LPA resolution process and Project Sponsors Council	15 minutes
3. Marine Drive Interchange Evaluation Update	40 minutes
4. Vancouver Interchange Updates	25 minutes
5. Other topics	5 minutes

DRAFT

Meeting: CRC Freight Working Group Meeting

Meeting Date: August 21, 2008

Attendees:

Corky Collier	Columbia Corridor Association
John Leber	Swanson Wood & Bark Products
Bob Hillier	Portland DOT
Steve Bates	Redmond Heavy Hauling, Inc.
Katy Brooks	Port of Vancouver
Deb Taylor	Port of Vancouver
Nick Haindl	Port of Vancouver
Kathryn Williams	Port of Portland
Louis Force	Food Express, Inc.
Mark Widing	Food Express, Inc.
Larry Epstein	Diversified Marine, Inc.
Cheryl Twete	MERC
Barry Hennelly	Metro
Bob Stewert	Glacier NW
Tracy Ann Whalen	ESCO Corporation
Frank Green	CRC
Lynn Rust	CRC
Ryan LeProwse	CRC
Cara Belcher	CRC
Casey Liles	CRC
Claudia Hirschey	CRC
Anne Pressentin	CRC
Ron Anderson	CRC

Review of Meeting Agenda:

- Discussion of LPA resolution process
- Status of Fourth Plain Blvd. interchange design development
- Review and input on Marine Drive interchange issues and work plan

Discussion of LPA Resolution Process:

The project partners adopted a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) with about 120 conditions. The list was distributed to the FWG. These conditions have been combined and summarized, and the summary shared as a handout to the FWG. Some of the more popular issues are:

- Validating the traffic forecasts and considering how fuel costs are integrated into the forecasts
- The number of auxiliary lanes across the bridge and a request to confirm need for the six lanes in each direction
- Aesthetics of the bridge
- Sustainability and carbon footprint
- Tolling and who pays for the bridge

All major decisions must be locked down by January 2009 to keep the project on schedule and complete the Final EIS. Other project documents require design decisions as well, such as the biological assessment. The most current funding plan will be provided at the same time that the Final EIS is

published. The Marine Drive decision, on this meeting's agenda, must be made by November to meet the January schedule deadline.

The Task Force was sunset in June. The project will now be guided by the Project Sponsor's Council (PSC). There are eight members, four from Oregon and four from Washington. The members include two citizens and the Department of Transportation (DOT) Secretaries from Oregon and Washington.

Fourth Plain Boulevard Interchange Design:

The current design was shared with the FWG. The ramps were shown with the turning template for tractor-trailer trucks with a wheel base of 67 feet (WB67), which reflects a tractor with a 53-foot container. The interchange and turning movements have been designed for a WB60. Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver, shared recent survey data that shows the range of truck sizes that goes to and from the ports. A design for WB67 may accommodate larger trucks. The design team will prepare some turning movement templates for larger trucks and determine how the trucks would be accommodated at the interchange. It was noted that there are some very large trucks that would occasionally use the interchange. Some trucks are 75 feet long. Some wind turbine blades are 55 meters long, and there are some double-wide trucks that travel in two lanes.

Previous design decisions were reviewed. The current design provides for easier vehicle movements with fewer property impacts. The Port of Vancouver may collect additional truck surveys at the Port's gate. The CRC staff will continue to develop design options at the interchange. The conclusion was to ensure that this interchange allows for a wide variety of trucks—five, ten, and twenty years from now.

Marine Drive Interchange Issues and Work Plan:

It was recommended that a stakeholder group be established to assist with the decision-making process for the Marine Drive Interchange options. David Knowles, from David Evans and Associates, will be the facilitator. There will also be a technical team of CRC staff to prepare the design and evaluation. The stakeholder group will include people living and working near the Marine Drive interchange. Ideally a decision would be made by November. There are three basic options to discuss:

1. The alignment south of Expo, and the interchange located further south.
2. The alignment through the Expo property.
3. The alignment similar to the current design.

The role of the stakeholder group was discussed. The stakeholders will be used to solicit input on issues, needs, and wants, which will result in preparation of evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria will be applied to the options and evaluation would be prepared by the technical team. The stakeholder group will react to the evaluation, and then a design option will emerge.

The stakeholder group should meet by mid-September. One member of the FWG will be on the stakeholder group. Other members include some who have been involved with the FWG, such as the Port of Portland and Portland DOT. The list is not yet final.

Many questions and issues were raised about the role and process of the stakeholders group:

- What are the advantages of a stakeholder group? The CRC Task Force developed decision-making criteria for I-5, but the criteria were not directly applicable toward interchanges. CRC staff would like improved criteria or agreement that existing criteria is okay.
- There was concern that the stakeholders do not have the knowledge necessary to address the overall movement of freight through the interchange. CRC staff needs public input. They want to be sure that one group doesn't get a larger voice than another. The PSC will make the final decision.
- The stakeholders should understand that freight movement is the #1 priority at this interchange. It was suggested that the existing design should be the basis for performance. All new options should perform, for freight, at least as well as the design shown in the Draft EIS.

- Could the FWG and the UDAG work together on these options? More public input, from nearby businesses and residents, would result from a stakeholders group.
- It is important to pull everyone together because we want the best solution. This is a 100-year project.
- How will the FWG be informed of the process? The FWG will be briefed, and the stakeholders would hear the FWG's issues from the member assigned to the Stakeholders group. All CRC meetings are open.
- How will the FWG member be selected for the stakeholders group? Three FWG members will make themselves available: Corky Collier, Tracy Wheeler, and Steve Bates.
- How did these new options come about? The UDAG brought forth these new options in order to consider opportunities while investing in a new interchange.
 - Opportunity to open up the riverfront to public access.
 - Opportunity for trails.
 - Opportunity for connectivity to other areas.
 - Redevelopment opportunities.

Requests:

The FWG should review and add to the compiled list of FWG issues for the Marine Drive interchange.

A FWG member will be invited to the Marine Drive Stakeholder group. Feedback will be provided at the September 18th FWG meeting. It was noted that if the next meeting has a narrow agenda, that everyone may not need to attend.

CRC staff will show how larger trucks could be accommodated through the 4th Plain Interchange.

Schedule:

The FWG agreed to meet next on the third Thursday, through December. Dates are:

- September 18, 2008.
- October 16, 2008.
- November 20, 2008.
- December 18, 2008.

Meeting: CRC Freight Working Group – Focused Meeting for Marine Drive Interchange

Meeting Date: September 17, 2008, 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Corky Collier	Columbia Corridor Association
Lee Johnson	Jet Delivery
Bob Hillier	Portland DOT
Kathryn Williams	Port of Portland
Larry Epstein	Diversified Marine, Inc.
Cheryl Twete	MERC
Anne Sylvester	Parametrics
Gavin Oien	CRC
David Parisi	CRC
Peter Ovington	CRC
Claudia Hirschey	CRC (by telephone)
David Knowles	David Evans and Associates, Inc.

Review of Meeting Agenda:

- Discussion of Marine Drive decision process
- Freight Working Group (FWG) input on design issues

Marine Drive Decision Process:

David Knowles of David Evans and Associates introduced himself and led the meeting. David is conducting stakeholder interviews and will facilitate the steering committee group for interchange design options at Marine Drive. He explained the structure, membership, and roles of the advisory group.

Invitations for the first meeting have been mailed out. The meeting is scheduled for September 24, 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Portland Expo Center, East Hall, Rooms 101 and 102.

David explained that he would like to hear some of the key issues of the CRC Freight Working Group. This meeting is one of the first interviews with stakeholders. By listening to all of the stakeholder interests, a design could be developed that is acceptable to as many as possible. He asked how the FWG would define success for this project.

The Freight Working Group looked at drawings of the three Marine Drive options, which are:

1. Standard alignment
2. Southern realignment
3. Diagonal realignment

The decision-making process was developed by a technical group including staff from: CRC, City of Portland staff, Metropolitan Exposition Recreation Commission (MERC), Port of Portland, various neighborhood associations, property owners, and CRC's Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, Freight Working Group, and Urban Design Advisory Group. The process would involve technical work and information provided to a steering group, feedback, and refinement work by technical staff. Three such cycles are expected between now and November. The goal is to reach general agreement on design.

The FWG was concerned that given the complexity of the interchange, and how long the FWG worked on this interchange, that it will be very difficult for an steering committee/advisory group to get up to speed on all design issues.

The charge to the steering committee is to review information, advise CRC staff on options, and ultimately the preferred option. It is an advisory committee. The advice will go back through the CRC decision-making process – to senior staff, and then to the Project Sponsor's Council (PSC).

Design Issues:

The FWG defined success as a design that is equivalent or better operationally than the existing interchange.

Level of service means everything – impacts to wetlands, truck freight capacity, capacity of roads leading to interchange, alignment, driver confusion, impacts MERC, and impacts to private property. Are the new options providing the level of service? It is close to the same?

Solve the problems that are at the Marine Drive interchange today. Provide easy flowing entrances and exits.

The current freeway design operates with less traffic on the mainline because local traffic is on collector-distributor roadways. For example, northbound I-5 can get on and exit SR 14 without merging on to the freeway mainline. Merging traffic reduces freeway capacity and causes back-ups. The off-ramp design is also important. Three bottlenecks are removed with the current design.

Diversified Marine stated that they want to stay in business. They want to keep their existing land. Location is important as they are in good proximity to other businesses. They must preserve access for clients, employees, and trucks. Only the southern realignment option seems to provide access (the standard and diagonal realignment options do not). Diversified Marine hopes to continue leasing land from ODOT and the Department of State Lands. The site at Diversified Marine is really unique. There is a dry dock and tugboat manufacturing. There is deep water close to shore. This is a very calm section of the river.

This is a freight priority interchange. There should be a thorough process, evaluating connectivity to neighborhoods, impact to wetlands, etc. The outcome should be the best design that will serve freight for the next 80 years. The outcome should be buildable, defensible, and fundable.

Be sure and consider the objectives that were applied while working on current design versus issues raised and new objectives generated by the new design options.

The Port of Portland will be growing, which means that industrial land and access to rail spurs should be maintained. All of the industrial land capacity should be protected. A design option should at least maintain the existing expectations. A design speed of 25 mph and two stoplights would be a downgrade compared to existing conditions.

The Bureau of Planning does not plan to rezone the interchange area. There is concern that a design option could generate pressure to re-zone. All reserve industrial land capacity should be protected.

New design options should consider cost along with the design decisions. Early in their work, the FWG considered two platinum-level options but the FWG felt the options were too costly for the benefit.

It was asked if there would be an Interchange Area Management Plan and the answer is yes.

At least two of these options include significant impacts to Expo Center. The operational and functional needs must be part of the decision. Impacts to Expo must be mitigated.

It was asked, "What is the difference between the options, with regard to truck movement and operations?" Vehicles must turn at the new signal. Trucks on Marine Drive and MLK and must now negotiate curves which reduces capacity. The new intersections reduce capacity. A curve is added in close proximity to the interchange. Grade, curve radius, and superelevation all affect truck operations.

Grades with new options are currently unknown. The intersection on a curve is an operation and safety problem.

There may be some advantages to the southern alignment for the freeway mainline. The perception of an out-of-town truck driver should be considered.

The intent in terms of future redevelopment and land use should be disclosed with each option.

There is concern that encouragement of walking or bike riding through industrial areas would compromise safety. There are tanks of fuel nearby, for example. Some areas really are industrial and warrant a separation of land uses.

There are several events per year at the Expo site that uses every part of the site including the outdoor areas.

There could be an opportunity to open up land, but then what will be the pressure on the land that to redevelop and/or rezone?

It was explained that this location would not be developed as a Transit Oriented Development (TOD), but a Business Oriented Development (BOD). Members asked what a BOD is and is it a synonym for TOD? If it is successful, traffic will be added to the intersections. Trucks leaving the freeway will mix with this traffic.

It was noted several times that this is the most important interchange for the entire state of Oregon. This is not a place to impact freight. The FWG want the qualities of this investment to be lasting. Industrial businesses and the Port of Portland must compete internationally to attract Port business. This is not a location to compromise the freight benefits.

Address what would happen with the old Marine Drive. Minimizing local road connections to Marine Drive helps operations. How does someone on a local street access I-5? (Routes discussed.) Existing conditions are mostly the same, even though the interchange options are different.

It was recommended that a matrix of opportunities and tradeoffs be developed in order to evaluate the design issues.

The FWG is committed to an efficient design decision process. It was noted that the design decision for Marine Drive must be made by November to write the FEIS and biological assessment.

Requests:

David Knowles will report on the technical work, steering committee meetings, and schedule at the October 16th FWG meeting.

Schedule:

The upcoming FWG meetings are on the third Thursday, through December. Dates are:

- October 16, 2008.
- November 20, 2008.
- December 18, 2008.