To Whom it May Concern: **April 1, 2014**

Do we know where and what we have been doing concerning the CRC (I-5 Bridge)? Do we really understand the magnitude of the role it plays in our state and regional economies?

Don't we really need to come to grips with that, and deal with the fact that we can't wait another ten or twelve years to get construction started on this vital link on Interstate 5 that is critical to both states?

We have had some of the finest people in our community and from the State of Oregon work on this issue for more than 15 years. Numbers of compromises were made with agreements reached by citizen committees as well as local and regional governments of both states. It took many years and a huge amount of public input.

Attached is a list of meetings and actions that were considered by those many groups. (Attachments A.)

Our federal elected officials from both Oregon and Washington were able, under the leadership of Senator Patty Murray, to come up with funding for a combined mass transit and highway project for a new bridge. Our Southwest Washington senators killed that legislation by not providing a vote by the state Senate when the votes were there. They did not seriously consider that the bridge had been studied for years, but most of them knew well both the age and deteriorating condition of the bridge, and that both states had to agree on a solution.

Because of the tragedy at Oso we are able to again see just what can happen if we let danger turn to disaster without taking bold action to protect the public. We have some of those dangerous conditions on our existing I-5 bridge, yet we don't seem to want to talk about them or deal with trying to correct the situation. In our case, it is going to take a new bridge to correct most of the problem. A report concerning the condition of the I-5 bridges is attached as Exhibit B.

We simply cannot afford to abandon the consensus positions we have reached through years of public participation, only to be replaced at the last minute by political rhetoric and half-truths about fantasy bridges that can be built east or west of Interstate 5, and within the next five years!

A group of us has asked the Oregon Highway Department to furnish us with a current report as to the condition of the bridges. We know with all the hearings we have had that the elected officials are, or should be aware of what that condition is.

Submitted by
Ed Barnes
4-1-2014

We are now asking everyone what they think is going to happen to that bridge during the time it would take to plan and replace our current bridges. The ones who opposed the bridge, now want to study it all over again and develop a new plan. As you know too well, our procedures for planning a mega-project like this between two states will take more than 10 years to complete. If they are hoping for less review in the future, they are sadly mistaken. WE NEED TO DO SOMETHING NOW!

We hope that you will review the condition of the bridge and come to your own opinion as to how safe and what repairs will be needed if it is still standing in 10 to 15 years. Please, we need your leadership now to take advantage of all of the serious work that has been accomplished and not let it go for nothing.

Edward L Barnes

Ed Barnes

A

I-5 Columbia River Crossing
April 17, 2013

Introduction
This timeline shows most of the major steps and obstacles throughout 17 years of discussions and planning for the Columbia River Crossing project. The massive, multi-billion dollar project would replace the aged I-5 Interstate bridges and improve several interchanges in South Vancouver and North Portland.

Though it was recognized in 1996 that congestion on the I-5 corridor at this bridge is costing the region dearly, the process to narrow down a solution to meet the needs of two states, two cities, two transit agencies and two metropolitan planning organizations to address this has been time consuming and often quite controversial. The complex project is now potentially one short year away from breaking ground and the level of controversy seems to be peaking.

- **1996:** Washington and Oregon DOTs meet with businesses and civic leaders to examine whether congestion issues on the I-5 corridor at the Columbia River are negatively impacting the local economy.

- **1999:** The area's transportation policy-makers appoint the Leadership Committee, a 14-member group of business and civic leaders.

- **December 1999:** Leadership Committee publishes Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Study. The study identified the magnitude of the congestion problem on I-5, costs of inaction, improvements needed, how to fund improvements, and next steps in the process.

- **1999/2000:** Leadership Committee recommends initiating a public process to develop a plan for improving the I-5 corridor.

- **2001**: Washington and Oregon governors form the 26-member I-5 Portland/Vancouver Transportation and Trade Partnership Taskforce to study problems and potential solutions for I-5 corridor from I-205/I-5 junction in Washington to the I-84 interchange in Oregon.

- **June 2002**: Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership publishes its Final Strategic Plan. The plan provided findings on key issues, including transit, freeway capacity, environmental justice, and financing. It also provided recommendations for action and spelled out the next steps in the process to improve the corridor.

- **Early 2005**: Governors appoint 39-member Task Force to advise the DOTs on project-related issues and concerns.

- **Late 2006**: Four of 12 originally developed transportation plans are selected for a final proposal, along with a fifth no-build option.

- **2007:** Task Force explores using existing I-5 bridges to meet the project's purpose and need. Work on Draft Environmental Impact Statement under way.

- **May 2, 2008**: DEIS published, comment period begins.

- **July 2008**: Six local partner agencies selected a replacement I-5 bridge and light rail extension to Clark College as the project's Locally Preferred Alternative.

- **Summer 2008:** The Environmental Protection Agency finds the DEIS did not adequately cover certain issues, including potential increased suburban sprawl, which could negatively impact minority communities in North Portland.

- **November 2008**: Governors appoint 10-member Project Sponsors Council to help develop a long term, comprehensive solution for a five-mile stretch of I-5 between Portland and Vancouver.

- **December 2009**: Federal Transit Administration approved the project into preliminary engineering.

- **Late 2009/early 2010**: A series of public meetings are held to address the concerns of Hayden Island residents and businesses over lack of local access, overhead structures and elevation at Tomahawk Island Drive, and overall footprint of a proposed interchange on the island.

- **April 2010**: Washington and Oregon governors convene an Independent Review Panel (IRP) to ensure that key project study assumptions and methods are reasonable.

- **August 9, 2010**: Project Sponsors Council chooses 10-lane option with new Hayden Island interchange.

- **September 2010**: Governors and DOTs accept IRP's findings and recommendations. The IRP unanimously assesses that the project should move forward with a new crossing to be built at the earliest possible date.

- **October, 2010:** The Washington and Oregon departments of transportation convene a Bridge Expert Review Panel to evaluate bridge types and configurations for the replacement Interstate Bridge.

- **2010**: City of Vancouver and C-Tran select light rail route through downtown Vancouver.

- **Late 2010/early 2011**: The appearance of a new I-5 bridge is a major topic of discussion among project partners. Some argue for an iconic design, while others argue a simpler design is still effective but less costly.

- **April 2011**: Governors of Washington and Oregon accept Bridge Review Panel's recommendation for a deck truss bridge type, presumably ending the debate over the bridge's appearance.

- **August 11, 2011**: Metro adopts Land Use Final Order, approving the route of CRC through Oregon, including highway improvements, the light rail route and stations, park and ride lots and maintenance facilities.

- **Summer 2011**: WSDOT performs an internal audit on the project's finances in response to accusations of lack of transparency and failure to respond to records requests.

- **September 2011**: Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods and the Coalition for a Livable Future file suit against Metro, contending they are using an obscure 1996 law to force the project through.

- **October 2011**: Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) rules that Metro did not have authority to grant its approval of the CRC route through Oregon when it used a 1996 law aimed at siting rail lines. LUBA turned back most other opposing arguments.

- **September 2011**: Final EIS published.

- **December 2011**: Federal Record of Decision received.

- **March 2012**: U.S. Coast Guard announces that the new bridge, at 95 feet above the Columbia River, does not provide enough clearance to meet the "reasonable needs" of ships. CRC staff commit to analyzing options for bridge height.

- **April 12, 2012**: Metro Council approves a Revised Land Use Final Order, allowing the project to move forward within the realm of Oregon land use law.

- **November 2012**: Clark County voters reject a sales tax increase that would have covered the local cost to operate light rail.

- **November 9, 2012**: A group of 10 Southwest Washington lawmakers call for a complete redesign of the project, citing the recently rejected sales tax increase for light rail, funding problems and lack of public participation in the design.

- **December 2012**: Analysis of a 115- or 116-foot-high bridge presented to a group of Washington state lawmakers. This height will be used as the basis for the critical bridge permit application expected to be filed with the Coast Guard in early 2013.

- **December 19, 2012**: State transportation commissions approve bi-state tolling agreement. Tolls must still have legislative approval to be used as part of funding.

- **February 2013**: Oregon legislature approves $450 million for CRC, contingent upon Washington producing its share of the funding.

B

Here is a quick summary of the major work elements for the interstate bridges.

Annual maintenance activities:

- Electrical systems
- Rebuilds of lift span slide assemblies (every 5 years)
- Ultrasonic testing of trunnion shafts (every 2 years)
- Spot painting (every 5 years)
- Fatigue crack inspection of the floor system (every 5 years)

Operations

The cost to operate the existing lift spans, in addition to routine maintenance costs for 1 year for the existing I-5 Interstate bridges, for the period of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012 was $1.2 million.

Major work items being scheduled:

- Cracked trunnion replacement – There are four trunnion shafts on each of the lift spans (northbound has 4 and southbound has 4). About 15 years ago one of the shafts on the south tower of the northbound bridge developed a crack at a filler weld that was made during the 1958 rehab in association with the construction of the southbound bridge. Since the replacement of the south tower shaft, we have been monitoring the other old shafts to see if they would also crack. In 2009 we found a crack in one of the north tower shafts on the northbound bridge. We have studies of the one we removed earlier, and as such are able to predict how much remaining life the shaft has and have considered scheduling the project to be included in the 2016-2018 STIP at roughly $12m.
- Painting, in 15-20 years at $75m
- Rollers – tower alignment was investigated as a possible contributer to the roller failures that you have read about. Instrumentation and surveys have established tower drift was minimal and within tolerance. The rollers on the 1958 bridge were a much less robust design than the original span. A more permanent repair is being estimated.

There are also links online on the ODOT webpage for bridge condition reports.

Thanks.