# Summary of Feedback
# Joint Community Forum and Task Force
# January 27, 2001

## Introduction:

This document summarizes the key outcomes from the first joint meeting of the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership's Task Force and Community Forum. This meeting was held from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday, January 27, 2001 at the Doubletree Hotel – Columbia River in Portland.

There were several objectives for the first joint meeting of the Task Force and the Community Forum: to bring participants up to speed about the purpose of the I-5 Partnership project, to make participants knowledgeable about the corridor and its problems, and to get input from participants about problems, potential solutions, vision and values.

The first half of the day was spent listening to presentations on the purpose of the project and the issues in the I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver. The second half of the day was spent working in small groups to get feedback. The remainder of this document summarizes this feedback and is organized as follows:

- **Small Group Discussion of the Key Questions**
  - What is the magnitude of the problem?
  - What if we did nothing?
  - What are your concerns if action is taken?
  - What are your concerns if no action is taken?
  - What improvements are needed?
  - How can they be funded?

- **Problem Statement Exercise**
  - Original Problem Statement
  - Edited Problem Statement
  - Additional comments on Problem Statement

- **Vision and Values Statement Exercise**
  - Original Vision and Values Statement
  - Edited Vision and Values Statement
  - Additional comments on Vision and Values Statement
- **Meeting Evaluation**

## Small Group Discussion of Key Questions:

During the small group breakout session, the groups were asked to address five questions:

1. What is the magnitude of the problem?
2. What if we do nothing to the corridor?
3. What are your concerns if action is taken?
4. What improvements are needed?
5. How can they be funded?

This section summarizes the answers to these five questions.

### What is the magnitude of the problem?

The general consensus reflected in the comments is that the problems in the corridor are significant. "It's a really big huge problem." "Really bad. Bad for years and getting worse." "We are at a critical point, were we could turn our problems around before we get like Puget Sound." "Still fixable. Not beyond point of no return." "The magnitude is not great now but it will be in a short time. Good that we are addressing it now, before we become like Seattle."

The issues identified around the magnitude of the problem included:

Quality of Life:
"Detrimental to quality of life. Because of delays need to get up earlier, spillover traffic to neighborhoods, growth in congestion, etc." "Spillover affects local neighborhoods too…commuter traffic using local roads congests local streets, reduces livability and creates negative impacts on alternative modes." "Quality of life impacts from commuting: stress, encroach on family time." "Increased accidents. Safety problems. Feeds into insurance rates."

Jobs/Housing Imbalance:
"Jobs vs. housing split north to south, creates unique aspects on travel behavior and associated congestion." "Need jobs on north side of river." "Balance of jobs – need more in Clark County." "Imbalance of housing and jobs between Vancouver and Portland contributes to the problem. The differences in current zoning and land use policies between the two states makes it worse." "Lower housing costs in Vancouver area…problem will get worse in Northern Clark County (if the) urban growth boundary expands.

Corridor Constraints:
"The problem is there's this huge confluence of everything: airport, ports, rail, highway, so no wonder there's a problem. We designed it this way." "I-5 will be tougher thing to fix than other freeways." "Interchanges are under-designed to carry traffic now and in the future." "Only two river crossings of the Columbia, in Portland there are several." "Bridge design is poor/unsafe." "(I-5 goes) right through the middle of two of the largest cities in the region."

Trade/Economy:
"The fact that we are so trade-dependant here is an issue." "Business impacts at Hayden Island." "Indirect effect. Anyone who is a consumer is adversely affected." "Housing values depressed because of congestion." "Port of Vancouver freight is being impacted – congestion does affect costs." "Trucking industry – is a critical economic issue – fuel and labor costs, has an economic cost to business because costs are slow to be passed on to customers which contributes to instability in the industry."

Lack of Alternatives:
"Limited options if you don't want to drive – bus, light rail, Amtrak are unreliable and inconvenient." "I'd like to consider the 'choice not to travel.' The single occupant vehicle continues to reign supreme. I don't think we have made a commitment to change that."

Taxation:
"Inequity of tax collection for the states – live on one side, work or shop on the other." "Effected by different tax structures between the two states." "Tax structure influence traffic decisions."

Commuter Influence:
"Commuters are the problem, but freight is impacted." "Seems to be a commuter issue, not a trade problem."

Freight Influence:
"As much due to freight traffic increases as commuter traffic."

A few comments indicate that some participants do not believe that the problem is significant. "How much of the problem is self-limiting? Since our economic vitality and quality of life is tied to transportation, if we do nothing, that might slow the problem. People are still going to Seattle, San Francisco, LA and other places anyway – demand is still exceeding supply."

## What if we did nothing to the corridor?

Economic Impact:
"Cost to business goes up – lose jobs due to moves." "Industries will leave to find other areas." "Will hurt trade and employment growth in region." "The efficiency of the system deteriorates." "Risk of losing employment centers (e.g., Silicon Valley)." "Businesses will leave the area." "Local businesses are pinched and may be impacted by higher transaction costs." "Potential for stagnation in trade/economic development due to perception elsewhere that Portland/Vancouver is "maxed out" like LA. Hinders relocation decision. Added costs to trade." "Increase in cost for goods and services." "Cost of living will go

up." "Trade will move elsewhere." "The quality of jobs may become of lower quality, and jobs in the central city will go down."

Emergency Services:
"More difficult to get to hospital and for fire department to go to fire. No emergency services access." "Emergency response to disaster would be very limited. Difficult to access/egress to corridor."

Livability:
"Limited abilities to enjoy the area quality of life (e.g. zoo visit, county fair, fireworks on July 4th, less family time and opportunities to share activities.)" "More cut through (traffic) in neighborhoods." "Traffic increases rage – would hate to have that in the community."

Increased Costs to Fix:
"At some point, if we do nothing, then the transportation crisis will cause solutions to be made at a later date." "Higher costs to fix the problems in the future." " If we do nothing the problem gets too big to solve."

Social Impacts:
"People withdrawn." "Quality of life impacts from commuting: stress, encroach on family time." "Sense of community would change."

There were some that believed that doing nothing, however, might be helpful:
"Positive – may force other changes – (people will use) High Occupancy Lanes, use other modes, move." "Some negatives may be positives – fewer people move in. Less needed for schools." "Fixes itself. People start to change behaviors – look for jobs locally, change commuting patterns." "People won't tolerate 6 hour delay – will have to adjust." "Employers look at different hours, telecommuting, flex time." "Drivers will adjust to traffic problems/change behavior – don't go, other routes, different hours."

## What are your concerns if action is taken?

Neighborhood and Community Impacts:
"How it will impact neighborhoods, communities." "Displacement of homes and businesses." "Concern that recommended improvements may increase housing prices along the corridor, with associated gentrification and displacement."

Environmental, Historical and Cultural Impacts:
"Environmental concerns. More impervious surface/rainwater runoff." "Keep air quality in mind." "Impacts on sensitive lands." "I-5 dissects Downtown Vancouver – where widening could ruin historic commercial and cultural resources." "Noise – particularly in North Portland." "Air quality – more vehicles = more pollution, global warming."

Financing:
"Cost: How much? Who pays?" "Expected large expense of improvements may necessitate financial trade-offs. Outcome is that there is going to be less money to spend on other activities if we actually decide to go forward and fund something. Less money for parks, police, community development."

Land Use Impacts:
"Compatibility with land-use programs." "Could encourage sprawl, more driving, longer distances." "Land use strategies between the two sides of the river need to be very tightly coordinated."

Growth Impacts:
"Don't want to make it worse by giving us more. Don't create additional traffic." "Will we be creating more of a problem? More roads means more people."

Concern about Highway Capacity:
"Induced traffic – 'if you build it they will come.'" "If we add capacity, will trucks and commuters just eat it up? Can we control it?" "No matter what you do, the traffic on I-5 will always be maxed out. If we make more capacity it will instantly get filled again."

Construction Impacts:
"Construction delays cause stress, impacts." "Construction disruption – neighborhoods."

Ability to Implement:
"Do we have the financial and political will to complete the project?" "How do we overcome the government mistrust by the community at large?" "Will a project really be able to be accomplished?"

Multi-modal Options:
"Adding lanes isn't the only thing to do, look at all options." "Have the focus of the action solution be options, travel alternatives, more options for more people." "Fear that we will only focus on cars and not consider transit or demand management techniques. We need to make sure that all modes are considered equally." "Actions have to address access and connectivity. Inter-modal transportation – people transportation." "Cannot rely on one mode." "Concern that focus is on big solutions, instead of smaller adjustments." "We end up reacting instead of being proactive. We need to be proactive – just building roads will not solve the problem. We need alternative transportation solutions."

Scope and Coordination Issues:
"Confining study to too small a region." "Should take long term action." "A coordinated set of actions. You've got a lot of different groups of people working

on problems – it would be nice to have an umbrella group to bring everyone's solutions together." "Can't fix the I-5 problem without looking at it through the regional perspective. You can't just talk about I-5, you have to talk about the whole region." "We need an integrated plan, we need to all view this together. Not just fix the problems of how to get from point A to point B – we need to look at the big picture."

Other:

- "Land use is dispersed: no critical mass for transit or carpool feasibility."
- "Commuting interest/business interest may not be very receptive to other alternative mode possibilities such as biking and transit."

## What improvements are needed?

Education:
"Major education program to get people out of cars." "Change public attitudes about mobility – how to get around." "Education influences choices that people make." "We need to provide options, education. People do not know that there other viable solutions."

Demand Management:
"Demand management focus, instead of new capacity." "Varying work hours for industrial in N. Portland more will help." "Staggered work hours – better coordination." "Flex hours for schools." "Demand management for rail and trucks." "How can we improve incident management?"

Truck Suggestions:
"Get trucks off road in peak periods or use other routes. Have separate truck routes." "Truck routes to/from the ports on the west side of town." "Better or more connections between truck and heavy rail transfer." "Freight lane – exclusive." "(Expand) Terminal 6 hours."

Incentives:
"Use tax incentives (regionally funded)." "Carrot – stick approach needs to be explored." "Incentives to businesses to accept freight out of peak hour." "Incentives to modify work day and home/work location." "Provide tax credits/incentives for use of public transit to employers, employees and institutions." "Take bus pass costs and have them be tax deductible."

Land Use:
"Restrict housing growth on edges of metro area." "Bi-state land use planning and economic develop agencies." "Economic development, compact communities, and more friendly alternative mode designs to make area more self-sufficient so that areas can support themselves and not have to have things transported into area. Land use planning is related." "Facilitate density and

mixed use development." "Limit development till adequate infrastructure." "Encourage job growth in areas that don't use the corridor."

Technology:
"Use high tech/better communication to coordinate truck and transit delivery." "Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) – driver information." "Incident response."

Transit and Commuter Rail:
"Need light rail. Should have up I-5 and I-205." "Other types of systems to facilitate movement in corridor: high speed bus, HOV lanes, etc." "Better bus connections with light rail." "Need peak hour commuter rail cars." "Mass transit." "Monorail ends at Vancouver downtown transit center and the Rose quarter. Have bike and pedestrian travel on top." "Commuter rail from Camas/Longview to downtown Portland." "Commuter rail is all-day system." "Express connections to east side light rail." "Downtown subway." "Jitney systems (vanpools, taxis, etc.)." "Express buses." "Dedicated lanes for buses." "Streetcars along MLK."

Columbia River Crossing:
"Bridge that can accommodate both cars and light rail, or even heavy rail. Put it all on one bridge." "Replace existing bridge in order to increase capacity within existing space." "Tunnel that starts south and comes up north for trucks and through traffic." "Additional capacity on bridge for buses, bikes, pedestrians, HOV, light rail and freight." "New bridge with express lanes from north of Vancouver to downtown Portland." "Local connection: Portland to Hayden Island to Vancouver." "New bridge or add lanes to Interstate Bridge." "High capacity transit links across the Columbia." "Alternative river crossing near St. Johns bridge to connect Rivergate/US 30." "Replace rail bridge with a rail/truck bridge." "Add rail bridge capacity."

Overall Highway:
"Fix bottlenecks and implement quick fixes." "Widen bottlenecks – 2-lanes to 3-lanes." "Reversible lanes." "HOV lanes the entire length at peak hours." "I-5 solutions include I-205 and I-84." "Private roadways." "Fix Going/Greeley interchange to provide truck access to the Albina Rail Yards." "Double deck I-5." "Provide second access to Swan Island." "Focus on improvement first that maximizes the efficiency of what exists before we get to spending more money and/or proposing new capital projects." "More highway crossovers to better connect neighborhoods." "Limit access: close ramps at key times." "Turn I-5 into a recreational corridor – separate lanes for express, local, bike/pedestrian – with boulevard treatment such as trees to improve visual impact." "Look at the little things – ramp upgrades, add truck only ramps." "Build a parallel corridor to the west of I-5." "Dust off idea of a third bridge." "Cap I-5 at Rose Quarter." "Build all planned improvements right now." "Shift through freight traffic to east

– e.g. make US 97 into Interstate 97." "Remove some closely spaced on and off ramps within the congested area." "Extend SR 500 from Vancouver Lake on up to I-5 and to the south to Portland. For port activity only."

Bike and Pedestrian:
"Improve bike access though Hayden Island." "Improve bicycle path/lanes across Interstate Bridge." "Enhance safety and convenience of alternative modes on the bridge crossing."

Navigational Changes:
"Port should move forward to deepen the channel so Port activities are not transferred to the highway." "Changes to the navigational channel in the area between the I-5 bridge and the RR bridge so the bridge doesn't have to be raised so often." "Ferries."

Other frequently mentioned suggestions:

- "Implement tolling or congestion pricing."
- "More jobs in Vancouver."

Other suggestions:

- "Ports coordinate activities."
- "Strategic reduction in capacity."
- "Regional parking management strategy."
- "Coordination of two rail yards."
- "Helicopters? Platoon bridges? Ferries?"
- "More retail options in Clark County."
- "Event scheduling with venues – at non-peak hours."

b. "C-Tran and Tri-Met merge – common transit planning."
c. "Bi-state transferability of public retirement systems."
d. "Don't promote "punitive measures to reduce auto travel. Concentrate on user choices as opposed to societal choices or non-choice."
e. "Correlate insurance rates with actual car use."
f. "Need to let people know how much worse it will get."

## How can they be funded?

Numerous funding ideas were shared. They included:

- Gas tax/increased gas tax.
- Tolls/Electronic tolls.
- User pay.
- Vehicle Miles Traveled tax.
- Gas-guzzler tax.
- Weight mile tax/increased weight mile tax.
- Tax large traffic generators, not just users.

- Private railroad operators.
- Regional bond levy.
- Grant funds.
- Federal funds.
- Tax on consumer goods.
- Local taxes.
- Parking taxes.
- Property tax.
- Impact fees/systems development charges.
- Gas tax used to build alternatives.
- Local Improvement District.
- Vehicle registration fees.
- Sales tax in Oregon.
- Regional transportation tax (attach to utilities?)
- Additional port taxes.
- Congestion pricing.
- Auto excise taxes.
- City business tax like Seattle.
- Tax windfall (?) profits on oil companies.
- Provide incentives to commuter not to use the system: such as pay people who don't use it, tax reduction for living close to where you work.
- Pay for SOV lanes but not for HOV lanes.
- Streamline environmental regulations to reduce costs.
- Dedicate portion of Oregon income tax proceeds from Washington residents who work in Oregon to go toward transportation improvements.

The message of accountability and ensuring that existing transportation funds are used appropriately was also present: "Accountability is important." "Do a through audit of ODOT to make sure our transportation dollars are being spent correctly and not on bureaucracy." "Performance and fiscal audits of Departments of Transportation, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, Metro."

## Problem Statement Exercise

As part of the small group discussion, the groups were asked to review and comment on a draft problem statement. The problem statement that was presented the groups is shown below as the "Original Problem Statement."

### Original Problem Statement:

Interstate 5 is the primary economic lifeline on the West Coast. The most economically significant segment of I-5 in the Portland/Vancouver region is in north Portland and Vancouver, where the freeway intersects with the Columbia

River. Here, the interstate provides access to deep-water shipping, up-river barging, and two water level, transcontinental rail lines.

Interstate 5 is currently the most congested segment of the regional freeway system in the Portland/Vancouver area. Without attention, future congestion in this important transportation corridor threatens the livability and economic promise of the Portland/Vancouver region.

The following is an edited version of the problem statement that takes the comments from 15 groups and combines them into an "Edited Problem Statement." The suggested edits will be used by the Task Force to re-draft the problem statement. Suggested new text is [**Bracketed and in Bold]**. Suggested deletions are in ~~strikeout.~~

## Edited Problem Statement

**[Interstate 5 is a primary integral component of infrastructure supporting community values: economic viability, quality of life, and protection of the environment.]**

**[The]** Interstate 5 **[corridor]** is currently the most congested segment of the regional ~~freeway~~ **[transportation]** system in the Portland/Vancouver area **[particularly during peak commuter hours]**. Without **[immediate, comprehensive] [proper] [significant financed (but no higher taxes)]** attention **[***or* **resources] [to solutions that include traffic dispersion beyond the I-5 corridor system]**, future congestion in this important transportation corridor ~~threatens~~ **[will cripple] [will decrease] [reduce]** the **[accessibility, livability and]** ~~livability and~~ economic promise of the **[entire]** Portland/Vancouver ~~region~~ **[metropolitan area] [and demands attention now]. [The cost of addressing the problem is astronomical and involvement of all stakeholders, gaining community consensus on appropriate solutions, is overwhelming.]**

**[This corridor's transportation needs have not been adequately addressed for the past 20 years. Use, growth and need of the corridor have outpaced its current system.]**

Interstate 5 is ~~the~~ **[part of the corridor and a]** primary ~~economic~~ **[transportation]** ~~lifeline~~ **[element]** on the West Coast **[and in particular for Portland]**. The most economically significant segment of ~~I-5~~ **[the corridor]** in the Portland/Vancouver region is [**the 14-mile stretch from I-84 to I-205]** in

north Portland and Vancouver, ~~where the freeway intersects with the Columbia River~~ **[***or* **where the freeway provides connectivity with the area] [***or* **where the freeway intersects with the approaches to the Columbia River]** [**(inclusive of the corridors that feed the bridge)]**. Here **[***or* **via the trucking industry]**, the ~~interstate~~ **[corridor]** provides access to deep-water shipping **[ports]**, up-river barging, **[the international airport], [freight], [jobs], [east-west connections, SR 14, 1-84, north-south rail, air cargo]** and two water level, transcontinental rail lines **[and is the arterial for the delivery of goods and services within the region]**. **[This area is also an important neighborhood and environmentally sensitive area.**

**Additional Comments on Problem Statement:**

- Three lanes into two is not good.
- Chance to talk about corridor. Replace interstate with corridor.
- Add rail, arterials.
- Add air transportation/cargo.
- Solution could be off I-5 itself.
- Should be thoughtful, discrete – not wholesale road expansion.
- Why is "water level" important?
- The corridor also provides access for commuting and shopping.
- Rail congestion.
- Need more precise examples.
- Statement is missing a sense of urgency.
- There is no single solution—not a quick fix.
- Statement currently doesn't reflect potential neighborhood impacts.
- Nothing relates to how much this will actually cost – add a sentence to paragraph 2 that the cost of fixing this problem is astronomical.
- The term "threatens" is not good. It is actually occurring now, and we need to point that out. It "will," not "may."
- Paragraph 2: "without immediate attention" this is something we need to do "NOW". As written, it allows some degree of flexibility or implies that we have time to give attention.
- Gaining community consensus is part of the Problem.
- I-5 divides residential neighborhoods. This constrains our options. We need to make our neighborhoods better.
- Commuters are big part of the problem, not too many trucks. We need to address this.
- Dedicated transportation funding that can't be diverted is required.

- Not just a commuter problem – larger economic consequences, and environmental issues.
- We have responsibility to consider our impacts to rest of OR and WA (we are an economic engine).
- We need to think of transportation infrastructure as an opportunity to allow people to move around (humanize the concept)
- Original statement was good too.
- Need to capture impacts of trucks on neighborhoods (livability, cut through traffic)
- We need trucks to deliver our goods though.
- Need to clarify freight trucks from delivery trucks.
- We're seeing a higher percent of trucks now. We're going to need more trucks/trade to serve our growing pop. We'll need even more if we can't expand rail, deepen channel.
- The statement is too focused on the facility.
- Sounds like the focus is too much on through traffic.
- Recognize that the problem is more than just the I-5 hwy.
- Also the impacts of the rail situation.
- Commuter needs to be clearer in the statement.
- Switch and have the second statement be first. Then expand the first paragraph, now the second to be a broader statement about accessibility I-5 impact on the whole area.
- Lack of updating the I-5 in the whole corridor.
- In the last sentence in the first paragraph – it completely leaves out truck traffic or vehicle traffic. It implies that this is a problem of water and rail – it eliminates travel.
- Add "access to thousands of jobs"
- Can we change the last paragraph to be positive instead of negative. "With attention, something good will happen…"
- Do we want to throw that out and make our new statement?
- We should change to positive b/c we don't think it's a huge problem yet.
- But if we change it to positive, it may be perceived as less of a problem.
- We should keep it a problem statement, and not add what we might do to fix the problem.
- Problem is congestion and if we do nothing we're going to be in a world of hurt.
- Change "freeway system" to "transportation" system.
- "of the region" instead of "of the "Portland/Vancouver region."

- Why is there so much importance placed on the connection with the river? Is it so important that we focus on this?
- "the Interstate provides regional connectivity and access…"
- "intersects with the Columbia River system. Here…"
- The I-5 Corridor is larger than just the immediate I-5 "ribbon". It encapsulates the nearby neighborhoods, rail lines, environmental areas, recreational resources, etc. The definition of the Corridor should be considered in much the same manner as a "watershed" area is defined in water resource design. The livability of the area should include all areas of the Corridor.
- There is a need to address the interrelated issues of:
  - Transportation/Alternative modes of transportation
  - Livability affecting neighborhoods & residents
  - Economics
  - Environmental sensitivity
  - Tourism
- Fundamentally long-term solutions (not short-term solutions), balancing the impacts on the neighborhoods, regions.
- Too limiting by just looking at I-5 corridor? Recognition of regional system.
- Statement focuses heavily economics. And too little on regional quality of life environment, community values, desired infrastructure.
- Impact area is much bigger than immediate I-5 Corridor.
- Airport access needs to be mentioned
- Is it true that "without attention … congestion threatens economic promise" (Seattle continues to prosper)?

## Vision and Values Statement Exercise

As part of the small group discussion, the groups were asked to review and comment on a draft Values and Vision Statement. The Values and Vision Statement that was presented to the groups is shown below as the "Original Values and Vision Statement."

**Original Vision and Values Statement**

The goal of the I-5 Partnership is to create a broadly accepted Strategic Plan for the I-5 Corridor between I-84 in Oregon and I-205 in Washington. The plan must balance the goals of maintaining and improving:

- mobility for commuters and freight within and through the Corridor,
- livability for neighborhoods and communities adjacent to the Corridor,

- access to and from industrial properties and Corridor ports, and
- our ability to meet regional growth management goals in Washington and Oregon.

Our common vision is for a plan that equitably balances livability, mobility, environmental stewardship, economic viability and social justice, now and in the future.

The following is an edited version of the vision and values statement that takes the comments from 15 groups and combines them into an "Edited Vision and Values Statement." The suggested edits will be used by the Task Force to re-draft the problem statement. Suggested new text is [**Bracketed and in Bold]**. Suggested deletions are in ~~strikeout.~~

## Edited Vision and Values Statement

**[Interstate 5 is a primary integral component of infrastructure supporting community values: economic viability, quality of life and protection of the environment.]**

~~The goal of the I-5 Partnership is to create a broadly accepted Strategic Plan for the I-5 Corridor between I-84 in Oregon and I-205 in Washington. The plan must balance the goals of maintaining and improving:~~

*or*

The goal of the I-5 Partnership is to create a ~~broadly accepted~~ Strategic Plan for the I-5 Corridor **[(I-5, rail, arterials, etc.)]** between I-84 in Oregon and I-205 in Washington. The plan must [**be regionally coordinated and]** balance [**mobility, environmental stewardship, economic vitality and social justice, now and in the future. This strategic plan must address the following goals:]** ~~the goals of maintaining and improving:~~

*or*

**[Our "Vision" is that we solve the problem; that means we: improve quality of life, enhance the economic promise of the community, and improve livability in the corridor in a way that is affordable by completing a plan that ensures:]**

- mobility **[for people] [and safety for all users of]** ~~for commuters and freight within and through~~ **[for commuters, through travelers, and freight within]** the Corridor,
- **[access to vital services served by the corridor]**
- ~~livability~~ **[quality of life] [health, economic impact, pedestrian impact] [and vitality of]** ~~for~~ neighborhoods and communities adjacent to **[and/or affected by]** the Corridor **[and throughout the region]**,
- **[travel time with the corridor]**
- **[regional quality of life]**
- **[the economic vitality of the region]**
- access to and from industrial properties **[, economic centers,]** and ~~Corridor~~ ports **[in the corridor] [including airports]**, and
- **[use growth management as a tool to affect transportation demand]**
- **[While meeting] our ability to meet [unified] regional growth management [and environmental] goals [and aligning with community and neighborhood plans] in Washington and Oregon.**

Our common vision is for a **[cost effective]** plan that equitably balances ~~livability~~ **[quality of life]**, mobility, environmental stewardship, economic viability and social justice, now and in the future **[through a balanced approach of personal and business action, incentives, transportation modes and capital improvements]**.

*or*

~~Our common vision is for a plan that equitably balances livability, mobility, environmental stewardship, economic viability and social justice, now and in the future.~~

**Additional Vision and Values Statement Comments:**

- Concern about noise impacts
- Don't tear up existing neighborhoods to improve commuting for new neighborhoods.
- Energy efficiency
- Should define the east and western corridor boundaries (of the project) to address Willamette River industries and shipping points, study area should address Rivergate terminals and US 30.
- The last paragraph is unnecessary, given the bullet statements.
- It doesn't read like a vision. Does not tie back to problem statement. Our vision is that we solve the problems. Not just articulate separate items.

- Open the vision that rewrites the problem statement in the positive. "we are not congested" we are not …….
- Vision is that we solve the problem and do that in a way that balances the competing objectives.
- "Our vision is that we solve the problem and in doing so we:"
- reduce congestion
- Enhance quality of life
- Do it in a way that is affordable and the financial costs are borne in an equitable manner
- Enhance economic promise of the region
- Remove first sentence of the written vision.
- The vision will be achieved by completing a plan which ensures: mobility, livability, access, our ability…
- The vision should come before the bullets. Your vision should be first, before our values.
- Last paragraph edits:
  - "Our common vision is for a <u>regional</u> plan"
  - equitably balances is redundant – get rid of "equitably"
  - livability has become a meaningless piece of jargon – quality of live does the same thing
  - get rid of the word livability, because if the other factors are balanced then you do have a high quality of life/livability

- "Our common vision <u>for the I-5 partnership, is to create a plan that</u> balances…"
- "The plan must balance the <u>values of:"</u>
- Within the context of the entire region including the east-west transportation corridor
- Consider solutions outside the region
- The group noted that they waffled on whether "Cost Effectiveness" should be added to the Vision Statement.
- Additional Comments on the Vision and Values Statement: Quality of life is more meaningful to people than "livability"

# Meeting Evaluation:

***Number of Evaluations returned: 52***

| Category | # Excellent | # Very Good | # Good | # Fair | # Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall | 15 | 32 | 6 | 0 | |
| Presentations | 13 | 29 | 12 | 1 | |
| Small Group Work | 24 | 26 | 4 | 0 | |
| Small Group Facilitators | 27 | 23 | 2 | 1 | |
| Materials | 16 | 18 | 9 | 0 | |
| Location | 14 | 24 | 14 | 2 | |
| Facilities | 6 | 23 | 16 | 5 | |
| Food | 1 | 11 | 34 | 9 | |

**Was your participation encouraged and your input listened to?**

- Yes (41 people).
- Part of why it was so enjoyable and valuable. I was able to put out many ideas which I've thought about for some time, so it was rewarding.
- Very much so – Kevia was excellent.
- Participation was very encouraged.
- Absolutely (3 people).
- It appeared so.
- No question of it.
- I felt these goals were well met.
- Your eagerness to listen is very appreciated.
- Nurtured and encouraged

**What was the most useful part of the day?**

- Small group discussions/brainstorming (20 people).
- Learned a lot from other participants.
- Watching the I-5 bridge run past fine!
- Lots of thoughtful input from lots of sources.
- Rewrite of values statement excellent exercise.
- Concise statements from consultants regarding Leadership Committee findings.
- Jay the engineer's comments about the Port's role in the region (made slightly after 10 a.m.).
- Education about I-5.
- All the slides were informative.
- The beginning of the meeting.
- Goal statements.
- Input from others.

- Exchange of ideas from persons interested and impacted groups.
- The presentations with the slides.
- Presentations with handouts of presentations – all helpful!
- I felt like the informational presentations were very valuable.
- What "Have We Learned So Far" presentation.
- Questions and answers.
- Receiving the information.
- It was balanced and useful.
- Information shared about how the information reported and what information was presented.
- Sharing with very knowledgeable people.
- Being able to share ideas.
- Sharing with others – meeting others.
- Exchange of ideas among diverse group with different vista points.
- Very cool to get the small group words up on the screen via computer.

**What was the least useful part of the day?**

- Lunch.
- "Travel" exercise (4 people).
- The "Project Overview" and "What Have We Learned" seemed pretty similar.
- Re-hashing the presentations we already had on hard copy.
- A few too many jokes.
- Too much printed material.

**Any other comments, suggestions or questions that you would like to share?**

- Cold (9 people).
- Have enough coffee at the start of the day (2 people).
- Good beginning
- This setup was a good way to integrate Task Force and Community Forum members
- Great program.
- Need opportunity to critique the Leadership Committee plan
- More data for scoping problems/solutions needed
- Check records for spelling of names, etc.
- Alternative modes of transportation such as bicycling and walking were conspicuous by their absence.
- Well done – obviously planning was done. Facilitator was excellent, so were facilitators (small group). Good to have Brian Baird stop by…his comments were well thought out.
- Please do not use box lunches in the future – it seemed like a lot of waste.
- Subsequent information from this meeting should be posted on I-5 Partnership web site. The site was mentioned but not its future use.

- These things are mostly an exercise in civic (oh, never mind), but this was among the most useful ones I've attended. I will be happy to continue participating. I do want to emphasize that I think that any solution to the problems in the I-5 corridor must be part of a more general regional solution.
- Very nicely done – start to finish.
- Well done.
- Show more films and slides about all forms of transportation.
- Good meeting. Funny facilitation. Open and generous tone. Didn't understand what the person at the table was who had a laptop and what was taking notes. Otherwise, very professional.
- Do future events on a weekday.
- More time should be used to discuss ideas to the forum on "open" microphone. More discussion as a large group!
- Having the laptops at the table was very ingenious!
- Would like (presentation materials) before (the meeting) so can study.
- Next time mix up the groups so that we can meet more people. Don't put the same people in the same groups as this time, but don't mix up the group during the sessions.
- The organizer is to be highly complimented on process and substance. Continuation of this process is key to collective positive outcome.
- Much better than expected.
- Reduce, Reuse, Recycle. I suggest next time the hotel serve the lunches on two or three serving tables with trays of sandwiches where people can walk by and pick the items they want. This will eliminate a lot of solid waste. Also, the hotel needs to provide bins for recyclable items.
- A logistical point… A presentation expert I heard said it is best if the speaker is placed to the left of the screen. Since people read left to right they can see the speaker and keep scanning to the right. The expert demonstrated this by switching sides of the screen and it was true.
- Well organized.
- Very good session.
- Good.
- Thought the entire process was well done and organized.
- Good job.