

A Proposed Plan of Action Concerning the I-5 Bridge

After consultation with community leaders and organizations about proposals and options of trying to resolve and move forward with a plan for the I-5 Bridge, we believe a small group should develop a plan to get the project of replacing the I-5 Bridge back on track so we can have a proposal that Washington and Oregon State Legislation can consider at their 2019 legislative session.

The suggestion has been made that we get a small group representing the following: Representative from the city, county, both political parties of the House of Representatives and State Senate of Washington, SW Washington High Tech Council, The SW Washington Labor Round Table, CREDC, Identify Clark County, Port of Vancouver and the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce. This group would be charged with coming up with a plan of how that group would recommend we move forward and what they believe the necessary steps are to get a proposal to the Legislature and Governor.

We suggest that all of the groups listed above be asked to participate in such an effort and have a representative to help solve this major problem facing our community. In the next two weeks we need to know who is willing to take part in such a group so we can establish the method of how we must proceed. We suggest having Ed Barnes, who served on the Washington State Transportation Commission and has been more active in supporting some type of positive action on the I-5 Bridge, to act as chairman of the initial meeting, and at that meeting let the group establish how they want to proceed.

The current articles in the Columbian reflect just how serious the problem is. We need to act now if we hope to have anything in time for the 2019 Legislature.

Approved by the SW Washington Round Table on 5-6-2016

Action needed for replacement of the I-5 Bridge NOW.

A resolution passed by the labor Roundtable in the summer of 2014 recognize the importance of all of the work expended by so many individuals, including elected officials to develop a compromise that planning groups and the majority of elected officials of both states and the governors supported. The process that was followed was too cumbersome, and took too much time, but it is a process that has been established to make sure everyone is heard. When we were dealing with funding agreements on the 205-Bridge many years ago, it was the strong support from our community leaders, business and labor, which said to our elected officials get the job done. It is time to say that again. We all recognize that compromise must be made on projects like this. We can't let those who tried to distract us by telling us we can get a bridge without tolls, or build another bridge without going through a process similar to what we used on the I-205 and I-5 Bridges. This approving process will be required when any major bridge is proposed in our state. We need to get the I-5 bridge replacement done now. Any major changes to the existing plan will delay its construction and will probably increase the projects cost and create more delay, congestion, injuries and economic impact on our area. The impact on families due to the traffic congestion and delays also needs to be considered. We don't seem to understand the impact this is having on both of our states

In any proposed new bridge east or west of I-5 will require new connections to major streets that do not exist now and a process of permitting that we have been experiencing on the current replacement of the I-5 bridge. If we can't solve the I-5 bridge replacement now we need to be asking ourselves how do we expect to come up with other bridges when the same process is needed that is required for I-5 bridge replacement.

It is difficult to ask our elected officials to support a compromise plan unless those of us in the community and our elected officials and Governor are strong advocates of the project. To date that has not been done. We saw in the last legislature that we couldn't even designate this important project as a project of statewide significance.

We are requesting that the RTC and our local elected officials contact the governors and legislators of both the states of Oregon and Washington and tell them that the I-5 replacement bridge is a project of statewide significance and that they need to take action NOW.

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION of the Labor Round Table of SW Washington (LRTofSWW) recognizing this region's volunteers, civic leaders and professionals who, over the past two decades, worked tirelessly to create a plan to address congestion in the Interstate 5 corridor through Vancouver and Portland, and expressing the Labor Round Table of SW Washington (LRTofSWW) heartfelt appreciation for the countless hours and great effort these groups and individuals expended on behalf of our region's citizens, present and future.

1. WHEREAS, citizens of this region have long recognized the need for improvements in the Interstate 5 corridor through Vancouver and Portland, particularly in the area of the Interstate Bridge; and
2. WHEREAS, in 1996 leaders from the business and transportation sectors of Washington and Oregon (1) met to determine whether the I-5 corridor was negatively impacting the regional economy and
3. WHEREAS, in 1999 area transportation decision-makers established a Policy Committee (2) and appointed a Leadership Committee (3) to identify the magnitude of I-5 congestion, the cost of inaction, improvements needed, funding sources and next steps; and
4. WHEREAS, in January 2000 the Washington and Oregon departments of Transportation (4) published the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Trade Corridor Freight Feasibility and Needs Assessment¹ study, which determined that the corridor was a chokepoint that, without improvements, threatened the region's economic promise and required new freight and passenger capacity across the river; that it would be dependent in part on federal financial assistance and quite likely tolling; and that the region needed a strategic plan to improve the corridor; and

¹ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/NonCRCRelatedDocuments/I-5_Partnership_Freight_Feasibility_Phase1_Final_Report1.pdf

5. WHEREAS, in 2001, Washington Gov. Gary Locke and Oregon Gov. John Kitzhaber formed the I-5 Portland/Vancouver Transportation and Trade Partnership Task Force (5) to study the problems and potential solutions for the I-5 corridor from the I-205/I-5 junction in Washington to the I-84 interchange in Oregon; and

6. WHEREAS, in 2002 the Transportation and Trade Partnership Task Force published its Final Strategic Plan² establishing that improvements were “necessary to meet the transportation, economic, and livability needs of the Portland/Vancouver Region,”³ and suggesting, among other projects, that light rail should be established in Clark County,⁴ that I-5 needed widening,⁵ that new transit and vehicle capacity should be built across the Columbia River and that the region should undertake an Environmental Impact Study (EIS);⁶ and

7. WHEREAS, in 2005 the governors of Washington and Oregon appointed 39 local residents to the CRC Task Force (6), which met 23 times between February 2005 and June 2008 and advised the Washington State and Oregon departments of Transportation on project-related issues. According to the Final EIS, “[t]he Task Force adopted a Vision and Values Statement and a Problem Definition, which led to the approval of a project Purpose and Need Statement[,] ... identified over 70 potential solutions and engaged in a multipart screening and evaluation process that was used to narrow options and package them into components for further study[,] ... assisted with the evaluation of 12 preliminary alternatives and guided the development of the

² http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/NonCRCRelatedDocuments/I-5_Partnerhip_2002_Strategic_Plan.pdf

³ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/NonCRCRelatedDocuments/I-5_Partnerhip_2002_Strategic_Plan.pdf, p. 16

⁴ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/NonCRCRelatedDocuments/I-5_Partnerhip_2002_Strategic_Plan.pdf, p. 19

⁵ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/NonCRCRelatedDocuments/I-5_Partnerhip_2002_Strategic_Plan.pdf, p. 20

⁶ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/NonCRCRelatedDocuments/I-5_Partnerhip_2002_Strategic_Plan.pdf, p. 29

five alternatives presented in the Draft EIS. The final action of the Task Force was to make a recommendation on the locally preferred alternative”;⁷ and

8. WHEREAS, in 2006, after two public open houses, two design workshops with neighborhood leaders and a combined open house-U.S. Coast Guard hearing on bridge options,⁸ four transportation plans and a fifth no-build option were selected for a final proposal; and

9. WHEREAS, on May 2, 2008, the Draft EIS was published by project co-leads (7) the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), Metro, Clark County Public Transportation Benefit Area (C-TRAN) and Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District (TriMet), pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and the guidelines of the U.S. Department of Transportation, FHWA and FTA;⁹ and

10. WHEREAS, the broad range of alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS took into consideration the nearly 4,500 received comments and community participation at 11 open houses and 350 public events, and responses to information sent to nearly 3,000 email addresses and more than 10,000 mailing addresses;¹⁰ and

11. WHEREAS, the Draft EIS was informed by discussions with the CRC Task Force and study by CRC project staff, which led to a set of 23 river crossing ideas being reduced to four and a set of 14 initial public transportation ideas being reduced to five using evaluation

⁷ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/FINAL_EIS_PDFs/Appendices/CRC_FEIS_Appendix_B.pdf, p. B-10.

⁸ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/FINAL_EIS_PDFs/Appendices/CRC_FEIS_Appendix_B.pdf, p. B-7.

⁹ <http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/DraftEIS/DraftEISPrefaceAndAcronyms.pdf>, p. xi.

¹⁰ <http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/DraftEIS/DraftEISPrefaceAndAcronyms.pdf>, p. xi.

criteria developed with local agency sponsors (WSDOT, ODOT, RTC, Metro, TriMet, C-TRAN, the City of Vancouver and the City of Portland (8)¹¹), the CRC Task Force, and state and federal permitting agencies (together constituting the Interstate Collaborative Environmental Process Group (InterCEP)) (9), “and extensive public input”;¹² and

12. WHEREAS, in July 2008, after the Draft EIS was published, local project sponsors—WSDOT, ODOT, RTC, Metro, C-TRAN and TriMet—adopted the Locally Preferred Alternative, which included a new river crossing, an extension of light rail to Clark College, bicycle and pedestrian improvements throughout the corridor, a toll on motorists, and transportation demand and system management measures;¹³ and

13. WHEREAS, the governors of Washington and Oregon formed the Project Sponsors Council (10) to consider technical information and input from advisory groups and citizen comments, and advise the departments of Transportation on future project development, and in 2010 the PSC collaborated to refine various components of the Locally Preferred Alternative;¹⁴ ¹⁵ and

14. WHEREAS, in 2010 the City of Vancouver and C-TRAN selected a light rail route through downtown Vancouver;¹⁶ and

15. WHEREAS, in April 2010 the governors of Washington and Oregon convened an Independent Review Panel (11) of eight transportation experts to ensure that the CRC Project’s key study assumptions and methods were reasonable;¹⁷ and

¹¹ <http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/DraftEIS/DraftEISPrefaceAndAcronyms.pdf>, p. xi.

¹² <http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/DraftEIS/DraftEISPrefaceAndAcronyms.pdf>, xi.

¹³ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/FINAL_EIS_PDFs/CRC_FEIS_Cover_Introduction.pdf, p. iii.

¹⁴ <http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/AdvisoryGroups/PSC.aspx>

¹⁵ http://columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/GeneralProjectDocs/PSC%20Final%20Report_091310/PSC%20Final%20Report_091310.pdf

¹⁶ <http://columbiarivercrossing.org/ProjectInformation/ProblemsSolutions/ProjectTimeline.aspx>

¹⁷ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/IRP/GovernorsPressRelease%20_041310.pdf, p. 1.

16. WHEREAS, in September 2010 the two state departments of Transportation accepted the Independent Review Panel's findings and recommendations, including that the CRC must move forward to build a new bridge as soon as possible;¹⁸ and

17. WHEREAS, in October 2010 the two state departments of Transportation convened a Bridge Expert Review Panel (12) of 16 national and international experts to evaluate bridge types and configurations for the replacement I-5 bridge;¹⁹ and

18. WHEREAS, in January 2011 the National Marine Fisheries Service issued an opinion stating that the proposed CRC project would not likely jeopardize the existence or habitat of various species of fish;²⁰ and

19. WHEREAS, in March 2011 the governors of Washington and Oregon accepted the Bridge Review Panel's recommendation for a deck truss bridge;²¹ and

20. WHEREAS, July 20, 2011, the office of the Oregon State Treasury presented a report, at the request of Oregon Gov. Kitzhaber, on the CRC's financing plan, the recommendations of which CRC then incorporated into the Final EIS;²² and

21. WHEREAS, in September 2011 the Final EIS was published; and

22. WHEREAS, between October 2005 and September 2011, when the Final EIS was published, project staff had more than 27,000 public outreach contacts at 900 events;²³ and

23. WHEREAS, in September 2011 the Oregon state legislature created a Joint Legislative Oversight Committee (13) on CRC that was charged with reviewing and providing oversight on all aspects of the CRC project, including the project's finance plan;²⁴ and

¹⁸ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/IRP/DOT_PressRelease_092810.pdf

¹⁹ http://columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/GeneralProjectDocs/BridgeExpertReviewPanel_PanelistBios.pdf

²⁰ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/Biological_Assessment_Opinion/NMFS_Biological_Opinion_011911.pdf

²¹ <http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/Newsroom/Default.aspx?Tag=3>

²² <http://columbiarivercrossing.org/ProjectInformation/ResearchAndResults/FinancialPlanReview.aspx>

²³ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/FINAL_EIS_PDFs/CRC_FEIS_Cover_Introduction.pdf, p. xxvi.

24. WHEREAS, in December 2011 the federal Record of Decision was released, stating that the FHWA and FTA found that the requirements of NEPA had been satisfied for the construction and operation of the Selected Alternative of the I-5 CRC Project;²⁵ and

25. WHEREAS, in March 2012 the U.S. Coast Guard announced that the new bridge, at 95 feet above the Columbia River, would not provide enough clearance to meet the “reasonable needs” of ships, and CRC staff agreed to analyze other options for bridge height; and

26. WHEREAS, in March 2012 Washington Gov. Chris Gregoire signed legislation calling for the formation of a Washington legislative oversight committee on CRC (14) that would provide oversight on project plans and financing, and give feedback to WSDOT; and

27. WHEREAS, in November 2012, Clark County voters rejected a sales tax increase that would have covered the local cost to operate light rail; and

28. WHEREAS, on November 9, 2012, a group of 10 Southwest Washington lawmakers (15) called 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;²⁶ and

29. WHEREAS, in November 2012²⁷ the CRC Project released an analysis of a 115- or 116-foot-high bridge that would reduce the number of vessels adversely affected by the bridge height and minimizing additional expenses;²⁸ and

30. WHEREAS, in December 2012 the Washington and Oregon state transportation commissions (16) unanimously approved a bi-state tolling agreement;²⁹ and

²⁴ <http://columbiarivercrossing.org/ProjectInformation/ResearchAndResults/ORLOC.aspx>

²⁵ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/ROD/CRC_ROD.pdf

²⁶ <http://www.columbian.com/news/2012/nov/08/southwest-washington-lawmakers-ask-scrap-crc-plans/>

²⁷ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/TechnicalReports/CRC_NavigationImpactReport_110212

²⁸ http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/PressReleases/NewsRelease_121012.pdf

²⁹ <http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/Newsroom/Article.aspx?ID=79>

31. WHEREAS, in March 2013 the Oregon legislature approved \$450 million for the CRC Project, contingent on Washington producing its share of the funding;³⁰ and

32. WHEREAS, the residents of the City of Vancouver as well as those of both Washington and Oregon owe a deep debt of gratitude to the hundreds of citizens who unselfishly gave time away from their work and families, often in evenings and weekends, to serve on advisory committees and in other important capacities to ensure this crossing would meet the demands of a new 100-year bridge; and

33. WHEREAS, we should be especially thankful for the congressional delegation from the states of Washington and Oregon who have strongly supported the CRC project and its federal funding: Washington State U.S. Senators: Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell and Oregon State U.S. Senators: Ron Wyden and Jeff Merkley; Washington State Congressional Members: Suzan DelBene, Rick Larsen, Derek Kilmer, Jim McDermott, Adam Smith, Denny Heck and Brian Baird; and Oregon State Congressional Members: Suzanne Bonamici, Earl Blumenauer, Peter DeFazio, and Kurt Schrader.

34. WHEREAS, as of June 2014 nearly \$200 million has been spent on planning the \$2.9 billion bridge³¹ and related transportation solutions that might never be realized.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE Labor Round Table of SW Washington (LRTofSWW):

Section 1. In this time of project dormancy, the Labor Round Table of SW Washington (LRTofSWW) takes this opportunity to review the history of the CRC project.

Section 2. The Labor Round Table of SW Washington (LRTofSWW) requests that all participating agencies conscientiously preserve the work that has been completed on the

³⁰ <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2013R1/Measures/Overview/HB2800>

³¹ http://www.oregonlive.com/clark-county/index.ssf?/2014/06/columbia_river_crossing_new_i-.html

project, so that our region's and its people's investment of time, money and energy do not go for naught.

Section 3. The Labor Round Table of SW Washington (LRTofSWW) requests that all agencies be prepared to draw on previous work and engage when and where appropriate in future discussions that could lead to a bridge project in the Vancouver/Portland I-5 corridor.

Section 4. The Labor Round Table of SW Washington (LRTofSWW) acknowledges and expresses its deep appreciation to the many people who contributed their time and effort to the CRC project, and we take this opportunity to offer our sincere thanks to all of the groups and individuals who made this work possible. Although we have not identified every participant, we are listing many of the people who participated in the major actions of this project in an addendum to this resolution.

I-5 BRIDGE PROJECT SHOULD CARRY "PROJECT OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE" DESIGNATION

The pending I-5 bridge project qualifies for, and should be designated by the State of Washington as a project of statewide significance. In 1997, the state legislature adopted legislation which provides that certain projects and investments merit special designation and treatment by government bodies as government projects and investments of Statewide Significance.

WHEREAS, the above mentioned legislation designates that border-crossing projects involving both private and public investments carried out in conjunction with adjacent states or provinces or a private development with private capital investment qualifies for this special designation; and,

WHEREAS, such designation is designed to "expedite the development of projects of statewide significance" and local governments having comprehensive plans may "develop a process to expedite the review, approval, permitting, and completion of projects of statewide significance; and

WHEREAS, the I-5 bridge project clearly falls under that designation; and

WHEREAS, this legislation refers directly to the types of investment like SEH America and Wafer Tech that were designated as projects of Statewide Significance; and

WHEREAS, we applaud the efforts by Oregon transportation leaders to address the I-5 corridor deficiencies through the I-5/I-84 interchange (aka the Rose Quarter) in Portland; and

WHEREAS, border Crossing projects that involve both private and public investments with adjacent states such as the State of Oregon; and local industries and the employees of those industries rely directly on the bridge that services the I-5 corridor; and

WHEREAS, President Dwight D. Eisenhower designated the I-5 bridge as part of a national defense interstate highway system serving the west coast from Canada to Mexico, including Oregon and Washington and the metropolitan area of Portland and Vancouver; (see attachment) and

WHEREAS, President Bush issued an order to expedite the Columbia River Crossing. This action placed this project in an elite status, extended to only 20 other projects in the USA over the last five years before 2008; (see Attachment) and

WHEREAS, President Obama announced on August 18, 2012 that the Columbia River Crossing project as one of the transportation projects to be expedited through his *We Can't Wait* initiative. This designation recognizes the national significance of the project; (see attachment) and

WHEREAS, existing I-5 bridge congestion is negatively impacting the entire west coast, and the economies of SW Washington and the Portland Metropolitan Area; and the economy of the West Coast of the United States; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the I-5 Bridge Group recommends that the state of Washington designate the I-5 Bridge replacement as a project of statewide significance and that we ask the state of Oregon and Washington to request Congress to assist in funding this important I-5 bridge replacement as a project of statewide significance.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we ask the state of Oregon and Washington to request Congress to assist in funding this important I-5 interstate defense highway bridge because of its importance to the economy of the United States.



CLARK COUNTY HIGH TECHNOLOGY
& COMMUNITY COUNCIL

February 27, 2015

Washington State Governor and Legislators:

MEMBERS

ROB BERNARDI
Chair
Kokusai Semiconductor
Equipment Corp.

CASEY O'DELL
Secretary & Treasurer
Sharp Microelectronics
of the Americas

JEFF PARKER
Linear Technology Corp.

SCOTT KEENEY
nLight Photonics, Corp.

LARRY MEIXNER
Sharp Labs of America

JOHN MARCK
Sharp Microelectronics
of the Americas

ROBERT SCHAEFER
Shin Etsu-SEH America

RALPH PARKER
Underwriters
Laboratories, Inc.

KC HSU
WaferTech

PATRICK COTTER
Kyocera Industrial
Ceramics

The Clark County High Technology and Community Council (HTC) in Southwest Washington would like to thank all the legislators who have worked toward solving the traffic problem on I-5 as it crosses the Columbia River. The HTC is seriously concerned at the seeming lack of interest within the Washington State Legislature to re-address the Columbia River Crossing when it failed to fund the project during the previous legislative session. The HTC represents some nine (9) industries and more than 4,000 employees in this region and the Washington Senate's failure to act has had a withering effect on our members' planning for the future. Of course, the magnitude of the problem is well beyond our region's businesses alone.

The lack of replacement of the I-5 Bridge means continued accidents, congestion and an inability to efficiently move freight and goods through the corridor and in and out of our state. This means that industries and manufacturers will be reluctant to expand or be attracted to our state or Southwest Washington. It also will affect other areas that use this corridor to obtain certain products and materials. All of these factors will affect jobs and our economy.

We all should realize how important the only north-south Interstate Highway is to our state, and that the I-5 Interstate is our only north-south Defense Highway in Washington. All the proposals now being presented concerning the Columbia River I-5 bridge location or type of structure were considered during the last 12 years. This includes the fact that the federal government does not want any draw bridges on the interstate. Additionally, the narrowness of the lanes and lack of shoulders contribute to many, many accidents per year and makes it difficult for emergency vehicles to access the accident site. This is certainly a situation that needs mitigating at a major entrance to our state.



CLARK COUNTY HIGH TECHNOLOGY
& COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MEMBERS

ROB BERNARDI
Chair
Kokusai Semiconductor
Equipment Corp.

CASEY O'DELL
Secretary & Treasurer
Sharp Microelectronics
of the Americas

JEFF PARKER
Linear Technology Corp.

SCOTT KEENEY
nLight Photonics, Corp.

LARRY MEIXNER
Sharp Labs of America

JOHN MARCK
Sharp Microelectronics
of the Americas

ROBERT SCHAEFER
Shin Etsu-SEH America

RALPH PARKER
Underwriters
Laboratories, Inc.

KC HSU
WaferTech

PATRICK COTTER
Kyocera Industrial
Ceramics

The current transportation package being considered by the State Senate should include the I-5 Columbia River bridge replacement and should be considered in the mega projects. The Governor and legislature should be actively working with the State of Oregon, and know some of you are. Because the transportation package spans a 16 year period it is critical that the legislature and governor address the I-5 bridge replacement now. As was stated in the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce letter to the Washington State Senate Transportation Committee, "The 100 year old drawbridge span will need replacement long before 2031". We have described just a few of the reasons this bridge is so important.

We thank all of you who are trying to solve the Columbia River Crossing on I-5 and know that you recognize its importance to our community and our state.

Sincerely,

Robert Bernardi, Chair
Clark County High Technology & Community Council

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.



Washington State Legislature

January 29, 1998

Olympia

The Honorable Gary Locke
Legislative Building
Olympia, WA 98504

Re: Industries of Statewide Significance

7671

post-it Fax Note		Date	# of pages
To: Bob Shaefer		From	
Co/Dept.		Co.	
Phone #		Phone #	693-1777
Fax #		Fax #	

Dear Governor Locke:

When I sponsored HB 2170 in 1997, hearings revolved around the intent being recognition of investments that have statewide significance and affect the overall economy of our state. Clark County has been blessed by having two such companies designated as Industries of Statewide Significance . . . SEH America and WasterTech. The size of these investments and the people they will be employing will make significant changes not only in Southwest Washington, but also in our state as a whole.

I felt that this legislation was following the intent of the legislature and the Governor by making sure we established special priority for projects that impact these investments and industries. The reason this was to inform industries that the state supported their investment and to encourage others to make such investments.

One reason that I used the mandatory language of "must" was to make sure that this special priority would be given to projects such as the 192nd interchange on State Route 14.

In the report by the House Committee on Trade and Economic Development to the legislature outlining the intent of this legislation, it quoted:

"The DCTED must assign an ombudsman to each industrial project of statewide significance. The DCTED ombudsman must assemble a team of state and local government and private officials to help meet the project's planning and development needs of each project. The members of the team include those with responsibility for planning, permitting and licensing, infrastructure development, work force development services, transportation services, and the provision of utilities. The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board must revise its compressive plan for work force training and education to address how a state's work force development system will meet employer hiring needs for industrial projects of

statewide significance.

The Department of Ecology must revise its various planning documents to address how the department will expedite the completion of industrial projects of statewide significance. The DOB and appropriate local government must also include in the master programs, adopted under the Shorelines Management Act, an economic development element for the location and design of industrial projects of statewide significance.

The Washington State Department of Transportation, as part of its state transportation policy plan, must address how the department will meet the transportation needs and expedite the completion of industrial projects of statewide significance.

Important

Important

By passage of this legislation we have told these industries that we support their investments in our state. We have also conveyed to them that we will develop a special priority for projects and processes which have an affect on their investment. To do otherwise now would be contrary to this unanimously passed legislation. A special priority must be established for the 192nd interchange on SR 14 this session, otherwise we are not following the intent of the legislation. We also want to make sure that we are establishing a priority for processing applications and reviews by any of our state agencies affecting these investments.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

John Pennington
Speaker Pro Tempore



Serving: Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas & Columbia Counties

9955 SE Washington St., Ste. 305
Portland, OR 97216-2453
(503) 235-9444
Fax (503) 233-8259
officemgr@nwolc.org

AFL ■ CIO

BOB TACKETT
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Resolution supporting the replacement of the Interstate 5 Bridge

WHEREAS, Interstate 5 is a corridor of national significance that serves the entire west coast of the United States, as well as international commerce with Canada, Mexico, and all of the countries of the Pacific Rim that access U.S. west coast sea ports; and

WHEREAS, the Interstate 5 Bridge is a key economic connector to two major ports and much of the industrial land in the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Region; and

WHEREAS, Interstate 5 between Portland, Oregon and Vancouver, Washington experiences some of the most severe congestion along the entire length of the Interstate 5 corridor, especially during the daily commuting periods, affecting travel time reliability and hindering the efficient movement of people and freight; and

WHEREAS, existing bi-state public transit service is inadequate to meet demand, and existing service operates in mixed-traffic, which has significant negative impacts on performance and operational outcomes; and

WHEREAS, high capacity transit does not currently connect Portland and Vancouver and high capacity transit with a dedicated thoroughfare would provide greatly improved transit service with much better schedule reliability and service than mixed-traffic operation; and

WHEREAS, frequent crashes on the corridor and on the Bridge itself affect public safety; and

WHEREAS, the existing Interstate 5 bridges are functionally obsolete and do not meet current seismic standards; and

WHEREAS, replacement of the Interstate 5 Bridge is needed to support critical trade routes, address congestion, provide transportation choices, and improve safety;

Now, Therefore be it Resolved that The Northwest Oregon Labor Council, AFL-CIO supports efforts to begin a new project development process for an Interstate 5 Bridge replacement, consisting of a replacement bridge and High Capacity Transit with a dedicated thoroughfare.

JEFF ANDERSON
President

EVERICE BROLIAR MORO
1st Vice President

ED BARNES
2nd Vice President

Be it Further Resolved that The NW Oregon Labor Council supports a multi-modal approach of highway, high-capacity transit, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements to support the region's travel needs.

And be it Finally Resolved that The NW Oregon Labor Council urges Governor Kate Brown and the Oregon State Legislature to analyze all options available to reduce congestion in the region, beginning with the replacement of the Interstate 5 Bridge.

ADOPTED this 22nd day of October 2018, by the Northwest Oregon Labor Council, AFL-CIO.



Bob Tackett
Executive Secretary Treasurer
NW Oregon Labor Council, AFL-CIO



Jeff Anderson
President
NW Oregon Labor Council, AFL-CIO