

October 30, 2006

TO: Tom Markgraf and Linda Mullen, Columbia River Crossing Project
FR: Adam Davis, Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc.
RE: Washington/Oregon Focus Groups Report

I. Introduction and Methodology

We facilitated four focus groups – two comprised of Washington (Clark County) and two of Oregon (Tri-County) residents – on October 17 and 23, 2006. The purpose of the research was to learn more about how to better communicate with the public about the Columbia River Crossing project, including how to increase understanding and support levels.

Focus group participants represented a cross-section of registered voters who are soft opponents and supporters¹ of transportation funding measures generally, or are neutral or unsure about them. A total of 35 people participated. Appendix A has demographic information on all participants.

Although research of this type is not designed to measure with statistical reliability the attitudes of a particular group, it is valuable in giving a sense of the attitudes and opinions of the populations from which the samples were drawn.²

This memo highlights key findings from the discussions. Each section reviews a major topic taken up during group discussions. Representative quotations are included along with evaluative commentary. The quotes and commentary are drawn from both written exercises and group discussions.³ The referenced Appendixes have complete responses to all written exercises.

II. Semantics and General Imagery

What works well

"MAX works well in Portland if you live close enough. On the Vancouver side there isn't any mass transit that's viable out where I am." (WA)

"I take the bus to get to Swan Island. It takes a long time, but it works." (WA)

"Mass transit does a good job at moving lots of people...that's about it." (OR)

"I like the carpool lanes." (WA)

"I love the transportation system here. Easy access, affordable, efficient." (OR)

"Major arterials do well here [in Portland]." (OR)

What doesn't work well

"Hopeless congestion!" (OR)

"I have never seen on/off ramps like here...It seems really dangerous." (WA)

"Freeways way too jammed up during rush hour – seems to be getting worse. Not enough advance planning for advancing population." (OR)

"We have too few ways across the river." (WA)

¹ Soft supporters and opponents were recruits who, when asked how willing they would be to pay anything more in taxes to improve the region's transportation system, responded 2-6 on a scale of 1=not at all willing to 7=very willing.

² The results of some rankings are included in the appendices. Although these are not a statistically valid measurement of views, they help illustrate the range and extent of consistency of views from group to group and within each group when read in combination with the written comments.

³ Quotations were selected to represent the range of opinions regarding a topic, and not to represent quantitatively the expressed attitudes. Each quotation indicates participant state of residence.

A. Problems in general

All groups were asked what works well and what doesn't work well when they think of transportation in the Portland/Vancouver area (Appendix B) and whether and why something should be done to minimize problems on I-5 between SR 500 in Vancouver and Columbia Boulevard and including the Interstate Bridge (Appendix C).

How transportation generally *works well*: Comments mostly centered on public transit. About half of all participants mentioned MAX/light rail and nearly a third mentioned buses (C-Tran, Tri-Met, or both). Other mentions included highway improvements on the Washington side, the Portland airport, HOV lanes, areas where lanes have been added, and the I-205 bridge.

How transportation generally *doesn't work well*: Comments included traffic congestion, light rail and buses not serving enough areas, C-Tran route cuts, and cost of public transportation. Several specifically noted "no light rail to Vancouver area." Other mentions included change in lanes at Delta Park, dated on and off ramps and related merging problems, and lack of an HOV lane continuing on the Washington side. Washington residents were more likely to mention safety problems related to ramp design and merging.

Nearly all thought something should be done to minimize the problems on this segment of I-5; only four said no or don't know. Several added an exclamation point to their yes! Phrases used most frequently to describe why they thought something should be done centered on "too much" traffic: congestion, bottleneck, back-up, jam, slow down/delays, and time. Although there was little or no mention of the bridge opening, several commented on the age of the bridge.

The handful who said nothing should be done had different reasons. One said, "Don't put band aids on long term problems...drive less – don't help us drive *more*." Another suggested diverting traffic to the east.

B. Awareness of proposals to minimize problems

Asked what they had heard about what has been proposed to minimize the problems on the specified segment of I-5, slightly more than half (19) indicated they had heard something and 16 said they had not (Appendix D). Washington participants had more awareness. About seven in 10 in the Washington groups said yes, while there were fewer than four in 10 yeses in the Oregon groups.

Most-mentioned among Washington participants were: new bridge, bridge toll, and MAX/light rail. Oregon residents mentioned a new bridge most often, followed by light rail, with none recording a possible toll. Both groups mentioned less frequently widening the bridge and adding lanes to the freeway.

Participants noted a variety of sources of information about this topic – newspapers (*The Columbian*, *The Oregonian*), television news, and word of mouth. Other mentions included radio and neighborhood and other meetings.

III. Reasons for Doing Something

- "If we don't do something soon, hey...let's just call ourselves Seattle version 1.2." (WA)
- "I-5 is the main road. You'd think on a priority scale that would be #1." (OR)
- "I see safety and congestion hand in hand. To merge into an exit is frightening." (WA)
- "If we have a natural disaster that wipes out one of the bridges, we will have to put ferries back into service." (WA)
- "It [easing up congestion] improves everybody's attitudes during rush hour." (WA)
- "Commerce is going on there...A lot of businesses won't take jobs over there [Vancouver]; it's not cost effective." (OR)
- "We're using 1920s technology to get across the river. It's a joke." (OR)

Participants offered and discussed what they personally thought were the best reasons for doing something about problems in the project area. They then indicated what they thought were the first, second, and third best reasons for doing something (Appendix E). The following table shows the reasons each group considered using weighted rankings⁴, with those in the top tier in ***bolditalic***.

Ranking of Reasons For Doing Something

Washington #1	Washington #2	Oregon #1	Oregon #2
1. <i>Shorter commute time</i>	1. <i>To accommodate increased traffic</i>	1. <i>Easier for commerce/business operations</i>	1. <i>Reduce travel time</i>
2. <i>To accommodate growth</i>	2. <i>Safety concerns – ramps, 3-2 lanes</i>	2. <i>Help reduce congestion</i>	2. Improve safety
3. Help local economy	3. Aging bridge needing replacement	3. Shorten commute	3. Freight mobility/help businesses, economy
4. Safety	4. Emergency preparedness	4. Important to West Coast	4. Replace old technology/eliminate need to open and close
5. Improved freight mobility	5. Predictable travel times	5. Reduce fuel consumption, pollution	5. Emergency preparedness/evacuation
6. More personal time	6. Improved freight mobility	6. Less road rage/stress	6. Help get to areas easier for economic and social benefits
7. Emergency preparedness	7. Road rage	7. Improve safety	7. Seismic improvement
8. Reduce road rage		8. Improve quality of life	8. Important to West Coast
9. Improved worker productivity		9. Enhance tourism	9. Accommodate emergency vehicles
		10. Emergency preparedness	

Even though the groups did not have identical lists, we learn from the weighted rankings that reducing congestion and the time associated with it was in the top tier for all groups. When we move beyond congestion, we find that safety was ranked fairly high in three of the four groups, came up more often in the Washington groups, and was in the top tier for Washington Group #2.

Emergency preparedness as a reason did not come up unprompted, although once it was mentioned it appeared to resonate with participants. However, in the final ranking of reasons for doing something, it was not among the highest.

⁴ Weighted rankings based on three points for best, two points for second best, and one point for third best reason.

No other reason really stood out in all four groups. Based both on the rankings and the group discussion, the two Oregon groups expressed more awareness of and concern about the impact of I-5 problems on interstate commerce and business, with Oregon Group #1 placing this in their top tier. Reasons related to the movement of goods and services (“freight mobility”) did not come up unprompted in the Washington groups, even though there was some discussion of the impact on the local economy.

IV. Reasons for Not Doing Something

- “If you don’t build it, they won’t come.” (WA)
- “It will cost a fortune.” (OR)
- “It’s wasteful if there are other alternatives. Some other things should be on the table.” (WA)
- “Gee, it’s not near the top of the priority list...My priority is taking care of kids.” (OR)
- “It’s not bad enough.” (OR)
- “Don’t want to make proliferation of the auto easier. We need to force mentality into mass transit.” (WA)
- “People who don’t benefit will object on the basis of cost.” (OR)

Participants offered and discussed what they personally thought were the best reasons for **not** doing something about problems in the project area. They then indicated what they thought were the first, second, and third best reasons for not doing something (Appendix F). The following table shows the reasons each group considered using weighted rankings, with those in the top tier in ***bolditalic***.

Ranking of Reasons For Not Doing Something

Washington #1	Washington #2	Oregon #1	Oregon #2
1. Cost/taxes	1. Cost	1. Cost/money	1. No personal benefit
2. More important priorities	2. Don’t use, so why pay	2. Priorities	2. Cost
3. Force consideration of mass transit	3. Construction impacts on neighborhoods, business districts	3. Still working/not bad enough/not a crisis	3. Poor project management
4. Don’t want to work with other state	4. Anti-growth	4. Futility	4. Won’t get Vancouver assistance
	5. Wasteful spending	5. Project details that don’t benefit enough people	5. Won’t be done with long-term in mind
	6. Environmental impacts	6. No personal benefit	6. Cost/benefit
	7. Other alternatives available		7. Not really result in benefit
			8. Futility
			9. Vancouver won’t do anything because it would help development there

There was more commonality for the best reasons not to do something. The ones that stood out across all the groups were cost, priorities, and no personal benefit (don’t use that stretch of freeway).

Interestingly, one group in each state raised issues related to whether the two states can work together, with a comment in the Washington group viewing Oregon as a state that hasn’t planned transportation well and a comment in the Oregon group thinking it might be to Vancouver’s advantage to develop independently and not cooperate. “It’s an odd relationship with people living in one place, working and shopping in another; we don’t have vice versa.”

V. Project Importance Level

- "Both sides need each other to co-exist. If we don't do something with the corridor, will result in discord...People have to get to Portland for jobs." (Somewhat/WA)
- "I can arrange my personal schedule to accommodate peak traffic flow." (Not very/WA)
- "I stay away from that section of I-5 and use alternate routes." (Not Very/OR)
- "This is a dangerous section of I-5 and it will only get worse with time." (Very/WA)
- "A fix to the problem will only get more expensive as time goes by." (Very/OR)
- "I value reduced congestion/greater ease of commute, *but* I would want to explore a cash benefit analysis and impact of continued growth." (Somewhat/OR)
- "For growth and stability of our city." (Very/WA)
- "No action toward mass transit or even reduction of driving will occur if we make it easier to drive to Portland." (Not at all/WA)

After discussing reasons to do/not do something, participants were asked how important it is to them that something be done about this segment of I-5 and why (Appendix G). Nearly half (n=16) said "very" important and 11 said "somewhat" important. Eight responded not very or not at all important.

Overall, those who said it was very or somewhat important focused on the many benefits to the economy, quality of life, and safety of the project area.

Many comments centered around the importance of making sure any solution was of benefit in the long term. "I'm not interested in spending millions if it is not long term enough." There was a strong sentiment that whatever the proposed solution, that it encompass a comprehensive and not piecemeal approach.

Some who said "it doesn't affect me personally" said it wasn't very important to them to do something; that they just didn't need to use that stretch of freeway. Others, though, could see the overall benefit to the area's economy and traffic flow even though they were not affected personally. The lack of personal benefit, regardless of perspective, was more commonly mentioned in the Oregon groups.

There was some mention of other options, including moving traffic to the west or east of where the Interstate Bridge is currently located.

VI. Incorporating Public Transit

- "Mass transit is a must!" (WA)
- "Anything that can get cars off the road is good." (WA)
- "It's going to take more than TriMet to get people to drive less." (OR)
- "Hopeful but skeptical." (WA)
- "Public transit must be an integrated part of answer and solution." (OR)
- "Public transit will not solve all of the I-5 issues...Might work to alleviate *some* of the congestion." (OR)
- "If you steal lanes off the Interstate Bridge, then have you made the problem better or worse?" (WA)
- "Bus idea would clog things up more. Don't understand how you get light rail across unless you build a bridge." (WA)
- "If you are using the same bridge, I don't see how rapid transit bus service could help." (OR)

Nearly all participants saw a role for public transit in addressing problems in the project area (Appendix H). Those most positive were adamant that public transit be a part of the solution. A minority thought public transit should be *the* approach to solving “the I-5 problem,” while most saw transit as being *part* of the solution. Some were cautiously optimistic but slightly skeptical that light rail and better bus service could help with congestion. A few were very negative about public transit being part of the solution.

Asked what they consider to be “public transit” and how it would work (Appendix H), a substantial number described a combination of MAX/light rail and bus service. A handful included other ideas like carpooling, water ferry, commuter trains, and truck/HOV lanes. Some looked at it in a different context, such as “Something that everyone pays for even if not using, like schools.”

When asked specifically how they felt about light rail or some type of bus rapid transit service being a specific part of the project, nearly seven in 10 participants (24 out of 35) said it was a good idea (Appendix I).

Most seemed to find light rail more appealing than bus rapid transit service. Some, especially in Washington, seemed to assume that the dedicated bus lanes and/or building light rail would be on the existing Interstate Bridge and had the caveat that it was a good idea “if it didn’t take away lanes for autos.” A few preferred light rail for environmental and fuel considerations. One suggested alternative fuel buses.

The few who thought transit a bad idea mostly talked about low usage, high cost, and its low impact on relieving congestion because people will still use their cars to get from one place to another.

VII. Tolling

“Too much money for lower income.” (OR)

“This is probably the only way to fund a new bridge. How long will it last?” (OR)

“That price exceeds value...” (WA)

“I support the need to do something that’s reasonable for the importance.” (WA)

“I don’t travel to Portland often so the cost wouldn’t be much for me personally.” (WA)

“I’d use the Glenn Jackson.” (WA)

“Too expensive. Don’t have enough info – what do I get for that? My own lane? Maybe 50 cents to get a speed lane, but not more. Is it temporary? If so, maybe \$1.” (OR)

“Should be lower and adjusted by traffic.” (OR)

Over half of the participants said they would *not be willing* to pay a \$2-\$3 toll to cross the bridge “if you also gained more dependable travel time between Vancouver and Portland” (Appendix J). The Washington groups and Oregon Group #2 were evenly split, while Oregon Group #1 had only two of eight saying “yes.” Other “acceptable” amounts generally ranged from fifty cents to one dollar.

Chief concerns among those who said they *wouldn’t* be willing to pay that much were:

- Affordability/impact on low income people who must use the bridge
- Not enough value for the money

Although some liked the idea that those who used it the most would pay for it, others were concerned about the “average worker” and whether “Portland would have to pay even more to compensate for crossing the bridge.” A small number objected to tolls as a matter of principle.

Although not always explicit, the underlying question about whether there was enough value for the money spent – is it *really worth* that much? – concerned many participants.

Those who said they *would* be willing to pay that much generally thought it was a good value for what was needed and was probably the only way to get a new bridge.

Participant suggestions included charging more or charging the toll only during peak hours (“Kind of targets those around congestion; burden is on those who cause the problem”) and offering a window of time to cross back (similar to a bus transfer).

The fact the Interstate Bridge was a toll bridge at one point came up in all the groups. The small toll and its end seemed to affect how many participants viewed the proposed toll and what limits they wanted. There was clear sentiment in all groups that any toll needed to be time-limited, and if used beyond payback that it be dedicated only to bridge maintenance. The Washington groups in particular assumed and supported having the Glenn Jackson Bridge remain toll-free.

Some questioned how cars would pay without creating a backup on the bridge, but others assured them that there is technology to take care of that.

VIII. Most Important Message

- “Make sure it’s what the people want, not just the commuters.” (WA)
- “Build a bridge for Vancouver’s future. The cities have to work together; otherwise, Vancouver will get cut off and die.” (W)
- “Whatever you do, make sure it will last awhile; not a quick fix.” (WA)
- “Not just one thing. There has to be lanes, mass transit, structural/infrastructure, long term. Don’t nickel and dime us to death every ten years.” (OR)
- “My main thrust is a thorough cost/benefit analysis and its impact on the community.” (OR)

Responses varied when asked what was the “one most important message” they had for the planners and policy makers about the need to do something about this segment of I-5 (Appendix K). The single most important messages that came up consistently were:

- Importance of careful, thorough planning with adequate explanations
- Making whatever is proposed a long-term, systemic solution that incorporates more than just the bridge

There were also some who said the solution must reflect a fair way of financing that serves “all users in an equitable manner.” A few commented that whatever money is involved should be spent on more important priorities.

The views of a majority were perhaps best summed up by this Oregon participant who wrote, “Make it a long term solution, environmentally friendly, and financially feasible.”

IX. Observations and Conclusions

Most important messages. There is no question relieving traffic congestion and the time associated with it in the project area is the single most important message on both sides of the river. Beyond that, there is no one “reason for doing something” that has as much impact on participants.

Safety appears to have more traction in Washington, possibly because they likely use this stretch of freeway more often. The importance of this segment of freeway to interstate commerce and thus to the entire West Coast was recognized fairly quickly in the Oregon groups. Fuel use and pollution-related issues had limited mention, although this was very appealing to some.

Beyond specific reasons for doing something, any solution must be presented as:

- Carefully thought out, with an understandable cost/benefit explanation
- A long-term solution
- Encompassing all aspects of a transportation system, including public transit and especially light rail
- The work product of a voluntary cooperative partnership between the two states

The importance of a long-term solution was consistently underscored by participants’ experience with the opening of the Glenn Jackson Bridge and the very temporary relief, followed by similar traffic congestion problems. Linking transit proposals to longer term solutions and how that conclusion was reached could be an important message linking three of these aspects together – thoughtful, long-term, and total system.

The importance of a comprehensive, systemic solution came up in all of the groups. Participants were able to look at how different elements of the current transportation system “compliment” each other and expect that any solution will not just add lanes. These participants also expect that part of making sure that whatever is done will accommodate future growth long term is that there will be a look at the range of options/alternatives (e.g. work shift changes).

The emphasis on the partnership between the two states emerges from expressed perceptions that there are problems with the relationship. One Oregon participant said, “Classic problem - you can’t get the two states to agree with each other.”

The two states. There were both similarities and differences between the two states. Nearly all see a role for public transit in addressing problems in the project area, although Oregon participants were possibly more skeptical about its potential for relieving congestion.

The groups also responded similarly when asked about the importance of doing something on this segment of I-5, although a greater proportion of Washington participants thought it *very* important.

Washington participants were far more aware of proposals for minimizing problems in the project area. On the other hand, Oregon participants were far more aware of the importance of I-5 to interstate commerce and the negative impacts of bottlenecks in the project area; that this doesn’t just concern Portland and Vancouver.

Washington participants' views seemed to be influenced by their greater usage of this segment of I-5. Many more of the Oregon participants indicated they either avoided it entirely or just didn't need to use it. As one commented, "There's no way I could do anything in Vancouver; it's an incredible hassle. Flip side must be equivalent situation."

Tolling. There was not an outright rejection of a toll, but at the same time support was very soft. Most did not want to spend as much as the proposed \$2-\$3. There was even some surprise that a toll that high would cover only a part of the cost; that there would be local, state, and federal dollars as well. At the same time, they know it will cost a lot to fix the problems, so there was some willingness to accept a lower toll with limits. Washington participants in particular did not want to see a companion toll on the Glenn Jackson Bridge.

Public transit. As mentioned earlier, nearly all see a role for public transit. However, there was healthy skepticism about its impact on congestion. Any analysis related to that is important, along with clarifying that residents will not be losing traffic lanes to transit service (either light rail or buses).

Challenges. Although most participants said something needed to be done in the project area, with some saying it is very important, the sense of urgency was not consistently present. Many reported they had changed their driving habits; some don't cross the river at all, while others adapt their work schedules around peak traffic times. Further, many of the Oregon participants don't drive in the project area often, if at all. Their concerns are directed more to other priorities in their community or to traffic problems elsewhere.

**Appendix A
Background Information**

Most Important Regional Issue			
Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Freeway across the Columbia – more lanes	Jobs – find more	Taxes	Immigration
Education	Education	Traffic	Stable Educational Funding
Employment	Healthcare – make it more affordable	Education	Transportation vs. Growth
Underage drinking	Getting a handle on growth and planning for community	Crime	Schools
Fixing the roads	Schools	Schools	School Funding
Unbounded county growth	Healthcare	Early education	Employment
Improve education without raising taxes	Growth management	Land use	Immigration
Healthcare	Growth management	Schools	Education
Iraq war			School Funding
Education			

Occupation			
Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Retired – Business Analyst	Computer Engineer	Unemployed – Data Recovery	Owner/Painting Company
Unemployed	Executive Assistant	Retired/Elderly Care	Teacher
Vitamin Manufacturer	Auditing	Homemaker	Window Business Owner
Administrative Assistant	Teacher	Consulting/Facilities Engineer	Floral Designer
Mailman / Letter Carrier	Teacher	Contractor	Consultant
Engineering Manager	Unemployed	Attorney	Social Services
Professional	Teacher	Pension Analyst	Retired
Jewelry Designer – Business Owner	Engineer	Unemployed	Retired Police Officer
Facility Coordinator for Physician's Offices			Web Designer
Unemployed - Student			

Political Affiliation					
Affiliation	Total	Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Portland Group 1	Portland Group 2
Democrat	14	4	4	3	3
Republican	11	4	2	3	2
Independent/Other	10	2	2	2	4

Willingness to pay more taxes to improve transportation					
1 = not at all willing 7 = very willing	Total	Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Portland Group 1	Portland Group 2
1	-	-	-	-	-
2	5	1	-	3	1
3	7	3	1	2	1
4	6	1	3	1	1
5	13	4	3	1	5
6	4	1	1	1	1
7	-	-	-	-	-

Location			
Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Vancouver - 5	Vancouver - 4	Multnomah/East of 82 nd - 2	Multnomah/East of 82 nd - 3
Other - 5	Other - 4	Multnomah/East River to 82 nd - 2	Multnomah/East River to 82 nd - 1
		Washington County - 3	Multnomah/West of River - 1
		Clackamas County - 1	Washington County - 3
			Clackamas County - 1

Age					
Age Range	Total	Vancouver Group 1	Vancouver Group 2	Portland Group 1	Portland Group 2
18-34	7	3	2	2	-
35-54	18	5	5	4	4
55+	10	2	1	2	5

Gender					
	Total	Vancouver Group 1	Vancouver Group 2	Portland Group 1	Portland Group 2
Male	17	5	3	4	5
Female	18	5	5	4	4

Appendix B

What comes to mind when you think of transportation in the Portland–Vancouver area and what works well?
What doesn't work well and needs improvement?

Washington Group 1	
Transportation and what works well	What doesn't work well and needs improvement
Bus/taxi – both get the job done – bus is cheaper but less convenient.	No light rail in Vancouver area.
It is a mess; the I-205 bridge.	All traffic; need engineering for traffic flow.
I feel that the bus system in P-town works very well by all the stops they have available.	In Vancouver the amount and how many times a bus stops? Needs improvement also on solicitation.
C-Tran; MAX; Tri-Met.	Highways are limiting; I-84 and I-5 are clogged up for daily commuting into and out of PDX.
Community transportation.	Not enough carpooling in Oregon; we have one and not too many get to use it. There was a wreck on I-5 with a log truck and it held up traffic for hours today.
Congestion; slow commutes; carpool works sort of well.	I-5 south; metered ramps.
Traveling by bicycle works well.	Traffic on I-5, I-205; getting to the highways are ill-planned.
Freeway.	Mass transit and access across Columbia.
Bus and MAX train.	Roads – congested – four lanes that go into two, then back to four.
Car and MAX – combination of the two.	C-Tran bus system.

Washington Group 2	
Transportation and what works well	What doesn't work well and needs improvement
Free service; not sure about it yet. Haven't used it yet.	Signs are not clear – confusing; unknown.
Portland downtown light rail; I-5 capacity in Vancouver.	Mass transit in Vancouver area; corridor I-5 south of Hayden Island.
Light rail; maintaining cost of tickets; levy passed to support rural routes.	Congestion on almost all roads.
MAX light rail; Portland International Airport.	North/south mass transit (no light rail); freeway system congestion.
MAX; buses; highways.	Too many cars, autos; not enough safe bicycle lanes.
MAX – convenient, expanding.	MAX – doesn't cross the river; bridges – too congested, too few; no MAX here.
C-Tran has many buses available locally in town. These buses seem to run every 5 -10 minutes.	C-Tran has cut so many buses from Vancouver to Portland. These routes and buses seem to be the bread and butter of C-Tran but they don't cater to the people who pay \$105.00 per month.
They help college students by giving reductions on fares.	Trying to raise costs; trying to reduce routes.

Oregon Group 1	
Transportation and what works well	What doesn't work well and needs improvement
Timely and very accessible; good coverage on routes.	Plan for OHSU tram – example – cost overrides.
Light rail from Gresham to downtown – easy commute, also to Hillsboro.	Getting people into and out of Portland from the north.
Light rail/Tri-Met – wide coverage.	High cost of Tri-Met fare rising yearly.
205 – 405 bypasses; light rail; multiple bridges across river.	Downtown traffic/parking.
Functional; easy access; cost effective; organized – able to commute easily.	Safety; need broader access to outlying areas.
MAX is growing faster getting around; I don't know.	Keeping up with the increase in population; roads too heavy and construction everywhere.
Moving lots of people from one place to another. Moving people from generalized areas to specific areas.	Serving outer areas.
-	-

Oregon Group 2	
Transportation and what works well	What doesn't work well and needs improvement
MAX, *Tri-Met, bikes seem to be best, room for improvement; use of bio-fuels a close second.	Highway and surface roads inadequate for current population – frequent traffic jams – maintenance problems with existing road.
The Portland airport is fairly efficient – lines are not very long; it is close to most areas of the city (centralized).	*Highway system cannot handle peak capacity – it is not built to handle growth. Light rail needs to service more areas.
Multiple occupancy vehicle lanes; extra lanes; *traffic lights for entrance to highway.	MAX doesn't move enough people; *no parking for MAX; not enough lanes on highways; no enforcement on entrance ramps; need a "405" for the west side.
I can't speak to Vancouver area but I feel Portland has a good transit system. I rode the bus to work for 30+ years and always had good service. Limited experience with MAX, but good the few times I rode it. Prompt and reliable.	Freeways way too jammed up during rush hour – seems to be getting worse. Not enough advance planning for advancing population.
Main arteries that connect different areas like Sandy Boulevard, Lombard, Barbur Boulevard; ramp lights to control flow to freeways; *light rail.	I-5 bridge (# of lanes, on and off ramp congestion – not enough off ramps); not enough access to freeways or highways east of 205.
Highways generally work well; options to use buses exist; *nice to have an airport that is accessible.	Traffic jams (highway) are increasing, worry about future.
*MAX; buses – the expansion for MAX has seemed to help more people.	Traffic still seems congested – too many people are still not taking advantage of the MAX, *bus systems.
Bulletin boards; on-ramp signals; *lanes on 26.	*Canyon tunnel system; Raleigh Hills/Scholls Ferry intersection; old road systems.
MAX – frequent – easy to schedule with online schedules.	Not enough public transit; buses are infrequent, slow and lack coverage; MAX does not cover enough territory.

*Indicates most important

Appendix C

Should something be done to minimize the problems on I-5 between SR 500 in Vancouver and Columbia Boulevard in Portland, including the Interstate Bridge across the Columbia River? Why no/yes?

Should something be done to minimize the problems on I-5 between SR 500 in Vancouver and Columbia Boulevard in Portland, including the Interstate Bridge across the Columbia River?					
Yes/No	Total	Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Yes	31	9	7	6	9
No	3	1	1	1	-
Don't Know	1	-	-	1	-

Washington Group 1	
Yes/No	Why?
Yes	The traffic and commutes (morning/night) take hours longer than they should.
Yes	There is always a traffic jam any time of the day.
Yes	There is so much congestion through those areas with only two or three lanes. The bridges need to be wider to help alleviate those problems, also the speed zone changes add to congestion.
Yes	Huge bottlenecks with morning commute and return commute on I-5 makes it difficult to live in Vancouver area and commute to PDX for work. PDX has largest percentage of jobs.
Yes	Because we need more carpool lanes so traffic doesn't get so backed up, and more lanes - the communities are growing so fast we need more room.
Yes	To ease the backups; to get a better flow of traffic.
No	Let the market and tolerance for the traffic problems drive the change of behavior - to drive less, carpool, or choose somewhere else to live or work. *Don't put band aids on long term problems...drive less - don't help us drive more.
Yes	More vehicles are using this route every day and it will continue to grow.
Yes!	Again, need more lanes on bridge, Portland side - put four lanes in where there are two. Everything moves better with four or more lanes.
Yes	Due to continued growth of the area, merging problems to maintain flow.

Washington Group 2	
Yes/No	Why?
No	Entrances to on ramps give no option to turn back.
Yes	Transit time through the Portland Meadows sector is unpredictable - both north and south bound. I need to know how long it'll take.
Yes	So many Vancouver residents work in Portland and the congestion just trying to get in and out of the city is overwhelming.
Yes!	Congestion at rush hour is crazy exits/entrances are too short.
Yes	Too much traffic (cars, trucks).
Yes!	Traffic is irritating and inconvenient - bottleneck southbound at Delta Park.
Yes!	There are so many commuters going over to Portland and with so many people moving here ... if we don't do something and soon, hey... let's just call ourselves Seattle version 1.2.
Yes	For safety and to speed up traffic.

Oregon Group 1	
Yes/No	Why?
Yes	Very bad bottleneck; huge rush hour delays.
No	Traffic is heavier to the east of Vancouver. Need to get people over Columbia east of city then bring them west to Portland.
Yes	Not wide enough; too many cars; high volume.
DK	Don't really travel that area with any frequency. Access to Jantzen Beach is really slow early to mid evening.
Yes	*Far too congested; too many accidents; long commute.
Yes	Too many lanes merge to only four – bottleneck effect.
Yes	*Alleviate traffic congestion for greater movement between Portland and Vancouver. Less separation of commerce and population.
Yes	Main route – way too many cars, should be priorities.

*Indicates most important

Oregon Group 2	
Yes/No	Why?
Yes!	Frequent traffic jams have stopped us from using Jantzen Beach area and it is less than one mile from my home.
Yes	Time in traffic for commuters is regularly too long and it is not very capable of handling problems.
Yes!	Hopeless congestion!
Yes	Traffic congestion is worsening as population grows and more people move to Vancouver to avoid rising housing costs in Portland.
Yes	The rush hour is now a rush afternoon. Things slow down from 1:30/2pm until 6pm. Jantzen Beach is only accessible by the freeway – I can't grocery shop at Safeway in the afternoons or early evenings.
Yes	*Because continued traffic growth will make for big delays in the future unless improvements are made. Vancouver will develop separately if <u>no</u> improvements.
Yes	Too much congestion/traffic tie-ups, especially during rush hours and holidays.
Yes	Because if there is a problem on this section there is no other way to avoid it except a huge 205 detour.
Yes	Frequent backups and slow traffic in the bridge bottleneck.

*Indicates most important

Appendix D

Have you heard anything about what has been proposed to minimize the problems on this segment of I-5?
What have you heard? What is the major source of information about what is being considered?

Have you heard anything about what has been proposed to minimize the problems on this segment of I-5?					
Yes/No	Total	Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Yes	19	9	4	2	4
No	16	1	4	6	5

Washington Group 1		
Yes/No	What have you heard?	Source of Information
Yes	Proposal for a new bridge crossing the Columbia; instituting a toll on the I-5 bridge.	Newspaper (Columbian); TV news; internet news; local news channels
Yes	New bridge near St. Johns; bigger I-5 bridge.	Word of mouth; paper - Oregonian
Yes	I believe that it is to get rid of the HOV lanes to help relieve traffic in those other non-carpool lanes; toll bridges.	Newspaper (Oregonian)
Yes	Very little as of late; think we have talked about an extra bridge; widening road.	TV-news (evening Channel 8)
No	I would think people would carpool more and that would be encouraged but with car places on every corner I would see why people don't.	If I did look for info it would be in the paper or the news.
Yes	Charge a toll to use I-5; build a new bridge system.	Newspapers – Reflector & Columbian
Yes	Get rid of the HOV lane, return it to an ordinary lane; also – 2 nd interstate bridge.	Evening TV news – Channel 12
Yes	New bridge, toll road, MAX train, expand current bridge.	The Columbian
Yes	Considered putting in more lanes; having I-5 bridge be a toll bridge <u>again</u> which is wrong.	Newspaper - Columbian
Yes	New bridge – toll attached; MAX trains to Portland.	TV news

Washington Group 2		
Yes/No	What have you heard?	Source of Information
No	Have not heard anything but traffic is heavy everywhere. Not sure what has been proposed.	-
No	A few years ago I recall – vaguely – something about another bridge.	Conversations at work
Yes	Build another bridge; possible tolls.	Radio (KPOJ); newspaper articles – The Columbian
Yes	Improvement to I-5 bridge; a light rail.	TV news Channel 8 at night; voter pamphlet
No	-	-
Yes	New bridge; upper deck on existing bridge; extend MAX across the bridge.	Radio – 103 FM; newspapers? Don't remember; hear-say
Yes	I heard MAX is supposed to come into Vancouver.	C-Tran riders
No	-	-

Oregon Group 1		
Yes/No	What have you heard?	Source of Information
No	-	-
No	-	-
Yes	Widening it, more lanes; road span bridge Delta Park – I-5	News - KOIN
No	-	-
No	-	-
No	-	-
Yes	New bridge or enlarge I-5 bridge; train between Portland and Vancouver.	Newspaper – Oregonian, Tribune
No	-	-

Oregon Group 2		
Yes/No	What have you heard?	Source of Information
Yes	Build another interstate bridge; light rail extended to Vancouver; straighten or add lanes at Delta Park.	Kenton Neighborhood Assoc. meeting; St. Johns Sentinel Newspaper
No	Nothing, although it does not effect me as much so I have not been paying attention.	-
No	-	-
No	-	-
Yes	New bridge that would not be a draw/lift bridge (use old bridge for light rail); add a bridge for light rail; use rail bridge for light rail.	Public involvement work with an interstate (WA/OR) focus group several years ago
Yes	Saw picture in Oregonian about proposed highway many years back; there were proposals to extend light rail across the river.	Oregonian
No	-	-
Yes	Build another bridge.	Not sure – newspaper/TV?
No	-	-

Appendix E

Participants list top three reasons for doing something.

Weighted Rankings*				
Washington Group 1				
Reasons	Weighted Ranking	First Reason Tally	Second Reason Tally	Third Reason Tally
Shorter commute time	14.5	10.5	2	2
To accommodate growth	11	6	2	3
Help local economy	8	3	4	1
Safety	7	3	4	-
Improved freight mobility	7	3	3	1
More personal time	5.5	4.5	-	1
Emergency preparedness	5	-	5	-
Reduce road rage	2	-	-	2
Improved worker productivity	-	-	-	-

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

Weighted Rankings*				
Washington Group 2				
Reasons	Total	First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
To accommodate increased traffic	17	6	10	1
Safety concerns – ramps, 3-2 lanes	16	12	2	2
Aging bridge needing replacement	6	-	4	2
Emergency preparedness	4	3	-	1
Predictable travel times	3	3	-	-
Improved freight mobility	2	-	-	2
Road rage	-	-	-	-

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

Weighted Rankings* and Tally by Reason				
Oregon Group 1				
Reasons	Weighted Ranking	First Reason Tally	Second Reason Tally	Third Reason Tally
Easier for commerce/business operations	10	3	-	1
Help reduce congestion	9	1	1	4
Shorten commute	8	1	2	1
Important to West Coast	6	1	1	1
Reduce fuel consumption, pollution	6	1	1	1
Less road rage/stress	4	-	2	-
Improve safety	3	1	-	-
Improve quality of life	2	-	1	-
Enhance tourism	-	-	-	-
Emergency preparedness	-	-	-	-

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

Weighted Rankings*				
Oregon Group 2				
Reasons	Total	First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Reduce travel time	23	21	2	-
Improve safety	8	3	2	3
Freight mobility/help businesses, economy	7	-	6	1
Replace old technology/eliminate need to open and close	5	3	2	-
Emergency preparedness/evacuation	4.5	-	2	2.5
Help get to areas easier for economic and social benefits	4	-	2	2
Seismic improvement	2.5	-	2	.5
Important to West Coast	-	-	-	-
Accommodate emergency vehicles	-	-	-	-

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

Washington Group 1		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
More personal time/shorter commute	Safety	Reduce road rage
Help local economy	Short commuting time	To accommodate growth
Shorter commute time	Emergency preparedness	Accommodate growth
Shorter commute time	To accommodate growth	Help local economy
Safety	Emergency/Freight - Carpooling	More personal time
To accommodate future growth	Help local economy	Shorter commute time
More personal time	Emergency preparedness	Improved freight mobility
Improve freight mobility	Help local economy	Accommodate growth
Shorter commute time	Improved freight mobility	Reduce road rage
To accommodate growth	Safety	Shorter commute time

Washington Group 2		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Accommodate increased traffic	Safety	Freight
Safety improvement	Traffic volume increase	Emergency accessibility
Safety concerns	To accommodate increase in traffic	Aging bridge
Safety concern of ramps	To accommodate increased traffic	Aging bridge needs repair
To accommodate increased traffic	Aging bridge	Safety
Safety concerns -- ramps	Aging bridge	Accommodate increased traffic
Predictable travel times	Accommodate increased traffic	Safety concerns of ramps
Emergency travel preparedness	To accommodate increased traffic	Improve freight mobility

Oregon Group 1		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Fuel conservation/pollution	Stress	Improve commerce
Main route north & south along coast	Shorten commute	Easier for commerce
Shorten commute	Less stress	Reduce fuel costs
Easier for commerce	Important to West Coast	Help reduce congestion
Reduce congestion	Easier for commerce	Shorten commute
Improve safety	Reduce fuel consumption	Important to West Coast
Help reduce congestion	Improve quality of life	Easier for commerce
Reduce congestion	Shorten commute	Better for business

*One participant listed a fourth reason, "Improve safety."

Oregon Group 2		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Reduce travel time and headaches	Freight mobility/increase economy	Emergency and seismic improvements
Reduce travel time	Freight mobility, help businesses, economy	Emergency preparedness – evac
Replace old technology	Freight mobility	Help to get areas for retail and social benefits
Safety issues	Reduce travel time	Emergency preparedness
Reduce travel time	Earthquake	Interstate commerce
Reduce travel time	Improve safety	Help get to areas/easier for economic social benefits
Reduce travel time	Help in emergencies	Safety improvement
Reduce travel time	Help get to areas more easily	Improve safety
Reduce travel time	Eliminate the need to open/close	Improve safety

Appendix F

Participants list top three reasons for not doing something.

Weighted Rankings*				
Washington Group 1				
Reasons	Weighted Ranking	First Reason Tally	Second Reason Tally	Third Reason Tally
Cost/taxes	21	15	4	2
More important priorities	20	12	8	-
Force consideration of mass transit	9	3	2	4
Don't want to work with other state	8	-	6	2

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

*Two participants did not list a third reason.

Weighted Rankings*				
Washington Group 2				
Reasons	Total	First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Cost	18.5	13.5	5	-
Don't use, so why pay	15	6	7	2
Construction impacts on neighborhoods, business districts	8.5	4.5	1	3
Anti-growth	2	-	-	2
Environmental impacts	1	-	1	-
Wasteful spending	2	-	2	-
Other alternatives available	1	-	-	1

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

Weighted Rankings*				
Oregon Group 1				
Reasons	Total	First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Cost/money	16	9	6	1
Priorities	15	9	4	2
Still working/uo not bad enough/not a crisis	6	3	2	1
Futility	6	3	-	3
Project details that don't benefit enough people	4	-	4	-
No personal benefit	1	-	-	1

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

Weighted Rankings*				
Oregon Group 2				
Reasons	Total	First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
No personal benefit	16	6	8	2
Cost	12	9	2	1
Poor project management	9	3	5	1
Won't get Vancouver assistance	8	6	-	2
Won't be done with long-term in mind	5	3	1	1
Cost/benefit	3	-	2	1
Not really result in benefit	1	-	-	1
Futility	-	-	-	-
Vancouver won't do anything because it would help development there	-	-	-	-

*Weighted rankings based on three points for every first reason, two points for every second reason, and one point for every third reason.

Washington Group 1		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Force consideration of mass transit	More important priorities	Cost/taxes
Cost/taxes	More important priorities	Don't want to work with other state
Cost/taxes	Don't want to work with other state (selfishness, example - will work there but live in other state)	Mass transit
Cost/taxes	More important priorities	Force consideration of mass transit
More important priorities	Don't want to work with other state – income tax, no sales tax	-
More important priorities	Cost/taxes	Don't want to work with other state
More important priorities	Force mass transit sooner	Cost/taxes
Cost/taxes	More important priorities	Force consideration of mass transit
Cost/taxes	Don't want to work with other state	Force consideration of mass transit
More important priority	Cost/taxes	-

*One participant listed a fourth reason, "Selfish."

Washington Group 2		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Increase in taxes – feared cost; logistics – space needs to be created; inconvenience	Environmental issues – not a benefit to everyone – don't use so why pay? Doesn't impact all	Construction
Construction impact	Cost	Other alternatives available.
Cost	Construction impacts/too costly	Don't use/Don't pay
Money	Don't use so why pay	Anti-growth
Cost	Wasteful spending	Don't use, so why pay
Cost	Don't use so why pay?	Anti-growth
Don't use so why pay?	Cost	Construction impacts
Don't need it because it doesn't help me	I don't need to go into Portland much	Lots more construction bringing congestion

*One participant listed a fourth reason, "Drive less, not more...we will run out of oil in my children's lifetime."

Oregon Group 1		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Cost vs. benefits	Still works	Futility
Still working, not bad enough yet	Cost	Priorities
Cost/money	Too many projects before it	No personal benefit
Priorities (other things that need to be done first)	Project details	Cost
Cost	Priorities	Futility of additional future growth
Futility	Project details	Priorities
Priorities	Cost	Not a crisis - yet
Priorities	Cost	Futility

Oregon Group 2		
First Reason	Second Reason	Third Reason
Lack confidence and trust in long range planners	Individuals do not see personal benefit	Will not be done with long-term plan in mind
No personal benefit	Poor project management – won't be done with long-term in mind	Cost
Won't get Vancouver help	Poor project management	Personal benefit
Cost – raise in taxes?	Poor project management	Will it really solve problem
Vancouver citizens/leaders	Cost/benefit	No personal benefit
No personal benefit	Cost	Won't get Vancouver assistance
Poor money management	No personal benefit	Vancouver won't buy in to it
Cost	No personal benefit	Poor project management
Cost	No personal benefit	Is the cost worth the benefit?

Appendix G

Now that we've looked at both sides of the coin, how important is it to you to do something about this segment of I-5: not at all important, not very important, somewhat important, or very important? Why? (Please star the most important) Please give a one to two word reason conveying why.

Importance					
Importance	Total	Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Very important	16	5	5	3	3
Somewhat important	11	1	3	4	3
Not very important	7	3	-	1	3
Not at all important	1	1	-	-	-

Washington Group 1	
Importance	Why?
Not very important	After hearing another state that NOT doing anything about it will force consideration of alternate methods of transportation...I have to agree. If we build another bridge/widen the current ones, it will encourage more people to use cars instead of alternative transportation.
	Encourage alternative transportation.
Very important	For growth and stability of our city.
	Fuller, better life.
Not very important	I don't commute past interstate/PIR exit anymore. Sure, getting over the bridge is somewhat of a nightmare but it is tolerable. If I needed to commute further on occasion, something could be done.
	Don't commute that often.
Very important	Needed to help the economy for transportation, help with quality of life, safety; these are the main reasons to help improve the transit system.
	Saves time.
Somewhat important	I have a fiancé that lives down in Portland and it would be nice not to wait an hour and a half for him to try to come after work, but him and I both agree if he or I just leave around 7 or so we still have time together. Not supporting it isn't what I'm trying to say because I would love to see more carpooling and HOV lanes and less car sales on every corner would be helpful.
	Carpool.
Very important	Future growth of the area dictates a need to do something. The road will keep getting fuller.
	Growth.
Not at all important	No action toward mass transit or even reduction of driving will occur if we make it easier to drive to Portland. We'll just keep growing until we outstrip our infrastructure and then fill up the new solution.
	Drive less! Unbounded growth!
Very important	Commute to daughter's house in Aloha is becoming very lengthy because of the bottleneck at Delta Park.
	Time.
Very important	Buses—mass transit—is needed as it also helps the disabled who can't drive, working poor who can't afford a car.
	Mass transit.

Not very important	Because I can arrange my personal schedule to accommodate to peak traffic flow.
	Convenience.

Washington Group 2	
Importance	Why?
Very important	Needs to be addressed sooner than later to avoid the Seattle/SF Bay Area syndrome. LA also experienced huge growth and no one wanted to live there. Undesirable <u>quality of life</u> . Traffic jams produce road rage and it builds.
	-
Very important	It's creating a barrier to movement that's adversely affecting the quality of life <u>economically, recreationally</u> , of the residents and businesses.
	People need to move themselves and their stuff.
Somewhat important	This area – both sides of the river depend on each other for employment and employees. This is the link and if both areas are to co-exist there must be a blending of need and compromise.
	Need; employment.
Very important	*Safety and congestion is out of hand in this area. I feel that if something isn't done, more accidents will occur causing more congestion.
	Safety; congestion.
Somewhat important	*Too much traffic needs to be addressed; I just avoid using it.
	Too much traffic.
Very important	This area is going to continue <u>to grow</u> . The corridor is *dangerous and outdated now, it's only going to get worse. Too much traffic (congestion) now – the future is scary!
	-
Very important	This is a dangerous section of I-5 and *it will only get worse with time.
	I don't want Vancouver/Portland roads to be like Seattle.
Somewhat important	For the safety of people who commute to Portland and back and vice versa. *I am always concerned about safety.
	Safety of everyone.

Oregon Group 1	
Importance	Why?
Somewhat important	Overall impact on region – economic and social.
Not very important	I-205 is under utilized by people who want to go south through Oregon.
Very important	*Relieve rush hour traffic.
	Improve I-5.
Somewhat important	*Need to assure that cost impact does not negatively affect other <u>crucial</u> programs (i.e. children’s services, education). Need to structure project so that benefit to cost ratio is maximized.
	Need to <u>maintain</u> existing system.
Somewhat important	I value reduced congestion/greater ease of commute, <u>but</u> I would want to explore a cash benefit analysis and impact of continued growth.
Somewhat important	It is the <u>main</u> West Coast connection between states.
Very important	*A fix to the problem will only get more expensive as time goes by. Once the problem is in crisis mode, it gets harder to fix.
Very important	In the realm of the “transportation budget,” my impression is that this section is a high priority fix.

Oregon Group 2	
Importance	Why?
Very important	To improve economy – the movement of freight to and from the port area and increase jobs. Decrease pollution and increase connection between two states.
Somewhat important	Somewhat because it has limited personal effect on my life. I do however want to see the city grow effectively and I also have concerns for the city as a whole and how it operates.
Not very important	Because I live on the west side and I don’t go to Vancouver because it’s so hard to get there.
Not very important	Because I don’t take the Interstate Bridge. I stay away from that section of I-5 and use alternate routes. If we have this kind of money there are better places to put it. There isn’t any reason I need to use I-5 to get to Vancouver.
Very important	Reduce travel time; interstate commerce; access/faster to local business on Hayden Island.
Not very important	I seldom use the bridge and although I consider it good for regional development, I don’t think the Vancouver side wants to really participate.
Very important	We need to reduce the congestion and improve the economy.
Somewhat important	Because the problems already stated will continue to get worse with time.
Somewhat important	Interstate traffic should not have that kind of bottleneck. This is not the most important project, but deserves to be addressed if only to review from time to time.

Appendix H

How do you feel about public transit being the approach or part of the approach to address the problems on this segment of I-5? What do you consider to be “public transit” and how would it work?

Washington Group 1	
How do you feel about public transit being the approach or part of the approach	What do you consider to be “public transit” and how would it work
I believe public/mass transit should be the approach to solving the I-5 problem. It would reduce pollution, lessen dependence on oil products, make travel across the river more convenient and reduce the amount of vehicles on the road.	Light rail – a system much like they have in Japan (my only real experience w/mass rail transit) convenient, inclusive...
Part – I think that there are many reasons to work on I-5, mass transit is a part.	Rail – like Portland is doing it now; I think that subways would be best.
I feel that this would be great for the approach ‘cause it would help with commuters to both states. Drive to Park & Ride which would lead to fewer cars on highway for better safety.	Buses linking towns to cities; MAX/light rail linking P-town to Vancouver; public transit means that it is accessible to everyone.
Public transit as an approach would be a great ideal! Better bus, MAX, or carpooling would be a huge improvement to I-5.	Train; bus – easier to use with more frequency; light rail – would follow main traffic patterns; carpooling.
Carpooling – the MAX coming over here; more buses in Vancouver, especially handicapped buses.	Carpooling (friends, co-worker), buses (workers, school children, group times), trucks – so we get our supplies, groceries, etc.
Public transit should be a part of the solution. I think if it is made to be easy to use, it could work.	Bus, MAX type train; subway; anything that can get cars off the road would be good.
Public transit is <u>part</u> of the approach. I believe it is only <u>part</u> . Making life choices is another part...we’ve chosen. Both result in <u>driving less</u> .	Light rail from transit centers; feeder lines of buses or lighter rail. <u>Not</u> just buses...those still rely on oil too much.
Public transit should be part of the approach.	Combination bus and light rail. Bus to multiple light rail stops.
We do need more mass transit as part of the approach to accommodate elderly, disabled, working poor and people who don’t want to drive in Portland.	Bus – need more and improved routes and MAX transit would greatly improve time and safety in Washington if put in the proper areas.
Yes – public transportation should be a part of the relief of the commute problem.	All forms of transportation are public.

Washington Group 2	
How do you feel about public transit being the approach or part of the approach	What do you consider to be “public transit” and how would it work
Public transit would address through traffic issue for the lower economic residents it usually works but unless it gives incentives to use it (taxes). Breaks or refunds? (sic)	
Hopeful but skeptical.	TODAY: buses and light rail as in Portland; but SHOULD mean MRT service like in Singapore and enough wide-area express buses so folks'll use it.
Effective but must have cooperation.	Time and cost effective – must have enough availability in all areas to accommodate ridership schedules.
Mass transit is a must!	Movement of large groups of people rapidly at low or no cost. Environmentally friendly, safe and comfortable.
Public transit is <u>very</u> important.	Light rail; bus; train.
Part of the approach.	Convenient – stops centrally located and schedule – many times; affordable.
I feel like C-Tran – MAX should be more respected by non-users.	Public transit should be something everybody pays for regardless of use on the thinking that we're doing what is best for our community. Public transit should consist of buses, light rail, trolley/cable cars, trains.
Part of the approach but not the approach.	A light rail type system or something that does not use a road.

Oregon Group 1	
How do you feel about public transit being the approach or part of the approach	What do you consider to be “public transit” and how would it work
Good, though do not see how public transit would help the situation.	Tri-Met (including light rail and bus, trolley, etc.).
Public transit would work out great especially if employers paid for the light rail/bus tickets.	Public transit is a separate road track made for bus/train.
It is going to take more than Tri-Met to get people to drive less – different route.	Tri-Met, light rail, bikes.
Public transit will not solve all of the I-5 issues – commercial traffic, through traffic. Might work to alleviate <u>some</u> of the congestion.	Light rail, buses.
Feel that may be a possibility to reduce some of the congestion.	MAX – extending; buses.
Great! Just think – MAX going to and from Vancouver for daily commuters – business still can drive – maybe two or three rails?	Not only connection with MAX downtown but to Gresham and Beaverton.
Public transit must be an integrated part of answer and solution.	Public transit should include buses, trains, freeway systems as a complete transportation solution.
*Who are your drivers on I-5 stretch? How do you know if the drivers are public transit users? Who are public transit users?	Light rail, buses.

Oregon Group 2	
How do you feel about public transit being the approach or part of the approach	What do you consider to be “public transit” and how would it work
Yes – part of the approach, not the whole solution.	Mass transit combination of more buses, light rail, another bridge for light rail – perhaps ferries like in Seattle.
Yes, it should be <u>part</u> of but not the sole solution.	Light rail; water ferry; commuter lanes; bus system.
Public transit is not the approach to I-5.	Public transit only contributes about 4% to traffic irregardless of whether it is MAX, bus, or anything else - i.e. it's only a drop in the bucket.
Yes, less cars, less traffic, less pollution, more accessibility.	Interstate MAX line, connecting bus routes, train?
Yes – light rail up to SR-500 or even 134 th in Vancouver could alleviate a lot of commuter traffic to make I-5 bridge more accessible for commerce/trucks and interstate drivers.	Light rail; commuter trains; buses.
<u>Should</u> be part of the approach; an efficient way to handle commuters would help greatly at peak hours.	Truck/HOV lanes and light rail would be my ideas of how; truck lanes for trucks only.
Yes.	Part of the solution could be another MAX line and also have some buses on a special route.
Part of the approach.	Continue the light rail system over the river.
Yes.	Public transit should be a large part of the approach to this segment of I-5. MAX should go across the river and go to Jantzen Beach. It should also be casier to walk and bicycle to Vancouver from Portland.

Appendix I

How do you feel about light rail or some type of bus rapid transit service (buses that travel primarily in dedicated lanes separate from other cars and trucks) being a specific part of the project: good idea, bad idea, no opinion. Why good/bad idea? Summarize in a few words.

Good idea, bad idea, or no opinion?					
Good/Bad/ No Opinion	Total	Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Good idea	24	7	7	5	5
Bad idea	6	2	-	2	2
No opinion	2	-	-	-	2

*One participant from Washington Group 1 wrote, "in the middle."

*One participant from Washington Group 2 wrote, "I like that on a different lane but not on a light rail."

*One participant from Oregon Group 1 wrote, "Sounds good today; Will relieve some traffic. Good because there are a lot of commuters; bad not all commuters."

Washington Group 1	
Good/Bad/ No Opinion	Why?
Good idea	Less pollution, less dependence on oil, less autos on the road, more options for those with no vehicles.
	As short as I can get it above.
Bad idea	It would add to the rest of the traffic if the same bridge is used.
	Not a fix, it is a boondoggle.
Good idea	Transportation is more appealing: no traffic, quick, great for rush hour, reliable and dependent.
	Convenience; safety.
Good idea	Anything would help with the transit problem; should follow main path (most crowded).
	Yes.
In the middle	Because it ends up going into the back of people's yards and Oregon does plan things like that very well. Not enough people for that in the 'Couve. Rapid bus service okay.
	Rapid bus service.
Good idea	To get cars off the road and make it easy for people to choose to use public transit.
	Ease for people.
Good idea	Light rail – faster, cleaner, uses less oil than buses. Or – alternate fuel buses would be okay too.
	Less oil.
Bad idea	Light rail good idea – rapid transit, bus in special lanes – bad idea.
	-
Good ideal	Would lighten up the car usage if it was available.
	Time.
Good idea	Human interaction.
	Relief of pressure.

Washington Group 2	
Good/Bad/ No Opinion	Why?
Good idea	Both options are good to implement. Again, I think ease of use will help but will need incentives for most people to give up their personal cars.
Good idea	Assuming in a lot (sic)... move more people with fewer cars but lost lanes – increased traffic? Enough feeders?
Great idea!!	Relieve some congestion on freeway; reduce car pollution; less stress to commute (must have participation and be cost effective).
Good idea	Environmentally friendly; eases traffic congestion; replaces need for freeway improvements.
Good idea	Dedicated lanes – if it didn't take away lanes for autos. Light rail – best idea.
Good idea	Speed – no traffic jams; environmental; flexible scheduling; cost effective.
Good idea	Help with congestion – people will be more willing to take buses and/or light rail if it works well.
-	I like that on a different lane but not on a light rail. It would have less traffic and be faster.

Oregon Group 1	
Good/Bad/ No Opinion	Why?
Good idea	Would aid the largest amount of people.
Good idea	It would eliminate many commuters and their cars taking up road space.
Good idea	It would help with part of the problem.
Bad idea	Low bang for buck; negative impact because of drug/crime problems.
Good idea	Less costly way to reduce traffic congestion as opposed to building another bridge.
Sounds good today!	Will relieve some traffic. Good because there are a lot of commuters; bad not all commuters.
Very good idea	It is a system for moving a lot of people on a regular basis to a specific location.
Bad idea	Doesn't seem like it would make a dent in the number of cars.

Oregon Group 2	
Good/Bad/ No Opinion	Why?
Bad idea	It doesn't seem to solve the problems with the bridge; HOV lanes are not enforced and buses sit in traffic jams like the cars and trucks. A separate bridge for trucks and freight might help.
Good idea	It will relieve <u>some</u> of the commuter traffic but it cannot be thought of as the sole solution. It is part of a plan of effective controlled growth in any city.
Bad idea	Bad idea – light rail. Very expensive; only contributes 4% to traffic; need federal help to pay for it.
Good idea	Light rail or rapid transit is a good idea for project. Rapid transit is a good idea <u>if</u> Washington shares cost and construction. Depends on how many people would actually use the system.
	Light rail should be a part of it – rapid bus does not seem as viable an option. Building a bridge for light rail would seem to me to be less expensive than a new eight lane interstate bridge. Don't think commuters like buses as well as light rail.
Good idea	Good idea for light rail/rapid bus. Specifically handles traffic increase during commuting hours which will leverage the investment over a larger period of time since it will take longer before more improvements needed. This assumes Portland has good local system from central stations.
Good idea	It would help ease the congestion and improve traffic flow. I would like to see the special lanes for faster travel time on buses.
	Light rail should be a part of the project. Light rail on a separate bridge would help.
Good idea	Light rail – it is a nice system. I have to say dedicated bus lanes do not make me happy. Light rail extending across the bridge is great, but only a first step – one would need to have it also serve Vancouver and have more lines in Portland.

Appendix J

We're talking about a big project costing lots of money. It will take federal, state, and local money, plus road tolls. Would you be willing to pay \$2 to \$3 toll to cross the bridge if you also gained more dependable travel time between Vancouver and Portland? Why no/yes?

Would you be willing to pay \$2 to \$3 toll to cross the bridge?					
Yes/No	Total	Washington Group 1	Washington Group 2	Oregon Group 1	Oregon Group 2
Yes	15	5	4	2	4
No	18	5	4	6	3
Yes/No	2	-	-	-	2

Washington Group 1	
Yes/No	Why?
Yes	I don't travel to Portland often so the cost wouldn't be much for me personally.
Yes	Because the most users would pay their fair share, also if you don't like it don't cross it.
Yes	This would help with the project and in the end would be better traffic in the end (sic); fair distribution; small price to pay.
No	Financially not able to handle that level of cost; \$1 to \$2 – this could be a yes.
No	Well for people going in and out all the time that makes up a lot of money and for people not having great paying jobs that hurts.
No	I would use I-205 for the few trips I make into Oregon.
Yes	Not much cost for this. What's \$10 - \$15 per week, a couple of lattes?
Yes	The convenience would be worth the toll if it goes away when project is paid for.
No!	We paid for that bridge years ago with it being a toll bridge and I don't feel it is right for it to go back to being a toll bridge.
No	That price exceeds value and I can arrange other people to pick up supplies.

Washington Group 2	
Yes/No	Why?
Yes	If it truly solved the problem. Fast track for commuters could work well if billed monthly. If people don't commute, they won't need to pay.
Yes	I don't use it that much and it's important when I do. And I support the need to do something that's reasonable for the importance.
No	Couldn't afford to pay this every day as wages are stagnant. Would want some type of offset or incentive monetarily to pay – otherwise would stay in Vancouver or take 205.
No	I pay taxes for highway maintenance and feel that with the current tax structure, money is there if it was used wisely. A toll would slow traffic to pay.
Yes	If I was <u>sure</u> of getting where I needed to be in a timely manner.
No	I'd cross the Glenn Jackson; I-5 is out of my way.
No	<u>Absolutely not!</u> They paid for the Narrows Bridge and the floating bridge a dime at a time. Who cares if we take longer to pay for it, but make it affordable. Once we have tolls...we'll never go back. 2 X 10 = \$20.00 a week at least + \$105.00 bus pass = \$125.00 – too much!
Yes	Gas mileage of sitting in traffic is less cost effective then paying a couple of dollars.

Oregon Group 1	
Yes/No	Why?
No	Unless you could have a time window to come back for free – frame of 2-3-5 hours. I would accept a lower toll.
Yes	If there is a limit on years to keep the toll in place.
No	<u>Too much money for lower income</u> ; monthly fee lower; toll 50 cents – temporary.
No!!!	Not so much for my own sake. I could afford it, but it strikes me as socially unfair. Highest impact is against the poorest people. No toll of any amount.
No	Too expensive. I would be willing to pay \$1 toll to cross until building cost paid in full.
No	Because cost of living is TOO high already, those on fixed income would be stuck!! Fifty cents.
Yes	Caveats – cost would need to lower, adjusted by traffic load timing (sic).
No	Too expensive. Don't have enough info – what do I get for that? My own lane? Maybe 50 cents to get a speed lane, but no more. Is it temporary? If so, maybe \$1.

Oregon Group 2	
Yes/No	Why?
Yes	I've paid tolls to cross other bridges into Washington i.e. the Bridge of the Gods, Astoria, and so forth. If we want the port to be economically viable we must solve this problem.
No	I personally would not, I think that is what gas tax and other transportation taxes are for. Those who use it every day might be willing. Possibly if it came to an end. Toll should be used to pay for the bridge and upkeep.
Yes	Because this is probably the only way to fund a new bridge. How long will it last?
Yes	Yes – <u>only</u> if there was a new bridge (at least lanes dedicated to light rail or rapid transit) and if <u>yes</u> does not involve a huge increase in taxes.
Yes/No	\$2 - yes (\$3 - no) if it is a new interstate bridge – but I think discounts should be given to those who travel often – passes, etc. The chips in your car or sensors. Would prefer \$1 - \$2.
No/Yes	Or yes if it were just during peak hours. At this time I can plan my travel times north so as to avoid traffic. If I had to go north during heavy traffic times, then yes, I would be willing to pay \$2 to \$3 for that particular trip.
Yes	Provided a new bridge and added transportation - light rail and/or buses would be available.
No	\$2 - \$3 is too much, I would consider 50 cents to \$1.
No	I have a personal grudge against tolls. I would not be using it. It truly seems silly, but \$3 during a trip seems a great deal more money than several hundred added to my property taxes. Yes, and then the toll booth time, which, I am sure, technology will take care of that. No amount of money would make this work for me.

Appendix K

Considering what we have discussed this evening, what is the **one most important message** you have for the planners and policy makers about the need to do something about this segment of I-5?

Washington Group 1

- Make it a long term solution, environmentally friendly and financially feasible.
- I think that you should add a bridge to improve Vancouver's future.
- Help make this a community decision. Put it in a levy/election type situation and really let the people decide what is best for them. Provide stats and economic info.
- The need is very urgent! Should include better flow, possibly new facilities (toll okay if thought out); mass transit – good idea. Should be long term.
- Instead of using money on making the traffic better and more accessible use it on SCHOOLS! Our children, they are the future. The traffic will never go away because we are still growing. Make buses more accessible, have a speedway where it has no exits for a while and gets off at bigger landmarks. Use hybrids maybe?
- Plan for growth.
- Plan for running out of oil! Don't hasten it!
- The need to do something is becoming critical and should be planned for in the next two years.
- Keep the lanes to four, not two and use more mass transit – buses and possibly light rail.
- Their planning should be thorough and well planned.

Washington Group 2

- I think something should be done but that a fair way should be found to fund it. Keeping in mind the low paid people need to use it, maybe tie it in with income...? Maybe put it to the voters.
- The segment must be improved for long-term economic and quality of life reasons. First, address the SYSTEM that is Vancouver and Portland Transit (and beyond for I-5 commerce traffic). Don't just look at Mill Plain to Columbia Boulevard. Short-term – bottleneck fix south of PIR and reduce speed limits near dangerous access points. Second, long-term solutions. Other alternatives – flex schedules; mass transit incentives.
- Something must be done in a cost effective and rational manner – no one wants to pay for a huge giveaway program that only helps a few. This project must serve all users in an equitable manner.
- The growth in the Vancouver/North Clark County area has placed unplanned pressure on the roadways between the two states. Careful planning/costing and explanations need to happen before action.
- Require businesses (especially large businesses) to provide and/or encourage workers to live near where they work.
- The problem is there and not going to go away. It's time to plan a solution. Start thinking and brainstorming the “how-to-get-it done.” Make it a long-term solution for the far future, not just for now.
- Something should be done for the sake of congestion, commuting and safety. The safety of ramps and the bridge is a huge problem.
- I feel that we should maybe make public transportation more affordable. Widen the I-5 or improve the bridge.

Oregon Group 1

- Keep in mind long-term 10-15 years. Won't work 20-30.
- If you do build it make sure it is built to handle the increase of traffic in 20 years so you don't have to build it bigger later on.
- Relieve traffic = cost = ratio.
- Any proposed solution to I-5 congestion needs to take into account a wide variety of peripheral issues: other priorities; alternate solutions; existing infrastructure; projected growth; impacts of the solution itself.
- Conduct a thorough cost/benefit analysis and consider long-term impact.
- Something NEEDS to be done to lessen congestion over the river. Be creative!!
- Plan, plan, plan long-term solutions, not quick fixes.
- Plan for the future. Come up with a long-term permanent solution that is best for residents and economically responsible.

Oregon Group 2

- Stop putting off making decision and start with solutions, more than one – light rail alone will not solve this – a new bridge.
- Make it a comprehensive plan that considers growth 10, 20 even 50 years from now and what the area will look like. The uses, the needs, supply and demand. Be efficient about the execution and true and reasonable in your communication to the public.
- This segment of I-5 is crucial to U.S. interstate commerce. The federal government should be engaged for commerce as well as security issues.
- We need to improve traffic flow between Columbia Boulevard and Vancouver – but, it is a West Coast issue – not a local issue and needs to involve local, state and federal cooperation and funds.
- Please consider commuter and commerce traffic in 10, 15 and 20 years. I want my grandchildren to want to live and work here and not go somewhere else because I-5 has the whole area stopped up. Also to say that we didn't have the forethought to do something about it when it has been a problem for a decade.
- Plan for the future, but also leave some costs for the future so that those who benefit later will also pay for the benefit.
- Please consider carefully and look at all resources available before making your final decision on helping to improve this area. Think in long-term.
- If we don't do something to improve the flow of traffic the problems will only get worse in the future.
- A solution is needed and public transit must be a part of it. Also – alternative transportation, i.e. bicycles and walking, must be addressed.