Public Feedback on Working Draft Recommendations
January 2002

Summary of Results

Overview

In January 2002, the I-5 Partnership Project solicited feedback from the Community Forum, corridor stakeholders, and the general public regarding the Task Force's Working Draft Recommendations for the I-5 Corridor. Notice of the opportunity to provide input to the Task Force was sent to approximately 45,000 people[1]. In addition, advertisements were placed in newspapers throughout the Portland/Vancouver region to notify the public of the open houses on January 14 and 15. Approximately 1,500 people provided us with feedback from January 1-18. Responses to a questionnaire about the Task Force recommendations came from the following sources:

Source:	**No. of Responses Received**
Mail-in Questionnaire (Carrier Route Mailing)	594
Web Questionnaire	490
Mail-in Questionnaire (I-5 Partnership Mailing List)	247
Vancouver Open House[2]	81
Portland Open House[3]	39
Community Forum	23
Vancouver Handouts	26
Total Number of Responses	***1,500***

The remainder of this document provides an analysis of the feedback we received from the respondents. The analysis generally reports the feedback from all respondents as a whole. Data for all of the respondents is provided in Appendix A. The text for all comments received is provided in Appendix B.

When reviewing this document, please keep in mind that the responses are from interested persons in the study area. The results are from an informal questionnaire that is not statistically significant. In addition, most of the analysis in this report is based on a review of written comments associated with each question. Not every person who filled out the rating section provided a comment.

[1] 34,000 carrier route mailing to zip codes adjacent to the I-5 corridor and the potential light rail loop; 9,100 mailing to I-5 Partnership mailing list; 900 I-5 Partnership e-mail list.
[2] 148 people signed in for the Vancouver Open House.
[3] 48 people signed in for the Portland Open House.

Summary of Overall Results

1500 responses were received to the I-5 Partnership Questionnaire on the Working Draft Recommendations for the I-5 Corridor. Respondents were asked to rate the recommendations on the I-5 rating scale where: 1 = Fully Acceptable, 3 = Neutral, 5 = Totally Unacceptable. 981 respondents were Washington residents, 455 respondents were from Oregon, and 64 respondents did not indicate which state they were from.

Draft Recommendations for Public Review:	**RATING**					
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.1 Widen I-5 to 3 lanes where it is currently 2 lanes between: a) Delta Park and Lombard and b) 99th St. to I-205 in Vancouver.	#	1039	168	101	67	76
	%	**72**	**12**	**7**	**5**	**5**
1.2 Establish a phased, light rail loop system in the vicinity of the I-5, SR 500/4th Plain and I-205 to serve travel needs within Clark County and between the two states.	#	765	165	155	97	274
	%	**53**	**11**	**11**	**7**	**19**
1.3 Provide peak-hour, premium express bus service to supplement light rail.	#	610	279	290	101	151
	%	**43**	**20**	**20**	**7**	**11**
1.4 Provide more capacity across the Columbia River for vehicles, light rail and buses.	#	821	302	117	64	104
	%	**58**	**21**	**8**	**5**	**7**
1.5 Consider interchange improvements between SR500 in WA and Columbia Blvd. in OR, where necessary for the Interstate to function smoothly and safely.	#	631	339	297	85	77
	%	**44**	**24**	**21**	**6**	**5**
1.6 Make the Columbia Blvd. interchange in Oregon into a full interchange to facilitate freight movement.	#	565	302	429	71	57
	%	**40**	**21**	**30**	**5**	**4**
1.7 Washington and Oregon need to agree now on a plan for managing land development around interchanges to protect and support the region's transportation investments.	#	803	306	220	43	56
	%	**56**	**21**	**15**	**3**	**4**
1.8 Before construction of any additional cross-river transportation capacity, Oregon and Washington will develop and agree to a workable accord for an integrated regional transportation and land use system.	#	806	297	187	50	97
	%	**56**	**21**	**13**	**4**	**7**

Draft Recommendations for Public Review:		RATING				
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.9 Do not widen I-5 to four through lanes in each direction between the Fremont Bridge in Oregon and the I-205 Interchange in Washington.	#	411	108	244	174	449
	%	**30**	**8**	**18**	**13**	**32**
1.10 No further study at this time, of a new west arterial road connection between the states in the vicinity of the railroad bridge. However, this alternative should be identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.	#	281	216	349	154	375
	%	**20**	**16**	**25**	**11**	**27**
1.11 The transportation issues near the Rose Quarter must be addressed and solved as part of an evaluation of the entire I-5/I-405 freeway loop.	#	553	277	371	83	106
	%	**40**	**20**	**27**	**6**	**8**
2.1 Overall, are the recommendations an acceptable solution to the transportation, economic, and livability needs of the Portland/Vancouver Region?	#	353	518	194	133	98
	%	**27**	**40**	**15**	**10**	**8**
2.2 Specifically for the needs of trade and moving freight, how acceptable are they?	#	209	426	406	132	78
	%	**17**	**34**	**33**	**11**	**6**
2.3 Specifically for the quality of life of the adjacent neighborhoods, how acceptable are they?	#	241	400	359	144	122
	%	**19**	**32**	**28**	**11**	**10**
2.4 And for the needs of the general everyday user of the system, how acceptable are they?	#	349	473	205	127	110
	%	**28**	**37**	**16**	**10**	**9**

Analysis of Responses and Comments

Question 1.1: *Widen I-5 to 3 lanes where it is currently 2 lanes between: a) Delta Park and Lombard and b) 99th St. to I-205 in Vancouver.*

- This question yielded the most support of any of the recommendations. Overall 83% of respondents found this recommendation acceptable (72 .5% fully acceptable and 10 .5% mostly acceptable); 7% of respondents were neutral; and 10% found the recommendation unacceptable.
- Comments indicate that the primary reasons for supporting a 3-lane option were:
  - To avoid the potential community impacts of widening I-5 to four lanes in each direction. The primary community impact that respondents were concerned about avoiding was housing displacement. This was a concern raised both in Oregon and Washington.
  - It would balance improving traffic flow with not encouraging additional vehicle traffic in the corridor
  - Three lanes appeared to be more cost effective than four lanes.
- Other consistent comments from people supporting the 3-lane proposal included:
  - The Delta Park section was seen as a higher priority than the 99th Street section among both Oregon and Washington respondents. Several people also commented that the Delta Park improvement should have been completed years ago.
  - Auxiliary lanes should also be provided where needed at interchanges to allow for safe and efficient merging on and off the freeway.
  - Traffic problems due to Hayden Island traffic would still exist under a 3-lane scenario.
- Among those who supported this recommendation, many either urged that:
  - The freeway improvements be made as soon as possible, or
  - Light rail be in place before any freeway improvements are made.
- Common concerns among respondents who opposed this recommendation fell primarily into one of two areas:
  - Three lanes is not enough, the freeway needs to be widened to at least to 4 lanes in each direction to handle future and/or current traffic and/or to allow for the HOV lane (see comments under 1.9).
  - Fixing the 2-lane sections would increase other problems by:
    - Inviting more traffic on the freeway "build it and they will come."
    - Encouraging more single-occupant vehicle usage in the corridor.
    - Moving the bottleneck further down the corridor to the I-5/I-405 split.
    - Impacting neighborhood livability.
- This recommendation was strongly supported on both sides of the river, however the rate of acceptance was higher in Washington (88%) than in Oregon (72%).

Question 1.2: *Establish a phased, light rail loop system in the vicinity of the I-5, SR 500/4th Plain and I-205 to serve travel needs within Clark County and between the two states.*

- This recommendation was supported by a majority of respondents. About 64% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable, about 11% were neutral, and about 26% found it unacceptable.
- Comments indicate that a primary reasons for supporting the light rail loop included:
  - It would reduce reliance on cars and fossil fuels.
  - It would provide more transportation choice.
  - It is good for the long-term future and livability of Vancouver.
  - It hooks up with the Portland MAX system to create a regional system.
  - People who don't like buses will like light rail.
  - It would provide economic stimulus for downtown Vancouver and Vancouver Mall.
- Several comments, were made regarding suggested changes to the light rail loop alignment, however, the most consistent comment about alignment was that the alignment should extend further north to the Salmon Creek area.
- Most of those respondents who opposed the light rail loop recommendation opposed it strongly (19% found it totally unacceptable and 7% found it mostly unacceptable). Common concerns among respondents opposing the light rail loop included:
  - Cost to construct and operate light rail.
  - Uncertainty about low ridership.
  - Lack of flexibility in rerouting transit service.
  - Doubts about the amount of congestion relief it could provide.
  - Preference that only one section should be built (either I-5 or I-205).
  - Money should be spent on roads instead.
  - Fear of increased crime in Vancouver/Clark County.
  - Travel times would be slower than bus.
  - Potential neighborhood impacts from construction.
  - "We already voted it down."
- Overall, a number of respondents raised the issue of how light rail would be paid for, many opposing tax increases and several suggesting that the Oregon income taxes paid by Washington commuters help fund light rail.
- A larger percentage of respondents from the carrier route mailing, and the Vancouver Open House, and the Vancouver neighborhood handout found the light rail proposal totally unacceptable, although overall there was still more support than opposition.

- While this recommendation was supported on both sides of the river, the rate of acceptance was higher in Oregon (72%) than in Washington (61%).

Question 1.3: *Provide peak-hour, premium express bus service to supplement light rail.*

- About 63% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable, about 20% were neutral, and about 18% found it unacceptable.
- Respondents supporting this recommendation gave one of three primary reasons for their support:
  - Many supported this recommendation because they favor express bus transit for bi-state transportation over light rail. Comments indicated that these respondents believe express bus will be more cost-effective and flexible.
  - Another group of comments indicated a need to have express bus service in the corridor on an interim basis until light rail is established.
  - A final group of comments about this recommendation supported having both light rail and express bus as complementary transit service, because buses can serve areas light rail cannot, and the bus routes can be adjusted as needed. This group, however, sees light rail as the priority.
- About 20% of respondents were neutral on this recommendation. The most frequently stated reason was a belief that light rail doesn't need supplementary service.
- Seventeen percent of respondents were not supportive of this recommendation. Overall, comments about the recommendations from this group fell into one of the following three categories:
  - Express bus is a superior transit mode to light rail. It should be used instead of light rail, not as a supplemental service.
  - Express bus is not needed as a supplement to light rail:
    - It would duplicate light rail service and is not a wise use of financial resources.
    - It would not draw as many riders as light rail.
    - Buses would be stuck in congestion.
  - Transit is not cost effective and resources should be spent on freeway lanes for cars and trucks, not buses.
  - Other issues raised by some respondents:
    - A need for more park and ride facilities for express bus to succeed.
    - Concerns about affordable fares and frequency of service.
    - HOV lanes could make express bus more effective.
- As with light rail, the rate of acceptance was higher in Oregon (69%) than in Washington (59%).

Question 1.4: *Provide more capacity across the Columbia River for vehicles, light rail and buses.*

- About 79% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable, about 8% were neutral, and about 12% found it unacceptable.
- Although respondents reacted favorably to the issue of additional crossing capacity, the comments, as summarized in the points below, indicate that much of the support was not for the specific proposal forwarded by the Task Force.
- In looking at the comments and reviewing the question, it is clear that many respondents did not understand that the new capacity was for the I-5 corridor. The most common alternate location suggested was the railroad bridge to the west. Other locations included the Camas area, I-205, or a connection to Ridgefield.
- Many comments from supporters *and* opponents indicated that they would support new crossing capacity if:
  - It only included vehicles, not light rail, for reasons articulated under 1.2.
  - It did *not* include autos. Specifically the suggestions stated that it be only for light rail, or for combinations of light rail, heavy rail, bus, pedestrian, bike and/or freight. Reasons stated included concerns about increasing auto capacity and moving the chokepoint elsewhere in the system.
- Many comments simply praised the draft recommendation, stating it should be a high or highest priority.
- Common reasons stated for supporting additional I-5 capacity were problems with the existing physical structure, capacity constraints, and the lift span.
- Another frequently mentioned idea was the concept of local bridge capacity rather than freeway capacity. Several people qualified their support for a bridge only if it was not a freeway bridge. At the Community Forum, there was quite a bit of feedback about the desirability of creating several local bridges to distribute the traffic better between Portland and Vancouver and not force all people to use a freeway crossing.
- Among those who opposed the idea of additional bridge capacity altogether, common comments included:
  - Opposition to adding any new capacity in the corridor.
  - Opposition to not solving the problems of interchanges so close to the bridge.
- A common admonition was to think long term (50 to 200 years) when designing the structure.
- A number of the comments expressed concern about the apparent absence of pedestrian and bike facilities in the recommendations.
- Common suggestions for the additional capacity included:
  - Additional structure, not a replacement.
  - Replacement, in order to eliminate lift spans and out-of-date structure.
  - Double-deck structure.

- Reversible lanes.
- Tunnel.

- The rate of support was similar for the two states.

Question 1.5: *Consider interchange improvements between SR500 in WA and Columbia Blvd. in OR, where necessary for the Interstate to function smoothly and safely.*

- About 68% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable, about 21% were neutral, and about 11% found it unacceptable.
- A majority of people supported looking more at the bridge influence area between SR 500 and Columbia Blvd. A concern expressed by a number of supporters was that in doing so, that improvements must minimize community impacts such as displacements.
- Those opposing further work in this area cited several concerns:
  - Improvements will only encourage more traffic.
  - Improvements could have unacceptable impacts to the community, including housing displacements.
  - A new bridge in a new location could eliminate the need for interchange improvements.
- Additionally, some respondents suggested that during the analysis of the bridge influence area the following should be considered:
  - The closing of some of the existing on/off ramps – Oregon and Washington.
  - The impact on land use plans.
  - A different design if there were more than one river crossing.
  - The down-stream impacts to the freeway system.
- The rate of support was similar for the two states.

Question 1.6: *Make the Columbia Blvd. interchange in Oregon into a full interchange to facilitate freight movement*.

- About 61% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable, about 30% were neutral, and about 9% found it unacceptable.
- Feedback on this question indicates that this question was confusing to many respondents.
- Comments from those who supported this recommendation included:
  - The recognition of the need to support freight movement and business activity in general.
  - The need to provide improvements to get trucks out of neighborhoods.
  - Concern about possible construction impacts.
- Most neutral comments indicated that respondents were not familiar enough with the location or the freight issues to offer an informed opinion.

- A frequent comment among those who opposed this recommendation was that more freight should be moved by heavy rail. Concern was also expressed about displacements and other environmental impacts (Editor's note: there are no known displacements from this project).
- Additionally, some participants suggested that during the analysis of Columbia Blvd. the following should be considered:
  - Limiting the hours of freight operation.
  - The greater use of rail, and the need to get freight on the freeway without going through neighborhoods.
  - Using other alignments (not I-5) for freight
- While the rate of acceptance was higher in Oregon (68%) than in Washington (58%), the largest difference was in the rate of neutral responses – 35% for Washington and 20% for Oregon.

Question 1.7: *Washington and Oregon need to agree now on a plan for managing land development around interchanges to protect and support the region's transportation investments.*

- About 78% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable, about 15% were neutral, and about 7% found it unacceptable.
- Among those supporting the recommendations, common comments included:
  - Should have been done long ago.
  - A bi-state effort is critical to success.
  - The only way regional air quality can be solved.
- Among those opposing, the following were common comments:
  - This requirement would delay or kill any action.
  - Status quo is working just fine.
  - Neither state should control the other.
- Additional participant comments included:
  - Whatever you're going to do, do it and don't delay.
  - States need to align, not mirror each other.
  - Balance the need for a durable agreement with the flexibility for success.
  - Limit to transportation integration, not land use.
  - Will need federal participation for an agreement.
- This recommendation was strongly supported on both sides of the river – 83% in Oregon and 75% in Washington.

Question 1.8: *Before construction of any additional cross-river transportation capacity, Oregon and Washington will develop and agree to a workable accord for an integrated regional transportation and land use system.*

- About 77% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable, about 13% were neutral, and about 10% found it unacceptable.
- The comments for this question generally mirror the comments for question 1.7.
- As with the previous recommendation, this was strongly supported on both sides of the river – 83% in Oregon and 74% in Washington.

Question 1.9: *Do not widen I-5 to four through lanes in each direction between the Fremont Bridge in Oregon and the I-205 Interchange in Washington.*

- W*e observed that the wording of this question resulted in some confusion in indicating how acceptable the recommendation was. Some comments indicated opposition to the recommendation, but their rating indicated they supported the recommendation, and vice versa. Also, a number of the comments expressed confusion over which way they were supposed to rate the recommendation.*
- Even bearing the above in mind, this recommendation appears to have received the most divided response of all recommendations in the questionnaire – about 37% acceptable, 18% neutral, and 44% unacceptable.
- Among those supporting the recommendation, the following concerns were voiced about adding more capacity:
  - Widening the freeway will result in more traffic.
  - Alternatives such as transit should be relied on rather than more lanes.
  - Widening the freeway will result in more neighborhood impacts such as displacement and pollution.
  - More capacity will result in more sprawl.
  - The cost of the 4-lane widening is too high when compared to the benefits.
- There were also some supporters of the recommendation that supported adding capacity elsewhere, such as on a new local connection.
- Among the comments of those who were neutral or had qualifications to their support, a range of issues were raised, including:
  - Either the study or the individual does not have enough information to dismiss four lanes as an option.
  - HOV lanes could be an alternative use for an additional lane, especially if light rail does not "fly."
  - Four lanes will be needed eventually on I-5.
  - A portion of the corridor should be four lanes.
- Those opposed to the recommendation stated one or more of the following concerns:

- A fourth lane is needed in the future and/or now.
- It will cost more later
- The recommendation does not recognize that drivers will not leave the freedom of their cars, and this does not address the needs of the majority of users.
- Either an additional lane is needed to replace the existing lane that is being used for HOV, or HOV would be more effective with a new devoted lane.
- The 3-lane proposal does not address the need to move goods and/or will affect the economy of the region.
- There are costs to congestion – time, fuel, pollution.

- While responses were polarized on both sides of the river, there was notably more support for this recommendation in Oregon (50%) than in Washington (32%).

Question 1.10: *No further study at this time, of a new west arterial road connection between the states in the vicinity of the railroad bridge. However, this alternative should be identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.*

- This recommendation resulted in a divided response. About 35% found the recommendation acceptable, 26% were neutral, and 38% found it unacceptable.
- *Similar to question 1.9, we observed that the wording of the question may have resulted in some confusion in indicating how acceptable the recommendation was. Several comments indicated opposition to the recommendation, but their rating indicated they supported the recommendation, and vice versa.*
- Those who favor the option cited two different reasons: some want the route to be studied further, others do not support the road and don't want any further work on it.
- Those who are opposed to the recommendation were much more likely to submit comments than those who supported it. They generally cited one of the following reasons for their opposition:
  - The road should continue to be studied now, by the I-5 Partnership, to answer the question of the need for the road.
  - Many favor having an arterial route to cross between the states instead of relying on the freeway bridges.
  - It helps the St. Johns neighborhood.
  - It can help take local traffic off I-5.
  - It can provide a more direct route to industrial areas for some trucks.
- The rate of support was similar for the two states.

Question 1.11: *The transportation issues near the Rose Quarter must be addressed and solved as part of an evaluation of the entire I-5/I-405 freeway loop.*

- Responses to this question indicate that respondents support this recommendation. About 60% indicated they found the recommendation to be acceptable, about 27% were neutral, and about 14% found the recommendation unacceptable.
- The comments of the supporters indicate that:
  - Many respondents focused their support on doing something to fix the Rose Quarter section of the freeway now.
  - Some felt this is more of a Portland issue and not a bi-state issue.
  - Moving or removing the Eastbank Freeway should be considered.
- Among those who opposed this recommendation comments indicate that most of these respondents believe that this area should not be delayed for further study, but that a plan should be advanced and a construction project should be moved forward with to fix the bottleneck.
- While Oregon showed significantly more support for this recommendation (70%) than Washington (55%), a much larger portion of Washington respondents were neutral (31%) than Oregon respondents (18%).

Question 2.1: *Overall, are the recommendations an acceptable solution to the transportation, economic, and livability needs of the Portland/Vancouver Region?*

- About 67% of respondents found the recommendations as a whole to be an acceptable solution, 15% were neutral, and about 18% found it unacceptable.
- Comments indicate that those who find the overall solution acceptable see the recommendation as balanced and want to move forward now without delay.
- Comments indicate that those who find the recommendations generally unacceptable:
  - See the plan as too shortsighted,
  - Believe there is too much neighborhood impact,
  - Don't want light rail included in the plan.
- Taking the comments as a whole, there were several overall themes that emerged:
  - An overall concern of respondents is that neighborhood and livability impacts are minimized.
  - Support for a phased light rail system is mixed with strong feelings supporting and opposing this form of transit.
  - When HOV was mentioned in the context of this question, comments generally were not supportive.
  - There is a desire to know how improvements will be financed.
  - There is a concern that action needs to be taken quickly to prepare for future growth.

Question 2.2: *Specifically for the needs of trade and moving freight, how acceptable are they?*

- About 51% of respondents found the recommendations acceptable for the needs of trade and freight movement, about 33% were neutral, and about 17% found them acceptable.
- Comments indicate that many of the neutral respondents did not feel knowledgeable enough about freight issues to respond.
- Among those who found the solution acceptable for trade and freight movement they tend to:
  - See freight as a very important issue in our region.
  - Support improvements for freight movement.
  - Make a connection between freight movement and jobs.
- Among those who find the solution unacceptable they tend to:
  - Believe we should focus more attention on rail.
  - Think we should consider the West Arterial road.
  - Think the recommendations are too commuter-oriented.
- Among all respondents a frequent comment was that commercial traffic should not use the highway system during peak periods.

Question 2.3: *Specifically for the quality of life of the adjacent neighborhoods, how acceptable are they?*

- About 51% of respondents found the recommendations acceptable for adjacent neighborhoods, about 29% were neutral, and about 21% found the recommendations unacceptable.
- Respondents that found the recommendations acceptable, generally believe:
  - The proposals address livability issues.
  - Should minimize impacts to neighborhoods.
  - Some impacts may be necessary.
- Respondents that found the recommendations unacceptable generally:
  - Think we need more information to understand the impacts.
  - Don't think the recommendations consider the quality of life in neighborhoods.

Question 2.4: *And for the needs of the general everyday user of the system, how acceptable are they?*

- About 65% of respondents found this recommendation to be acceptable for the everyday user, about 16% were neutral, and about 19% found it unacceptable.
- Among those who agreed that the recommendations met the needs of the general user, they commented on the following:
  - Support for light rail transit

- Support for fixing the corridor bottlenecks
- Support for transit/transportation options
- Something needs to be done to fix the problem

- Among those who did not think that the recommendations met the needs of the general user, they commented on the following:
  - More needs to be done, soon
  - Need for more road capacity
  - Need for more transit
  - Concern about population growth.

Question 3: *Overall, what is the most important point you would like the Task Force to consider as they continue their work in developing recommendations for the corridor?*

This question resulted in the greatest number of comments of any item on the questionnaire (1126 comments). The three most distinctive areas of comments from this question were:

- Support for fixing the bottleneck at Delta Park.
- Support for adding a new river crossing to fix the bottleneck at the I-5 Bridge.
- Light rail – there were many comments both supporting and opposing light rail transit in Clark County.

Other issues of that were frequently mentioned include:

- Concern about avoiding displacements.
- The need for additional river crossings in locations outside the I-5 corridor.
- The importance of transportation demand management.
- The importance of a multi-modal transportation system including mass transit.
- Urgency to do something quickly.

Question 4: *Are there actions or missing elements you believe could be taken to make this a stronger plan or more acceptable to you?*

The three most distinctive areas of comments from this question were:

- Support for adding back the West Arterial Road proposal
- Support for additional river crossings. Arterial crossings were frequently mentioned, as were new freeway crossings such as the Westside Bypass and a new freeway crossing east of I-205.
- Support for commuter rail.
- Opposition for light rail.

Other common comments included:

- Use tax and policy incentives to get people to travel at non-peak times and on alternative modes.
- There is quite a bit of interest in how the improvements will be funded. With an emphasis on being good stewards of the public's money.
- Several respondents urged that the plan, or elements of the plan be voted on by residents.
- Many Washington respondents urged the Task Force to think about the Oregon income tax paid by Washington residents who are employed in Oregon.
- The need to improve bicycle and pedestrian connections across the river.
- Opposition to the existing Washington HOV lanes.
- Improving job opportunities/growth in Washington to avoid bi-state travel.
- Support for reducing or eliminating bridge lifts.
- Support for 4-lanes.
- Support for fixing merging and weaving problems at interchanges.

Appendix A: Survey Responses

1. Widen I-5 to 3 lanes where it is currently 2 lanes between: a) Delta Park and Lombard and b) 99th St. to I-205 in Vancouver.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 571 – 22 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	428	57	41	20	25
Percentage	75%	10%	7%	4%	4%

WEB SURVEY – Total 484 - 6 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	336	67	24	34	23
Percentage	69%	14%	5%	7%	5%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 242 – 5 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	171	26	21	11	13
Percentage	71%	11%	9%	5%	5%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 79 – 6 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	57	6	10	0	6
Percentage	72%	8%	13%	0	8%

COMMUNITY FORUM – Total 23 - 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	16	3	1	0	3
Percentage	70%	13%	4%	0	13%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 27 – 12 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	16	5	2	2	2
Percentage	60%	19%	7%	7%	7%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 25 – 1 person skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	15	4	2	0	4
Percentages	60%	16%	8%	0	16%

COMBINED – Total 1,451 – 48 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	1039	168	101	67	76
Percentages	72%	12%	7 %	5%	5%

2. Establish a phased, light rail loop system in the vicinity of the I-5, SR 500/4th Plain and I-205 to serve travel needs within Clark County and between the two states.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 574 – 19 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	303	44	67	41	119
Percentage	53%	8%	12%	7%	21%

WEB SURVEY – Total 485 – 5 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	256	75	41	37	76
Percentage	53%	16%	9%	8%	16%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 243 – 4 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	130	31	34	10	38
Percentage	54%	13%	14%	4%	16%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 78 - 24 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	34	9	7	4	24
Percentage	44%	12%	9%	5%	31%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	15	4	0	2	2
Percentage	65%	17%	0	9%	9%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 27 – 12 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	16	2	3	1	5
Percentage	59%	7%	11%	4%	19%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	11	0	3	2	10
Percentage	42%	0	12%	8%	39%

COMBINED – Total 1,456 – 43 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	765	165	155	97	274
Percentage	53%	11%	11%	7%	19%

3. Provide peak-hour, premium express bus service to supplement light rail.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 564 - 30 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	223	105	129	40	67
Percentage	40%	19%	23%	7%	12%

WEB SURVEY – Total 476 – 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	199	108	91	37	41
Percentage	42%	23%	19%	8%	9%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 240 - 7 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	117	41	40	17	25
Percentage	49%	17%	17%	7%	10%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 77 - 10 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	38	11	16	2	10
Percentage	50%	14%	21%	3%	13%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 person skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	11	6	3	1	2
Percentage	48%	26%	13%	4%	9%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 27 – 12 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	14	4	5	2	2
Percentage	52%	15%	19%	7%	7%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 24 - 2 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	8	4	6	2	4
Percentage	33%	17%	25%	8%	17%

COMBINED – Total 1,431 – 69 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	610	279	290	101	151
Percentage	43%	20%	20%	7%	11%

4. Provide more capacity across the Columbia River for vehicles, light rail and buses.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 549 – 45 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	333	92	50	23	51
Percentage	61%	17%	9%	4%	9%

WEB SURVEY – Total 477 – 13 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	263	126	38	26	24
Percentage	55%	26%	8%	6%	5%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 235 - 12 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	131	61	20	11	12
Percentage	56%	26%	9%	5%	5%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 76 - 9people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	49	10	5	3	9
Percentage	65%	13%	7%	4%	12%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	19	3	1	0	0
Percentage	83%	13%	4%	0	0

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 24 – 15 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	17	4	1	0	2
Percentage	71%	17%	4%	0	8%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 24 – 2 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	9	6	2	1	6
Percentage	38%	25%	8%	4%	25%

COMBINED – Total 1,408 – 92 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	821	302	117	64	104
Percentage	58%	21%	8%	5%	7%

5. Consider interchange improvements between SR500 in WA and Columbia Blvd. in OR, where necessary for the Interstate to function smoothly and safely.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 558 – 36 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	241	122	133	35	27
Percentage	43%	22%	24%	6%	5%

WEB SURVEY – Total 479 – 11 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	218	147	76	25	13
Percentage	46%	31%	16%	5%	3%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 239 – 8 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	106	46	57	15	14
Percentage	45%	19%	24%	6%	6%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 79 – 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	29	16	17	3	14
Percentage	37%	20%	22%	4%	18%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 person skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	12	4	4	2	1
Percentage	52%	17%	17%	9%	4%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 25 - 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	17	1	2	2	3
Percentage	68%	4%	8%	8%	12%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	8	3	7	3	5
Percentage	31%	12%	27%	12%	19%

COMBINED – Total 1429 – 71 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	631	339	297	85	77
Percentage	44%	24%	21%	6%	5%

6. Make the Columbia Blvd. interchange in Oregon into a full interchange to facilitate freight movement.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 561 – 33 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	202	109	204	21	25
Percentage	36%	19%	36%	4%	5%

WEB SURVEY – Total 475 – 15 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	175	121	136	28	15
Percentage	37%	26%	29%	6%	3%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 236 – 11 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	114	44	58	12	8
Percentage	48%	19%	25%	5%	3%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 77 – 6 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	36	13	19	3	6
Percentage	47%	17%	25%	4%	8%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	12	7	2	2	0
Percentage	52%	30%	9%	9%	0%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 26 – 13 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	17	2	3	1	3
Percentage	65%	8%	12%	4%	12%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	9	6	7	4	0
Percentage	35%	23%	27%	15%	0

COMBINED – Total 1,424 – 76 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	565	302	429	71	57
Percentage	40%	21%	30%	5%	4%

7. Washington and Oregon need to agree now on a plan for managing land development around interchanges to protect and support the region's transportation investments.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 563 – 31 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	306	102	107	19	29
Percentage	54%	18%	19%	3%	5%

WEB SURVEY – Total 476 – 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	257	130	62	15	12
Percentage	54%	27%	13%	3%	3%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 239 – 8 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	151	40	38	5	5
Percentage	63%	17%	16%	2%	2%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 78 – 7 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	46	16	6	3	7
Percentage	59%	20%	8%	4%	9%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 person skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	12	9	2	0	0
Percentage	52%	39%	9%	0	0%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 23 – 16 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	19	2	1	1	0
Percentage	83%	9%	4%	4%	0

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	12	7	4	0	3
Percentage	46%	27%	15%	0	12%

COMBINED – Total 1,428 – 72 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	803	306	220	43	56
Percentage	56%	21%	15%	3%	4%

8. Before construction of any additional cross-river transportation capacity, Oregon and Washington will develop and agree to a workable accord for an integrated regional transportation and land use system.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 567 – 27 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	332	95	85	18	37
Percentage	59%	17%	15%	3%	7%

WEB SURVEY – Total 476 – 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	232	132	55	25	32
Percentage	49%	28%	12%	5%	7%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 242 – 5 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	150	45	30	5	12
Percentage	62%	19%	12%	2%	5%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 77 – 13 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	40	14	8	2	13
Percentage	52%	18%	10%	3%	17%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 person skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	14	7	1	0	1
Percentage	61%	30%	4%	0	4%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 26 – 13 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	22	0	3	0	1
Percentage	85%	0	12%	0	4%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 16 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	16	4	5	0	1
Percentage	62%	15%	19%	0	4%

COMBINED – Total 1,437 – 63 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	806	297	187	50	97
Percentage	56%	21%	13%	4%	7%

9. Do not widen I-5 to four through lanes in each direction between the Fremont Bridge in Oregon and the I-205 Interchange in Washington.

.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 536 – 58 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	129	36	117	65	189
Percentage	24%	7%	22%	12%	35%

WEB SURVEY – Total 475 – 15 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	139	43	76	77	140
Percentage	29%	9%	16%	16%	30%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 231 – 16 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	79	16	32	21	82
Percentage	34%	7%	14%	9%	36%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 72 – 19 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	27	8	13	5	19
Percentage	38%	11%	18%	7%	26%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	16	0	1	2	4
Percentage	70%	0%	4%	9%	17%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 24 – 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	10	3	2	3	6
Percentage	42%	13%	8%	13%	25%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 25 – 1 person skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	11	2	3	1	8
Percentage	44%	8%	12%	4%	32%

COMBINED – Total 1386 – 113 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	411	108	244	174	449
Percentage	30%	8%	18%	13%	32%

10. No further study at this time, of a new west arterial road connection between the states in the vicinity of the railroad bridge. However, this alternative should be identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 527 – 67 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	111	64	151	47	154
Percentage	21%	12%	29%	9%	29%

WEB SURVEY – Total 469 – 21 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	83	96	113	80	97
Percentage	18%	21%	24%	17%	21%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 226 – 21 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	48	39	57	16	66
Percentage	21%	17%	25%	7%	29%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 57 – 28 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	13	7	9	0	28
Percentage	23%	12%	16%	0%	49%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	7	3	1	5	7
Percentage	30%	13%	4%	22%	30%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 32 – 5 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	7	2	3	0	20
Percentage	22%	6%	9%	0	63%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	5	1	9	4	7
Percentage	19%	4%	35%	15%	27%

COMBINED – Total 1,375 – 123 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	281	216	349	154	375
Percentage	20%	16%	25%	11%	27%

11. The transportation issues near the Rose Quarter must be addressed and solved as part of an evaluation of the entire I-5/I-405 freeway loop.

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 535 – 59 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	200	94	167	30	44
Percentage	38%	18%	31%	6%	8%

WEB SURVEY – Total 476 – 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	182	122	111	35	26
Percentage	38%	26%	23%	7%	6%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 227 – 20 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	102	42	57	10	16
Percentage	45%	19%	25%	4%	7%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 77 – 10 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	31	12	23	1	10
Percentage	40%	16%	30%	1%	13%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 23 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	8	1	3	5	6
Percentage	35%	4%	13%	22%	26%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 26 – 12 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	21	3	1	0	1
Percentage	81%	12%	4%	0	4%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	9	3	9	2	3
Percentage	35%	12%	35%	8%	12%

COMBINED – Total 1,390 – 109 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	553	277	371	83	106
Percentage	40%	20%	27%	6%	8%

2.1. Overall, are the recommendations an acceptable solution to the transportation, economic, and livability needs of the Portland/Vancouver Region?

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 521 – 72 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	172	173	89	41	46
Percentage	33%	33%	17%	8%	9%

WEB SURVEY – Total 408 – 82 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	75	211	52	54	16
Percentage	18%	52%	13%	13%	4%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 224 – 23 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	70	84	35	18	17
Percentage	31%	38%	16%	8%	8%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 71 – 9 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	20	23	10	9	9
Percentage	29%	32%	14%	13%	13%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 21 –2 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	5	12	1	3	0
Percentage	24%	57%	5%	14%	0

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 25 – 14 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	7	8	3	3	4
Percentage	28%	32%	12%	12%	16%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	4	7	4	5	6
Percentage	15%	27%	15%	19%	23%

COMBINED – Total 1, 296 – 202 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	353	518	194	133	98
Percentage	27%	40%	15%	10%	8%

2.2. Specifically for the needs of trade and moving freight, how acceptable are they?

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 503 – 91 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	102	139	180	42	40
Percentage	20%	28%	36%	8%	8%

WEB SURVEY – Total 398 – 92 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	50	160	121	49	18
Percentage	13%	40%	30%	12%	5%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 215 - 32 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	39	77	70	20	9
Percentage	18%	36%	32%	9%	4%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 67 – 8 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	8	24	17	10	8
Percentage	12%	36%	25%	15%	12%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 20 – 3 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	2	7	6	5	0
Percentage	10%	35%	30%	25%	0

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 23 – 16 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	5	11	5	0	2
Percentage	22%	48%	22%	0	9%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 25 1 person skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	3	8	7	6	1
Percentage	12%	32%	28%	24%	4%

COMBINED – Total 1,251 – 248 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	209	426	406	132	78
Percentage	17%	34%	33%	11%	6%

2.3. Specifically for the quality of life of the adjacent neighborhoods, how acceptable are they?

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 515 – 79 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	117	132	160	51	55
Percentage	23%	26%	31%	10%	11%

WEB SURVEY – Total 399 – 91 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	63	150	107	51	28
Percentage	16%	38%	27%	13%	7%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 214 – 33 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	47	77	55	20	15
Percentage	22%	36%	26%	9%	7%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 69 – 11 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	8	22	20	8	11
Percentage	12%	32%	29%	12%	16%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 19 – 4 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	0	6	7	5	1
Percentage	0	32%	37%	26%	5%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 24 – 15 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	6	5	2	6	5
Percentage	25%	21%	8%	25%	21%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	0	8	8	3	7
Percentage	0	31%	31%	12%	27%

COMBINED – Total 1,266 – 233 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	241	400	359	144	122
Percentage	19%	32%	28%	11%	10%

2.4. And for the needs of the general everyday user of the system, how acceptable are they?

MAIL-IN SURVEY (CARRIER ROUTE MAILING) – Total 513 – 81 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	166	162	90	39	56
Percentage	32%	32%	18%	8%	11%

WEB SURVEY – Total 399 – 91 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	84	180	56	51	28
Percentage	21%	45%	14%	13%	7%

MAIL IN SURVEY (I-5 PARTNERSHIP LIST) – Total 212 – 34 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	69	77	32	20	14
Percentage	33%	37%	15%	9%	7%

VANCOUVER OPEN HOUSE – Total 70 – 6 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	18	27	12	7	6
Percentage	26%	39%	17%	10%	9%

COMMUNNITY FORUM – Total 20 – 3 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	4	9	4	3	0
Percentage	20%	45%	20%	15%	0%

PORTLAND OPEN HOUSE – Total 24 – 15 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	6	9	3	3	3
Percentage	25%	38%	13%	13%	13%

VANCOUVER HANDOUTS – Total 26 – 0 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	2	9	8	4	3
Percentage	8%	35%	31%	15%	12%

COMBINED – Total 1,264 – 234 people skipped

	1	2	3	4	5
# Responses	349	473	205	127	110
Percentage	28%	37%	16%	10%	9%