Columbia River Gorge Commission
Meeting Minutes
August 12, 2003

Location: Columbia Gorge Discovery Center
Time: Meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Anne Squier, Chair
Judy Davis
Joe Palena
Joyce Reinig (until 12:40 p.m.)

Kenn Adcock
Jane Jacobsen
Wayne Wooster
Kim Titus for Daniel Harkenrider

Doug Crow
Walt Loehrke
Katharine Sheehan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Michael Farrow (excused)
Dave Robertson (excused)

STAFF PRESENT

Martha Bennett, Executive Director
Brian Litt, Senior Planner
Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch, Administrative Assistant

AUDIENCE PRESENT

Steven Anderson, Cascade Planning
Bob Bachman, USFS
Chris Bernhardt, City of The Dalles
Clifford Casseseoka, Yakama Nation
June Carlson ODOT
David Collier, Oregon DEQ
Todd Cornett, Wasco County
Lee Curtis, MCEDD
Bob Elliott SWCAA
Dan Erickson, Wasco County
Mark Fisher
Ted Haigh
Patrick Johnson, Skamania County
Diana Karabut
Tiffany Kenslow, Friends of the Columbia Gorge
Jeanette Kloos, ODOT
Richard Krikava, Office of Senator Smith
Michael Lang, Friends of the Columbia Gorge
Report on New Columbia River Bridge (Hood River to White Salmon/Bingen) Michael Ray of the Oregon Department of Transportation gave a presentation on the status of the SR-35 Columbia River crossing project. The project is an on-going multi-agency effort involving possible construction of a new Columbia River bridge between Hood River and White Salmon/Bingen urban areas (See attachment I-1).

Martha Bennett prefaced the discussion by stating that commissioners should consider what scenic standards should be in place for this project (see attachment I-2).

Michael Ray presented information about the purpose of the project, the need for the study, existing bridge and some history of the bridge, some problems with existing structure, public and agency involvement. He also discussed the three options currently under consideration and the next steps for the project.

Commissioner Adcock asked if ODOT or WSDOT has any elevation concepts. Ray said they have some basic line drawings, but no engineering drawings yet.

Commissioner Crow asked what will happen to the old bridge. Ray said the old bridge will probably be removed. Commissioner Palena asked about a tunnel. Ray said a tunnel was considered, but it is very expensive due to the length that would have to be tunneled to get under the river.

Commissioner Wooster asked about the timing for a new bridge. Ray said the current bridge has 20-30 years useful life span but it is not seismically stable.

Chair Squier asked if there is any sentiment to mimic the existing bridge. Ray said no, the public wanted something more graceful, but simple.

Commissioner Davis asked when the commission needs to make decisions. Bennett said the staff recommends resolving issues about the scenic standard before the FEIS starts in January 2004. This would be a policy-level decision, not a Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Wooster noted that it was interesting to see that various groups at the public workshop in 2001 seemed to agree on a unique but simple design.

Squier expressed the difficulty of articulating a policy if we don’t have a framework in which to judge. Is the new bridge an enhancement? How does it fit into the Scenic Act? Kim Titus urged the Commission to use landscape architects expertise to assist in any design standards.

Squier summarized in response to the questions to be considered: #1 the bridge is not exempt from review. #2 we must have standards to apply
#3 we need to do something within the ODOT's time frame to be useful.
#4 we must provide enough guidance to not undermine the Scenic Act.
#5 we must draw on whatever expertise is available.

Planning/Finance Committee Report on 03-05 budget & Oregon Emergency Work plan (see attachment J) Bennett provided a review of these items to be considered and requested that commission give direction as to how to proceed with the (1) Long term plan review list, (2) Oregon budget note work plan, and (3) Commission work items.

She noted that the funding level is 15% lower than previous biennium, approximately $645,000 for Washington and $610,000 for Oregon, with $50,000 held back pending a work plan of the 6 items identified by Oregon. The Oregon and Washington budgets must match, so our effective funding level is $610,000 x 2 for the biennium.

Bennett reported that the Planning/Finance Committee had discussed a staff recommendation about what to do with the work items on the "long-term" list for Plan Review. She noted that with the exception of resolving regulatory conflicts related to fuel breaks in the GMA forest zone and to mining in Washington, the Committee recommends that the Commission not take up any of the other items on the long-term list. She added that this is a difficult recommendation because all of the items on the list are important. She added that the Commission could schedule this for another day if they want more time to consider. Bennett added that she would be bringing a work plan for Plan Adoption which would include a recommendation on how to handle Plan Amendments to the October meeting.

Squier asked if everyone concurs with this idea and Bennett asked for a motion since the Commission had adopted previous work plan lists.

Commissioner Jacobsen moved to approve the Planning/Finance recommendation to resolve the two issues, suspend action on the other items, and move to Plan Adoption. Commissioner Sheehan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chair Squier apologized that she had not called upon Mr. Leipper for public comments. Mr. Leipper confirmed that he did not wish to comment on this particular aspect of discussion.

Discussion of Oregon Budget Note Work Plan- Bennett noted that Oregon directs that the Commission request the first $20,000 of the $50,000 hold back at the first Emergency Board in FY 2004. Then, the Commission will request the remaining $30,000 in FY 2005 after progress on the work plan. Bennett summarized that on the six budget items, there is $35,000 worth of work that the Commission already was scheduled to complete. There is $94,000 in new costs, and $43,000 can be absorbed within existing budget. There is a gap of $51,000
Columbia River Gorge
Commission Presentation

Presented by ODOT in cooperation with WSDOT and RTC

August 12, 2003

Purpose

• The purpose of the project is to improve multi-modal transportation of people and goods across the Columbia River between the Bingen/White Salmon, Washington and Hood River, Oregon Communities.

Need

• The overall need for the State Route 35 Columbia River Crossing project is to rectify current and future transportation inadequacies and deficiencies associated with the existing Hood River Bridge.
Hood River Bridge
Background

- Built in 1924 (2nd oldest)
- Lift Span added in 1938
- 4,418 feet long, 19 feet wide
- Open-grid steel decking
- Currently weight restricted
- Navigation channel span 246'
- No bike/pedestrian facility

Objectives/Criteria

- Improve cross-river transportation
- Meet river navigation standards
- Minimize impacts to the environment, fish and wildlife, recreation
- Financially acceptable/economic dev.
- Minimize cultural/historic impacts
- Interstate highway integrity

Public and Agency Involvement

- Committee Meetings: LAC/SC/RRC
- Open Houses/Stakeholder Interviews
- Telephone and Intercept Surveys
- Design Workshop
- Newsletters
- Media Releases and News Articles
- Speaking Engagements
- Bi-State Environmental Review Process
Project Planning Phase

- Community Driven Study
- Study Process (Three Tiers)
- Study Area/Corridors
- Public Meeting
  - Major Concerns Identified
  - Support for Study

Tier I Corridor Evaluation

SR-35 Crossing Study
Potential Corridors

Tier II: Elements

- Cost Estimates
- Financial Feasibility
- Environmental Review
- Transportation Forecast
- Alternative Screening
  - Two screenings
- Short/Mid-Term Improvements
Tier II Alternatives Screening

SR-35 Columbia River Crossing Study

Alternatives

Tier II: Short-Term Improvements

- Roundabout or Traffic Signal at I-84 Eastbound Ramps
- Convert Toll Booth to One-Way Tolls Southbound
- Begin Bridge Replacement Fund

Tier II: Mid-Term Improvements

- Signalize I-84 Westbound Ramps
- Roundabout at Four-Way Stop
- Restrict Private Driveway
- Automated Toll Collection
- Signalize SR-14 Intersection
Tier III: Elements

- Preliminary Engineering
- Technical Reports
- Preliminary Preferred Alternative
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Tier III: Preliminary Preferred Alternative

![Columbia River Crossing Study Alternatives Map]

Upcoming Activities

- October 2003 Circulate DEIS
- December 2003 Public Hearing
- Summarize DEIS Comments and prepare scope of work for the FEIS
Next Steps

- Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)

Gorge Issues

- With both bridge landings in urban areas, should a replacement bridge be exempt from Management Plan review?
- If subject to review, what Scenic resource policies apply?
- Visually subordinate?
- Should the Management Plan be amended?
MEMORANDUM

TO: Columbia River Gorge Commission

FROM: Martha Bennett, Executive Director
Brian Litt, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Questions for Consideration Regarding New Columbia River Bridge; August 12, 2003 Commission Meeting Presentation

DATE: July 31, 2003

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff requests that the Columbia River Gorge Commission discuss issues related to replacement of the bridge between Hood River and White Salmon/Bingen and provide direction to staff on timing to address Management Plan issues related to the project.

BACKGROUND

At the August 12, 2003 Commission meeting, a representative from the Oregon Department of Transportation will give a presentation on the status of the ongoing study regarding construction of a new Columbia River Bridge between Hood River and White Salmon/Bingen. These efforts will be continuing through at least the next year. The project is now in the environmental review phase with a draft EIS planned for release later this year.

Routing alternatives under consideration for the new bridge are limited to corridors with landings within the Hood River and White Salmon/Bingen urban areas. The span itself would cross over the Columbia River within the General Management Area. The project raises two important questions. First, are “new” bridges allowed in the Columbia River zone? Second, what standards, especially scenic resource standards, apply?

Uses in the Columbia River Zone

With a few exceptions (such as docks), the Management Plan does not expressly address new uses in the Columbia River. The plan does not include a list of allowed uses for the Columbia River. This issue may not be a problem for the Hood River/White Salmon/Bingen bridge if it replaces the existing bridge. Then, the guidelines addressing replacement of existing structures may arguably allow a new bridge replacing an existing bridge.
Resource Protection Standards
The Management Plan’s resource protection guidelines were designed to address land-based development. Many of them are not workable for a new Columbia River bridge. In particular, GMA scenic resource guidelines require new development to be visually subordinate from key viewing areas. Due to its magnitude and the open expanse of river (a KVA) it must traverse, a new Columbia River bridge cannot be made visually subordinate from all key viewing areas. Additionally, the Gorge Commission has never discussed whether a bridge should be “visually subordinate.” In other words, is this the appropriate standard or should there be another policy objective for a bridge between two urban areas?

QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Some changes to the Management Plan are needed to accommodate a new Columbia River bridge. The presentation on August 12 will include future time lines and key milestones for the bridge project. Such information will help the Commission as it considers how and when to provide input into the process and possibly initiate changes to the Management Plan. Staff recommends the Commission discuss the following questions.

1. If both bridge landings are in urban areas, should a replacement bridge be exempt from review under the Management Plan, assuming that natural resource and cultural resource protection issues will be addressed in NEPA work required for federal funding of the bridge?

2. If subject to Management Plan review, what scenic resource policy should apply regarding the design and appearance of this future Columbia River bridge?
   a. Should a new bridge utilize a “low-profile” design that minimizes its visibility from surrounding vantage points and attempts to blend it with its surroundings?
   b. Should a new bridge make an “architectural statement” and not attempt to blend into the surroundings?
   c. Should a new bridge emulate the look and features of the original bridge?

3. Should the Commission consider adding a new review use category for new bridges (that are not replacements of existing bridges?) Alternatively, should we address only this bridge, assuming that the likelihood of new bridges is unlikely, at least before the next Plan Review?

4. When should the Commission seek to amend the plan? Before completion of the DEIS (now)? Before completion of the FEIS? Before permitting?
Columbia River Gorge Commission
Meeting Minutes
January 13, 2004
A complete record of this meeting is available on audio tape

Location: Bonneville Hot Springs Resort, North Bonneville WA
Time: 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT
Kenn Adcock
Doug Crow
Judy Davis
Dan Harkenrider (9:05 a.m.)
Jane Jacobsen
Walt Loehrke
Joe Palena
Joyce Reinig (9:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m.)
Kathy Sheehan
Anne Squier
Wayne Wooster (9:00 a.m.-1:15 p.m.)

MEMBERS ABSENT
Michael Farrow (excused)
Dave Robertson (excused)

STAFF PRESENT
Martha Bennett, Executive Director
Brian Litt, Senior Planner
Jeffrey Litwak, Counsel
Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch, Administrative Assistant

AUDIENCE PRESENT
Anderson, Steven. Cascade Planning Associates
Borland, Stacey. Skamania County Planning Department
Carlson, June. Oregon Department of Transportation
Euler, Gordy. Clark County Planning Department
Garrett, Matthew. Oregon Department of Transportation
Hall, Priscilla. Multnomah County resident
Karabut, Diana. Multnomah County resident.
Lang, Michael. Friends of the Columbia Gorge
Quinn, Bud. Skamania County Commission
Robins, Dale. Regional Transportation Committee
Sauter, Dave. Klickitat County
Thiemann, Phyllis. Columbia River Gorge Visitors Association
Tokos, Derrick. Multnomah County Planning Department
amendment packages be reviewed for consistency with the Management Plan. He explained that the Clark County Ordinance 2003-11-01 reorganizes Clark County’s Scenic Area Ordinance into a chapter of the new comprehensive development code for the county. Clark County Ordinance 2003-12-15 authorizes the county to apply natural resource buffer zones, as provided for in countywide riparian and wetlands ordinances, which are wider than those mandated in the Clark County Scenic Area Ordinance. Litt noted that Gordy Euler, Clark County planner was also present to answer any questions.

Chair Squier asked whether the Clark County Ordinance 2003-12-15 change only pertains to allow wider buffer zones. Litt indicated that this was the only substantive change in either ordinance. Chair Squier asked for public comment on this item.

Michael Lang, Friends of the Columbia Gorge provided testimony (see attachment H). He stated that after a preliminary review, these amendments seem to be consistent with the Scenic Area Act and that the wider buffer provided better resource protection.

Commissioner Sheehan moved to adopt the staff recommendation finding that the GMA portions of the ordinance are consistent with the Management Plan and making a preliminary finding that the SMA portions of the ordinance are consistent with the Management Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Adcock.

A roll call vote was taken and passed unanimously. Chair Squier noted that there were 3 members from each state present for the vote.

Kenn Adcock   aye
Doug Crow     aye
Judy Davis    aye
Jane Jacobsen aye
Walt Loehrke  aye
Joe Palena    aye
Kathy Sheehan aye
Anne Squier   aye

Report on work plan and implementation options for design policies for Hood River-White Salmon/Bingen Bridge
Martha Bennett presented the work plan for implementing the Commission’s direction to develop guidelines for replacement of the Hood River-White Salmon Bridge prior to the transition to the Final Environmental Impact Statement. She noted that scenic standards and policies must be developed for this project to move forward, because the Management Plan is silent on bridges across the Columbia River.
Bennett said a workshop is scheduled for March 2nd to discuss this issue and asked Commissioners to think about scenic values and standards. She stated that there are different options as to how to implement any policies developed, and staff needs direction as to how to proceed. The options are as follows; (1) include this work as a part of the Management Plan review & adoption, (2) provide policy guidance now, initiate a plan amendment 2005 or (3) provide policy guidance now, review implementation options later (closer to bridge construction).

The Commissioners deliberated on the issue and discussed the pros and cons of the options outlined. Dale Robbins of the Regional Transportation Committee reviewed the schedule for the project.

Commissioner Crow indicated that with limited staff resources, the Commission should limit the involvement to include developing guidelines meeting the Commission's statutory responsibility and incorporate with the current Management Plan review for efficiency.

Chair Squier noted that this item was different than other items not included in the Management Plan review as it would hold up a major transportation project with a significant impact on the area.

Commissioner Sheehan made a motion to incorporate developing bridge guidelines with the Management Plan review/adoption as proposed by staff. Commissioner Palena seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Bennett further described the parameters of the guidelines that would need to be developed, noting that the Commission will not be involved in the actual bridge design.

Other Business

Chair Squier asked whether there was any additional business and requested that the Committee meetings missed due to weather be rescheduled as soon as possible. There was no other business.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting is Tuesday, February 10, 2004 at the Columbia River Gorge Commission office, White Salmon WA.

Meeting notes taken by Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch
Minutes approved on 2-10-04
Columbia River Gorge Commission
Meeting Minutes
March 9, 2004

A complete record is available on audiotape

Location: Hood River Inn, 1108 East Marina Way, Hood River, Oregon
Time: 9:07 a.m.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
Kenn Adcock
Doug Crow
Judy Davis
Michael Farrow (9:15 a.m.)
Virginia Kelly for Dan Harkenrider
Jane Jacobsen (2:10 p.m.)
Walt Loehrke (9:10 a.m.)
Joyce Reinig (1:30 p.m. to 4:00 pm.)
Dave Robertson (9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.)
Kathy Sheehan
Anne Squier (9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.)
Wayne Wooster

MEMBERS ABSENT
Joe Palena

STAFF PRESENT
Martha Bennett, Executive Director
Brian Litt, Senior Planner
Jeffery Litwak, Counsel
Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch, Administrative Assistant

AUDIENCE PRESENT
Andersen, Steven. Cascade Planning Associates
Bryan, Peggy. Skamania County Economic Development Council
Cornelisen, Peter. Hood River County resident
Karabut, Diana. Multnomah County resident
Kloos, Jeanette. Oregon Department of Transportation
Leipper Bob. Multnomah County resident
Thiemann, Phyllis. Columbia River Gorge Visitors Association

Chair Squier called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. and roll was called.

Approval of Minutes for February 10, 2004
Commissioner Adcock requested that paragraph 3 on page 3 be changed to more accurately reflect his statement. He requested that staff check the tape and change this statement to reflect that he was a former member of Rotary and if the Rotary's 4-way test was applied, there would never have been a Scenic Area. Commissioner Sheehan
Squier's admonition was appropriate. Chair Squier indicated she did not direct her comments at any individual and regretted it if her comments offended anyone.

Commissioner Loehrke introduced the topic of natural internment. He stated that this practice was being allowed in certain areas of South Carolina, where a scenic easement was granted. Scenic property with limited uses may be allowed for use as a natural internment facility. He said that his son was researching this issue and he would provide more information.

There being no further business, Chair Squier adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m. and noted that there would be a Workshop on Scenic Standards for Hood River/White Salmon Bridge in the afternoon.

**Workshop to Discuss Scenic Standards for Hood River/White Salmon Bridge**

The Commission held a public workshop to discuss alternatives for Scenic policies and guidelines that would govern replacement of the bridge across the Columbia River between Hood River and White Salmon/Bingen. The public was invited to participate. The Management Plan does not currently contain a policy standard or implementation guidelines that would permit a bridge. The Commission will fold the results of this workshop into the Management Plan revisions currently being considered.

Next meeting is scheduled for 3/23/04 at the Hood River County Administration Building, 601 State Street, Hood River, Oregon

Minutes taken by Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch

Minutes approved on April 13, 2004
Columbia River Gorge Commission
Meeting Minutes
April 13, 2004
A complete record of this meeting is available on audiotape

Location: Rock Creek Recreation Center
710 SW Rock Creek Drive, Stevenson WA
Time: 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
Kenn Adcock
Doug Crow
Judy Davis
Dan Harkenrider
Walt Loehrke
Joe Palena
Joyce Reinig
Dave Robertson
Kathy Sheehan
Anne Squier
Wayne Wooster

MEMBERS ABSENT
Jane Jacobsen (excused)
Michael Farrow (excused)

STAFF PRESENT
Martha Bennett, Executive Director
Brian Litt, Senior Planner
Jeff Litwak, Counsel
Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch, Administrative Assistant

AUDIENCE PRESENT
Andersen, Steven. Cascade Planning and Associates
Cornelson, Peter. Friends of the Columbia Gorge (FOCG)
Curtis, Lee. Oregon Investment Board (OIB)
Kloos, Jeanette. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Lang, Michael. FOCG
Lalor, Peggy. Limitless Events and Marketing
Leipper, Bob. Troutdale, Oregon
Liggett, Keith. Gorge Games
Johnson, Patrick. Skamania County Planning Department
Robbins, Dale. Regional Transportation Agency (RTA)
Ruhssenberger, Chuck. Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Sauter, Dave. Klickitat County
Thiemann, Phyllis. Columbia River Gorge Visitors Association
Peggy Lalor, owner of Limitless Events and Marketing, requested a $10,000 National Scenic Area economic development grant to partially fund marketing activities for the 2004 Gorge Games. The grant will be used to create a website which will be a core communications tool for the Games. She also requested a $10,000 National Scenic Area economic development grant to fund a study of the economic viability of a hotel/indoor water park and outdoor water park/theme park in the City of The Dalles. She said that the feasibility study would determine if The Dalles could support a hotel, conference center, retail complex, and indoor/outdoor water park. She said she expected it to be a regional draw that wouldn't rely solely on local business.

Peter Cornelison of FO CG expressed support of Peggy Lalor’s request for $10,000 for the Gorge Games website, however he said there was no comment on the second request, without more details of what is being proposed.

Commissioner Palena asked whether it would be a compatible with the recently proposed SDS project in Washington. Lalor explained that the market would be different, so it wouldn’t detract from that market. He asked how the project would address the unique nature of the Gorge. Commissioner Crow commented the fact that The Dalles is a hot dry place only 90 minutes from a major metropolitan area and passing through the lush western Gorge was a unique feature.

Commissioner Adcock made a motion to approve the certifications H04-0106 and H04-107 with a correction on the last page of the Director's Report to indicate the City of The Dalles not Hood River County. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Loehrke. A voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Commissioner Robertson asked whether these projects will be funded soon. Curtis responded that the OIB approval is still pending for the website proposal. The OIB has approved the water park feasibility study. She said as the Commission had expedited their certification process, the OIB process will be revised as well.

Chair Squier explained that public comment on the Plan Review items on the agenda would be taken today and at the next meeting on April 27th.

**Follow-up on Plan Review Issues**

**Hood River/White Salmon & Bingen Replacement Bridge**
The Commission discussed the results of the March 9, 2004 workshop on a scenic resources policy that would govern replacement of the bridge between Hood River and White Salmon & Bingen. Bennett introduced the topic and said there was considerable consensus among the 40 people who participated in the workshop. George Crandall and Don Arambula presented the results of the workshop (see Attachment C-1). Brian Litt explained how the workshop results were drafted into the final revisions of the Management Plan (see Attachment C-2).

Commissioner Crow asked about the handout as there seemed to be some pages missing. Litt provided corrected copies.
Commissioner Sheehan asked for clarification about why only dark green and black were specified as proposed colors, and not other dark colors. Crandall said with a predominately green setting, a dark brown can work but typically dark green is the accepted color.

Commissioner Adcock commented on the tally of the meeting and noted that 37 votes seemed to be a small number for the impact of the decisions being made. Crandall responded not everyone who participated completed a ballot and the tally was an actual count of the ballots received. He said unless you are willing to engage in an in depth public education and outreach effort, it would be difficult to determine any meaningful results as a "comments only" survey is very difficult to make decisions from.

Commissioner Adcock asked him to comment on the cost of a contemporary design versus a historic design. Crandall responded that he could not put a number on either style at this point in time as one is not necessarily more expensive than the other.

Commissioner Wooster asked him to comment on the issues of historic versus contemporary design and the issue of a preferred dark green color. Crandall said dark green was recommended for a steel bridge. Commissioner Wooster asked him to comment on the issue of permanent sidewalks on both sides and whether it meets safety requirements determined by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Crandall said 8 ft. wide is inadequate, especially for a mile long bridge crossing as people will naturally prefer to stay as far from vehicular traffic as possible and ideally it should be at least 14 ft. wide. Commissioner Wooster asked him to comment on the bike lane that could also be used for stalled vehicles and other emergencies as outlined in the transportation agency’s plan. Crandall said there is a safety issue having only 1 pedestrian sidewalk and no designated "bicycle only" lanes.

Commissioner Robertson asked for wording clarification for "light". Crandall said it means light in terms of the look, that is “light and airy.”

Commissioner Robertson said having more than one walkway and designated bicycle lane is important for safety. He asked about the Dalles project in regard to how the public process worked to accommodate the community’s desires and not just meet highway standards. Crandall explained that the first step was education with the design group, a first-hand look at underpasses, and then they developed very prescriptive design guidelines to get to the goal. The funding was approved because the underpass met other needs, such as economic development and was bold and creative. Crandall and Arambula explained how stakeholders were involved in this project.

Commissioner Davis asked about lane widths and how the 8 ft. width is measured, does it include 8 ft. total for bikes and pedestrians or is it 8 ft. for bikes and 8 ft. for pedestrians. Bennett explained that 8 ft. is to be measured as a total for bikes and pedestrians on both sides.
Commissioner Crow asked about why certain bridges were selected as prototypes. Crandall explained the Glenn Jackson bridge was not an appropriate contemporary style for the setting.

Commissioner Harkenrider questioned the need to specify the width of the sidewalks. Bennett said it was important to specify to ensure an appropriate width as a minimum acceptable width is inadequate when put into actual use. Commissioner Harkenrider said when the bridge was actually designed, there would be consideration for multiple uses and he has faith in the process. Commissioner Palena said it might be presumptuous in selecting a width other than what was recommended by experts in the field.

Chair Squier called for a break at 10:55 a.m. and called the meeting back to order at 11:08 a.m.

Chair Squier called for public comment and noted written comment and testimony would continue to be accepted on this issue.

Dale Robbins, RTA, Jeanette Kloos, ODOT and Chuck Ruhsenberger, WSDOT addressed the Commission on the draft bridge design guidelines as prepared by staff based on the workshop results.

Dale Robbins explained they are requesting general policy guidelines and believe some of the draft guidelines are too prescriptive. He said as to the issue of visual quality, item 2a- to choose a concrete bridge with a black or dark green tint, the cost would increase the concrete costs by 15%. The term "transparent structure design" needs to be explained or defined. As to the issue of historic design, item 2b- all three types of bridges recommended by his agency were not considered in these draft guidelines. He said overall the language was too prescriptive, such as "wooden historic benches", noting that wood was often not preferred due to maintenance issues.

He explained the RTA had conducted a number of public meetings and workshops and this information was used in drafting their proposal. As to the issue of two permanent sidewalks and designated bicycle lane, he said that people would certainly prefer a sidewalk on both sides but when looking at the probability of increased costs, people supported a single 15 ft. wide area rather than an 8 ft. wide sidewalk on both sides of the bridge.

As to the issue of creating elevation or other barrier from vehicular traffic, he said the two 10 ft. wide shoulders provided by the highway standards, would be ample for touring bicycles and typically those users won't be on the sidewalks. He said the viewing platform language was too prescriptive.

As to the issue of funding, he said based on input from a variety of people, it was determined that $1.50 per bridge crossing was the maximum amount that people would pay. The bridge toll would finance $50 million. The gap of $150 million would need to
come from agencies and federal government and anything over $200 million would need to be supported by additional local levies.

Robbins asked that these guidelines provide some flexibility for additional public input and provided a revised version of the guidelines (see Attachment D) developed by staff based on Crandall and Arambula’s workshop results. He said we don’t seem to be miles apart for the most part but some of the guidelines seem to be prescriptive.

Jeanette Kloos, ODOT said she supports Robbins comments and emphasized the following points:
- “transparency” needs a definition,
- a concrete bridge does not need to be painted
- do not specify a construction method; for example, poured in place concrete has many drawbacks
- ornamental railings must also meet crash tests and newly designed railings are expensive to have crash tested
- differentiate between different patterns of bicycle use, as some will use the sidewalk and some will use the shoulder
- creating good pedestrian connections to the communities is critical
- need clarification on the issue of signs

Chuck Ruhsenberger said he supports Robbin’s comments and written comments from his agency would be submitted.

Commissioner Robertson asked for clarification of the bike lanes and widths. Robbins explained how the lanes would be used and their widths. Robertson said the midpoint language for a viewing site is too prescriptive and cautioned about using the phrase "visually unobtrusive" as this could create interpretation problems.

Commissioner Palena asked if there was any way to differentiate between local users and visitors. He suggested having reduced fee toll tickets for local users. Commissioner Wooster said there were 200-300 thousand vehicles per month, with 300 thousand being the high use summer months.

Michael Lang, FOCG addressed the procedural issues related to the inclusion of this item in the Plan. Chair Squier explained there was an oversight in not starring this item on today’s agenda for public comment. She said written comments will be accepted in prior to the April 27th meeting and there will be public testimony on the 27th.

He said the Plan provides general guidelines, but it seems that the bridge guideline language is specific. He emphasized the following points:
- “replacement” bridge title—what kind of "replacement" is this? is this removal of the old structure? is this a new bridge or a replacement of the old bridge?
- supports specifying dark colors but want to see language for non reflective as well
- supports siting as close as possible to the current bridge
• supports height similar to the existing bridge
• supports a separate and distinct bike lane that is not an overflow or emergency lane for vehicles

Commissioner Reinig said we should be cautious about any last minute additions, such as the air quality issue. She said stipulating construction methods isn't appropriate as new methods will be developed by the time the bridge is constructed. Chair Squier said that there is a difference between this issue and the air quality issue.

Commissioner Davis said the guidelines as drafted are too specific overall, such as stipulating two pedestrian sidewalks and the width of bicycle lanes.

Chair Squier said it seems that there are some issues to be resolved and that everyone agrees revisions are needed. She said there is no mention of the old bridge.

Bennett said the understanding is the bridge is a replacement of the old bridge (which would therefore have to be removed), as building a new bridge is restricted on the Columbia River. She said staff will work on the following issues to address the concerns expressed today:
• color and reflectivity
• "transparent" structural design
• construction methods
• keep visual and historic elements separate
• existing sign requirements

She said certain items are of substantive disagreement at this time including:
• decorative or ornamental features, should be built into the bridge itself
• pedestrian lanes need to be on both sides, we need to be clear to be sure that it really works to promote the recreational element

Commissioner Wooster said he disagrees about needing to specify two lanes and feels that this is an issue that can be worked out at a more appropriate time.

Commissioner Robertson suggested we draft guidelines that pertain more the desired outcome rather than prescribing design elements.

Commissioner Loehrke said that he disagrees with the idea that we've been too prescriptive. He said that this bridge can be an enhancement of the Gorge and it's the Commission's shot to ensure that this is lasting asset in the Gorge. The Wal-Mart version of the bridge may be functional and a less expensive version but it doesn't enhance the area. He said specifying elements to promote the recreational value is needed but we may have gone too far in specifying materials and construction methods.

Commissioner Adcock said in regard to the historic design element #1 the Columbia River Historic Highway is not pertinent to the bridge. He said he does not agree with Loehrke and we should leave design and engineering to the experts. These guidelines
need to be less specific. Commissioner Palena said there needs to be ample crossing areas onto the bridge.

Commissioner Sheehan supports permanent sidewalks and designated bike lanes. She said she was concerned about stipulating sidewalks on both sides and the siting of viewing areas as there should be some leeway on these items.

Bennett said we can develop some level of criteria as opposed to specific design elements and agreed that the viewing platform language was too specific, that it ought to have criteria such as being accessible and providing valuable views. She said vehicular safety was an issue that the transportation agencies were experts at but we need to consider various users besides vehicles and promote recreational use as well. She agreed with Commissioner Loehrke that this was the one shot to make it right for the area without overly prescribing.

Chair Squier asked staff to prepare a revised version and Bennett said the revision would be sent out on Friday or Monday at the latest. She said this will help identify the areas of agreement and disagreement.

Chair Squier called for a lunch break at 12:25 p.m. and said the executive session pertaining to possible litigation would begin after a 5 minute break. The regular meeting would resume at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Chair Squier called an executive session to order pursuant to Commission Rule 350-11-006 (1)(g) at 12:35 p.m. and Jeffrey Litwak, Counsel provided a review of possible litigation.

Chair Squier closed the executive session at 1:35 p.m. and noted that no deliberation or decisions occurred in the executive session, and no follow-up actions were needed. The regular meeting was called back to order at 1:40 p.m.

**Public Hearing and adoption of revised Commission Rules for open meetings and public records, 350-11 and 350-12**

Commission legal counsel, Jeffrey Litwak, provided a review of the issue (see Attachment E). The National Scenic Area Act requires the Commission to adopt rules for open meetings and public records that are consistent with the more restrictive of the two state’s provisions. After reviewing the results of the 2003 legislative sessions, the Rules Committee recommended minor changes to these rules. The Commission initiated rulemaking on these draft rules at its January 13, 2004 meeting.

Chair Squier asked for public comment on this item.

Michael Lang of FOCG commented on the revisions as provided. He said the only concern is the lack of definition for the term “security”. Litwak explained the language is verbatim from Oregon law and doesn’t recommend defining the term at this time. He suggested taking cues from Oregon law. Chair Squier referred to page 5 and asked if the section on public records assists with the definition. Litwak responded we don’t have
Public Workshop Summary & Comments Received

Workshop on Design Policies for New Columbia River Bridge
March 9, 2004
The workshop included a PowerPoint presentation, from which relevant slides are shown below. Definitions were provided for the concepts being discussed and asked about on the response sheet.

**Meeting Purpose**
- To discuss issues and generate creative ideas related to the design and aesthetics of the new Columbia River bridge.
- To provide direction to Gorge Commission staff in developing bridge design standards and policies for the Management Plan.

**Meeting Agenda**
- **Presentation** 1:30 pm
  - Welcome and Introductions
  - Status of Bridge Project
  - Framing of Scenic Area Context
  - Design Policy Options for Bridge
  - Questions
- **Workshop** 3:00 pm
  - Break-out Session
  - Group Reports
  - Next Steps
  - Adjournment

**Bridge Visual Character (Day)**
- **Historic**
  - Uses historic gorge design themes
- **Unobtrusive**
  - Recessive colors
  - Transparent structure
  - Uniformity of materials
  - Does not dominate setting
  - Graceful from shore to shore

**Bridge Visual Character (Night)**
- **Contemporary**
  - Does not use historic gorge design themes
- **Unobtrusive**
  - Recessive colors
  - Transparent structure
  - Uniformity of materials
  - Does not dominate setting
  - Graceful from shore to shore

**Bridge Visual Character (Day)**
- **Signature**
  - May or may not use historic gorge design themes
- **Obltrusive**
  - A dominant color
  - Dramatic form
  - Dominates setting

**Bridge Visual Character (Night)**
- **Functional Lighting**
  - Meets highway lighting standards
- **Enhanced Lighting**
  - Special lighting for pedestrians and bikes
- **Signature Lighting**
  - Festive and decorative
## Public Workshop Summary & Comments Received

*Workshop Slides/Definitions of Terms, continued*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use at Landings</th>
<th>Circulation (Pedestrian/Bike)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Accommodated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Woodland character</td>
<td>• Meets highway design standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks and recreational facilities</td>
<td>• Generous and inviting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commercial development</td>
<td>• Emphasized with viewing and seating areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop on Design Policies for New Columbia River Bridge
March 9, 2004 Workshop

Please check only one preference:

Visual Character
1) Day

2) Nighttime lighting

Circulation (pedestrian/bike)
1) To Bridge

2) On Bridge

Land Use at Landing
1) South Side

2) North Side

Other Issues: (For example, noise, bridge alignment, etc.-please comment)

Name (optional) Crandall Arambula PC
520 SW Yamhill, Room Suite 4
Portland, OR 97204
503.417.7879 / FAX 503.417.7904
Public Workshop Summary & Comments Received

Workshop Summary

Comments made during the group discussion were recorded on a flipchart (transcribed below).

**GENERAL SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION/RESPONSE SHEET COMMENTS**
- Use historic Columbia Gorge themes.
- Combine historic and contemporary elements.
- Provide low key nighttime lighting.
- Create “signature”/“highlight” lighting at night.
- Provide seating and viewing areas on bridge.
- Allow some combination of recreation/development on both north and south sides.
- Provide “harmonious” design.

**INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**
*recorded on flipchart*
- Pier spacing - 450'/300'.
- Auto-oriented views from bridge.
- Railroad access limitations.
- Policies by commission/other governments place structures out of flood plain (not affected by historic floods).
- Arch not needed for river channel.
- River channel - near ex. lift span, closer to Washington.
- Can bridge be maintained - sailboat association - safety concerns.
- Height - 25' higher than deck.
- Cost concerns for enhancements.
- Cost mostly impacted by: 1) span; 2) length; 3) bridge type; 4) amenities - ped, etc.
- Do not revisit - provide Gorge Commission with policy recommendations.

**TABLE 1:**
- Auto view points.
- Subtle lighting, accent lighting, no uplighting.
- Not compromise for cost.
- Competition.
- Harmonious - historic, not copying current bridge.
- Some enhanced night light.

**TABLE 2:**
- Visually unobtrusive.
- Mix of historic/contemporary - not bland.
- Lighting - signature without light pollution; judicious uplighting.

- Circulation - enhanced to celebrate - two viewing platforms.
- Land use - to south, development; to north, recreation.

**TABLE 3:**
- Harmonious - historic, not copying current bridge.
- Some enhanced night light.
- Open viewing, seating for peds, bicycle; two sided?
- Developed land use - committed.

**TABLE 4:**
- Unobtrusive, historic element consistent with historic highway.
- Current bridge not a model.
- Night lighting - functional.
- Circulation - two-sided, bikes on roadway, not sidewalk, 16’ sidewalk - good.
- Land use - committed south; north - recreation or development.

**NEXT STEPS:**
- Forms - a record.
- Ideas - policy and design guidelines.
- To website - April 13, 2004 - preliminary discussion with commission.
Public Workshop Summary & Comments Received

Each person was asked to complete an individual Response Sheet answering three questions and raising any “other issues” of concern. Responses are transcribed below, grouped by topic:

**Visual Character**

**Day:**

*Historic Columbia Gorge Themes*
- Use Historic Columbia Highway themes with stone guard rails.
- Have features that harmonize with CRGNSA.
- Have features that bring “feeling” of gorge.
- Themes of the Gorge.
- Columbia River Gorge Cascadian.
- Historic to me means to match the Historic Columbia River Highway, with arches.
- I think the new structure should reflect historic themes that exist on other structures along the Historic Highway. That is, to the extent possible, incorporate arches, stonework, and ornamental railings on the new bridge similar to those that exist today.
- Ties in with historic theme of NSA.
- Not existing bridge look HCRH bridges.

*Contemporary and Historical/Combination*
- Contemporary with historic feel.
- Contemporary with historic architectural elements.
- Contemporary unobtrusive design with historic design elements.
- Contemporary version of Historic Columbia River Highway styles.
- Historic - not like current bridge; historic materials (appearance) and details, but with a low profile like contemporary.
- Other: historical and signature both.
- Bridge - visually “signature” dominant, historically reminiscent (can be historical and “obtrusive”).
- Signature but unobtrusive.
- Want functional and also signature.
- Non-reflective color.
- Transparent; subordinant; graceful.
- Don’t agree with these categories [unobtrusive/obtrusive].
- Make a beautiful bridge! Most importantly, do something extraordinary like some of the bridge designs shown by Alan Phipps (Denver, Colorado), or have a competition for bridge designs.

*Harmonious/recreational/rock type use - textured; color mixed with concrete.*

**Nighttime lighting:**

*Low Key Lighting*
- Low key signature that enhance bridge at night.
- Low key signature no light pollution.
- Other - subtle.
- Low - not high overhead.
- Downlight; legal minimal.
- Use low level lighting.
- Subdued lighting.
- Incorporate lighting on inside of rail kept to minimum.
- Contemporary lighting - enhanced; low key signature would enhance or accent bridge feature.
- Safety, security and enhanced low-shining.
- Pedestrian-base lights.
- Dark sky and ped enhancement.

*Signature*/“Highlight” Lighting
- “Signature” - highlight historic features with white spotlights.
- Signature lighting doesn’t have to be obtrusive. It can be unique but not glare or glow from miles around.
- Nighttime lighting enhanced with some “signature” light elements.
- Highlight historic features with spotlights.
- To accentuate the structural design features/soft earthen tone lighting - so people traveling through have a sense of awe when seeing the bridge at night.
- Enhanced lighting.
Public Workshop Summary & Comments Received

Comments received on Individual response sheets, continued

Circulation (pedestrian/bike):

Seating
- Pedestrian seating for viewing.
- Enhanced means to me: with benches, trash receptacles, etc.
- Viewing areas with seats.
- Celebrated - seating.
- Would like to have some seating, info placards/displays.
- Circulation should allow for seating and viewing.
- Circulation on bridge; enhanced with celebrated features, benches, interest signs located 1/4 mile from each shore.

Viewing
- Additional bike/ped amenities for viewing
- Bridges themselves should be key viewing areas. Pedestrian and bicycling access should be free of charge (i.e., no tolls) and enhanced.
- Consider having viewing platforms near the shore at each end.
- On bridge viewing stations near both shores.
- On bridge: large path with areas to stop, views, rest.

Other
- Have walker/runner-friendly surface for part of the pedestrian area.
- Separate pedestrians from car-lanes/car noise - with clear plastic barrier.
- Consider ped-bike on both sides.
- More than sidewalks.
- Bikeways.
- Lots of room for recreation including site seeing, running, biking roller blading, etc.
- Pedestrian and bicycling access should be free of charge (i.e., no tolls) and enhanced.

Land Use at Landing:
- Picnic/day use recreation at each end.
- Provide for recreational opportunities at both ends of bridge to make the structure a destination.
- Recreation and development both at each side.
- Development at either end should allow for bike rentals, ice cream shops, tourist friendly while also having a natural setting (with landscaping).
- Provide restrooms on both sides.
- Not up to us.
- Existing.

South Side:
- Keep southwest - need pedestrian access. Would like to have more recreation.
- On south shore accommodate both recreation and some development (incorporate natural elements into development).
- Perhaps developed (as now) but recreation is better.
- Urban end of bridge (south end) should be the recreational destination.
- Two viewing platforms - one-quarter of the length from either end.

North Side:
- Connect to family-oriented swimming areas.
- Ample parking for park & ride.
- Recreation - no possible development.
- Potential recreation opportunities south of railroad.
- North side recreational opportunities.

Other topics mentioned on Response Sheets:

Harmonious Design
- Consider context sensitive design.
- Harmonious.
- Borrow from basalt and historic bridges.
- Gorge-context sensitive designed - in tune with its environment.
- The National Scenic Area Act requires protecting and enhancing the scenic, natural, cultural and recreational resources of the Columbia River Gorge. New bridges should be required to comply with generally applicable scenic resource.
Public Workshop Summary & Comments Received

Comments received on individual response sheets, continued

standards (e.g., visual subordinance). Replacement bridges of the same scope and in the same location as bridges being replaced should comply with the harmonious standard at a minimum. The best alternative for this project would be to expand the existing bridge. The second best alternative would be EC-2. The third best alternative would be the no-action alternative.

- Visually subordinate.
- Look at design guidelines for NSA, developed by Forest Service; look at “harmonious” design.
- Location #2 looks best. I did the design workshop on 1/2002. Good progress. Parabolic concrete looks best. Finance seems key - I would be glad to help [Douglas Crow]. I think in design its up to you and you have exhibited good sensitivity to the NSA. Thank you. Low profile, color, lighting - all can help to achieve visual subordinate consistent with a bridge across the river - giving it a prominence that makes it a landmark, but subtle. standard.

Form:
- Slim
- Need design details that are appropriate.
- Arch desirable.
- No overhead super structure.
- Based on parabolic concrete.
- Replicate railing arches/design to Historic Highway.
- Cantilever out from piers looks good - but cost effective?

Wind:
- Wind direction - the ped/bicycle way should not be east of traffic lanes. Passing traffic will disturb the high wind flow and make a turbulent environment, possibly affecting cyclist. Also, an east side ped-crossing would blow hats/people etc. right over the side.
- Wind: what stops tractor trailers from being blown off like the one at Biggs two years ago.
- Please incorporate windmills to help pay for bridge.

Safety:
- Concern of safety on bridge rail design due to trucks and wind.

Noise:
- Try to keep noise down.
- Use concrete road bed to minimize noise.

Other
- Thanks for your good work in gathering this data.
- Don’t want to be driven by $ now.
- I didn’t think the boxes [on response sheet] were mutually exclusive.
- “Celebrated” circulation is really nice, but if it makes bridge much wider, it would increase viewable area of the bridge (more scenic impacts).
- It is important to be able to see from the bridge (open railing design).
- Connection to existing bike/ped path on both sides of Hood River end of bridge.
- Try to use permanent structure material, like colored concrete not paint.
- Need 450-foot spans; bridge for everyone.
- You projected a 75-year traffic need. If we are still driving cars from point A to point B 75 years from now the climate will collapse and crossing rivers will be a low priority.
- Please consider putting a rail plan on it.
- Keep height consistent with minimum for navigation.
- We are celebrating nature not civilization or development/manifest destiny.
- Include peripheral areas - no more rock forts!
- Views from bridge.
Design competition.
• Any 100-year bridge will become historic.
• I'd like the low profile of the contemporary design, but would want historical “pizzazz” in the details - materials, forms and patterns; like arched signs. Mini-arches at the tops of the piers.
• What happens to old bridge?
• Bridge will break the conceptual flow of the Gorge based on n/s orientation. Current, wind, visual lines, ways of travel and flow. The bridge will go against this. I think it is worth investigating ways/signifiers that acknowledge flow (transverse). Possible wind active sculpture at pedestrian plaza at center. Sculpture would show both wind speed and direction in an interesting manner. I am a sculptor/designer and would be interested in submitting proposals/ideas. [John Mayo]
Names and addresses of public workshop attendees who signed in are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Barnhart</td>
<td>ODOT District 2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ray</td>
<td>ODOT Region 1/123 NW Flanders St, Portland, OR 97209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Kloos</td>
<td>ODOT Region 1/123 NW Flanders St, Portland, OR 97209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Robertson</td>
<td>Gorge Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Phipps</td>
<td>FIGG Bridge Engineers/1823 S. Berlaine St. #1500/Denver, CO 80222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Prigel</td>
<td>PO Box 745/Bingen, WA 98605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Graham</td>
<td>FHWA Oregon Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Doke</td>
<td>Port of Hood River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenn Adcock</td>
<td>Goldendale, WA 98620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Wooster</td>
<td>White Salmon, WA 98672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Sheehan</td>
<td>Prindle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Walker</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric.walker@co.hood-river.or.us">eric.walker@co.hood-river.or.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Salter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nathan@gorge.net">nathan@gorge.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Pawchuk</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kpawchuk@yahoo.com">kpawchuk@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Kelly</td>
<td>US Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Carlson</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Litt</td>
<td>Columbia River Gorge Commission/PO Box 730, White Salmon, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galilee Robison</td>
<td>PO Box 92/White Salmon, WA 98672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Jenkins Edwards</td>
<td>WSDOT/PO Box 1709/Vancouver, WA 98682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Kirker</td>
<td>PO Box 47340/Olympia, WA 98504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Clark</td>
<td>WSDOT/PO Box 1709/Vancouver, WA 98682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Henderson</td>
<td>PO Box 223/Bingen, WA 98605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Thiemann</td>
<td>PO Box 324 Corbett, OR 97019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Baker</td>
<td>522 SW 5th Ave./Suite 820/ Portland, OR 97204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Lochrke</td>
<td>982 Hemlock Rd./Carson, WA 98610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mayo</td>
<td>949 SE Oak St./White Salmon, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Bush</td>
<td>ODOT/355 Capitol/Salem, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Metzger</td>
<td>204 Prospect Ave./Hood River, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Maddox</td>
<td>318 Ninth, Hood River, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Maddox</td>
<td>318 Ninth, Hood River, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Struck</td>
<td>PO Box 889/White Salmon, WA 98672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hoyle</td>
<td>551 Easy St./Goldendale, WA 98620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Davis</td>
<td>The Dalles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Crow</td>
<td>Mosier, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Harvey</td>
<td>111 Alder St./Lyle, WA 98635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

• January '04 Commission direction: fold into plan revisions
• Final Draft includes goal and 6 guidelines on replacement for Hood River to White Salmon/Bingen Bridge
• Provisions on page II-163 and 164
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

- Provisions only apply in GMA
- Need for MP direction on scenic and other aspects of replacement bridge
- Based on March 9 workshop and consultants' recommendations
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

- Goal provides broadest direction
- Guidelines for 3 topic areas:
  - Visual quality
  - Historic design elements
  - Recreation and pedestrian access
- For each topic, 1st guideline broader
- 2nd guideline: specific direction implementing 1st guideline
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

- Depending on topic, binding or advisory language
- Advisory statements: details for incorporating historic design elements
- Other direction with “shall” statements: colors, lighting, ped/bike access and viewing areas
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

- Visually unobtrusive and harmonious:
  - Proper colors, light structure, consistent design character
  - Lighting: avoid river and sky glare, safety
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

- Incorporate historic design elements:
  - Arches, other traditional forms into bridge structure
  - Light steel trusses, poured-in-place concrete elements
  - Historic style detailing, pedestrian furnishings, graphics
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

• Encourage and promote peds/bikes:
  
  – Permanent sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides with sufficient width
  
  – Peds/bikes separated from autos
  
  – Several sitting/viewing areas
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

GMA Goal
1. Ensure that a replacement Columbia River Bridge Between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas provides for regional transportation and public safety needs while being consistent with both purposes of the Scenic Area Act.

GMA Guidelines

Visual Quality
1. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall be visually unobtrusive and harmonious with the surrounding Gorge landscape and the Columbia River.
2. A replacement Bridge shall:
   A. utilize neutral color that blends with the environment;
   B. use a thin structural design that blends with the horizon;
   C. minimize the number of piers
   D. utilize consistent design character and ornamental elements;
   E. employ lighting that provides a safe and pleasant atmosphere for motorists, bicycles and pedestrians that minimizes glare into the sky or onto the river.

Historic Design Elements
1. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall incorporate elements that reflect historic design features of the Scenic Area roadways and bridges.
2. A replacement bridge should include:
   A. decorative or ornamental bridge entry, railings, and other features that are graceful in their visual effect.
   B. arches, columns, and/or other historical forms;
   C. historic style furnishings and fixtures;

Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access
1. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall encourage and promote pedestrian and bicycle use, for recreational enjoyment and to enhance multi-modal transportation connections between the Urban Areas it connects.
2. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall incorporate pedestrian viewing areas.
Columbia River Gorge Commission
Special Meeting Minutes
April 27, 2004
A complete record of this meeting is available on audiotape

Location: Troutdale Community Center, SE Buxton Avenue, Troutdale OR
Time: 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
Kenn Adcock
Doug Crow
Judy Davis
Michael Farrow
Dan Harkenrider
Jane Jacobsen
Walt Loehrke
Joe Palena
Joyce Reinig
Dave Robertson
Kathy Sheehan
Anne Squier
Wayne Wooster

STAFF PRESENT
Allen Bell, Senior Planner
Martha Bennett, Executive Director
Brian Litt, Senior Planner
Jeffrey Litwak, Counsel
Kathy Obayashi-Bartsch, Administrative Assistant

AUDIENCE PRESENT
Andersen, Steven. Cascade Planning Associates
Annus, Heino. Corbett, Oregon
Baker, Nathan. Friends of the Columbia Gorge (FOCG)
Boyd, Carnetta. Corbett, Oregon
Carlson, June. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Clark, Mike. Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Cornelison, Peter. FOCG
Cornett, Todd. Wasco County Planning Department
Curtis, Lee. Mid-Columbia Economic Development (MCEDD)
Erickson, Dan. Wasco County Courts
Ferrioli, Ted. Oregon State Senate
Fullilove, Glenn. FOCG
Gaul, Willard. Columbia Gorge United
Gorman, Kevin. FOCG
Heuker, Chris. Cascade Locks, Oregon
and is distinct from the Act's directives on qualifications for appointment to the Commission. This issue has been brought up before and legal opinion supports Commissioner Sheehan's participation. Commissioner Sheehan explained her work with the Forest Service was strictly as a technical staff in forest entomology and web design and was not involved in work pertaining to the National Scenic Area (NSA).

Andersen continued to read from prepared testimony (see attachment D1-D3) and said the revised Plan is incomplete and questioned Commissioner Harkenrider's involvement in the adoption process of the SMA sections. Commissioner Harkenrider said the letter sent from his office to the Secretary of Agriculture does not suggest the Secretary delegate authority for concurrence to the Scenic Area office. He said the Management Plan revisions are sent to the Secretary of Agriculture for approval. She has the option to delegate authority for concurrence to the Regional Forester.

Dale Robins of Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) read from prepared testimony (see attachment E) pertaining to proposed bridge guidelines. Commissioner Robertson asked for clarification when the bridge is likely to be built and asked what the purpose would be to draft generic bridge guidelines if this is the only bridge planned. Robins responded the Hood River Bridge is planned to be built in 10-20 years and while no other bridge is planned, there may be an emergency and the guidelines should not be project specific. Commissioner Crow asked for clarification as to the guidelines for view points and Robins explained there might be a problem with pedestrian safety.

Mike Clark, Regional Planning Manager for WSDOT read from prepared testimony (see attachment F).

Nathan Baker of Friends of the Columbia Gorge (FOCG) read from prepared testimony (see attachment G1-G2), prepared by Michael Lang pertaining to bridge design and scenic guidelines. Chair Squier asked him to clarify his interpretation of KVA Policy #1. Baker responded that this policy can be interpreted that no application can be denied based on scenic impact and this can create problems. He said we need to allow planners the tool of denial if an applicant will not comply.

Derrick Tokos, Multnomah County Planning, said the revised Plan is an improvement. There are other issues to be resolved in the future with the Commission and the Forest Service including geologic hazards, cumulative impacts, uses allowed in historic structures and Scenic Management Area (SMA) residential conflicts. Chair Squier asked to clarify his concern about natural resource buffers. Tokos said the comment period in the SMA is a concern because it is too open ended.

Dan Ericksen and Todd Cornett of Wasco County read from prepared testimony (see attachment H). Commissioner Farrow asked about the counties' commitment to enforcing the Act and Management Plan. Ericksen said the Commission should focus on ensuring that the Management Plan addresses federal issues and should expect that local nuisance issues will be managed at the local level. Commissioner Crow spoke on the issue of balancing federal concerns and local issues. Commissioner Robertson
asked for clarification pertaining to road work issues and Cornett provided more information.

Chair Squier called for a break at 10:55 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 11:10 a.m. She said Commissioner Harkenrider would need to leave at noon and Kim Titus will represent the Forest Service and has full authority to concur on behalf of the Forest Service.

Eric Walker of Hood River County Planning covered the topics that were part of the county's written comments. Walker said they do not support the General Management Area (GMA) Key Viewing Areas (KVAs) guideline requiring a grading plan on slopes of less than 10%. Grading of 100 cubic yards is not substantial with developments on level terrain. They recommend requiring a grading plan for projects in the range of 200-300 cubic yards. They support the clarification that developed settings and visible subordinance policies in certain landscape settings are exempt from color and siting requirements. In General Policies they suggest that the county's decision on a request for extension of time is considered a ministerial review item. They would support at most, a notice of decision sent to the Forest Service, Tribes, Gorge Commission and any party of record involved in original application. In reference to the Expedited Development Review process, these types of requests should be considered a ministerial review item. They would support at most, a notice of decision sent to the Forest Service, Tribes, Gorge Commission and any owners within 200 feet of the parcel. He referred to a draft document "Home occupation to Host Weddings & Related Events" (see attachment I) and said many of the concerns for commercial events could be resolved on a local level and supported Wasco County's comments. Commissioner Robertson asked him to comment on the winery issue. Walker said they are supportive of the clarity provided by the revised definition in the final draft. Commissioner Wooster asked about the public process and permits for commercial weddings and events. Walker said you must have an approved commercial use in place, the special event is reviewed as a conditional use permit with notice to neighbors. There is a two year limit to establish the use and the approval is specific to the individual, not the land.

Chair Squier read from prepared testimony submitted to staff by Multnomah County Commissioner, Lonnie Roberts (see attachment J) in support of economic development.

Chris Heuker provided testimony (see attachment K) and addressed the issue that small scale fish operation is illegal. He said legal counsel assured him that it could be a considered a legal use according to the Plan. He thanked the Commission for including this item in the Plan and said this type of activity has been occurring in the Gorge for over 100 years. Commissioner Adcock asked if he was aware of the implications of the Plan when it was initially developed. Heuker said it was assumed that activities which had been occurring would continue to be allowed. Commissioner Farrow said he was concerned about allowing a commercial use in a residential area. Heuker responded the commercial use preceded the residential use and any relocation could be financially devastating.
Chapter 2-Forest Land
Commissioner Farrow discussed the issue of state enforcement of forest practices laws and regulations. Litwak explained this was a complex issue not related to Plan Review. The Commission did not take any action on this.

Chapter 4-Residential Land
Commissioner Farrow made a motion to encourage vertical growth, such as apartments as this would assist in protection of rural areas in the Gorge. Commissioner Reinig said this kind of growth was acceptable in urban areas and should be encouraged in these areas. There was no second for the motion.

Page II-65, Guidelines B and C
Chair Squier discussed the list of items that qualify as a review use. She said the language still needs work to make this clear and moved for the item to read as follows:

Il-65 B “Accessory structures for an existing or approved dwelling that are not otherwise allowed outright, eligible for the expedited development review, or allowed in Guideline 1.C below.”

Il-65 C Accessory building(s) larger than 200 sq ft in area or taller than 10 ft in height for a dwelling on any legal parcel are subject to the following additional standards:” (The remainder of this guideline was not changed by the motion.)

As presented on page 2 of attachment R, similar changes would be needed for all land use designations in Part II of the Plan except Open Space. Commissioner Sheehan seconded and a voice vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously. Titus said the Forest Service concurs with this decision.

Chapter 7- General Policies and Guidelines

Pages Il-163 and Il-164
Commissioner Robertson discussed the RTCs suggestion that the proposed guidelines apply to all Columbia Gorge bridges instead of just the Hood River Bridge. He said it would be best to stay with specific designation for the Hood River Bridge. Bennett said the terms visually unobtrusive and harmonious were discussed with other agencies and were left in the draft as the transportation agencies did not object to these terms. Brian Litt, Senior Planner added that the specific measures in prior Visual Quality Guideline 2 were consolidated with Guideline 1 to clarify that they implement “visually unobtrusive” and “harmonious”. The Commission discussed the issue and opted to make no changes.

Commissioners discussed the issue brought forth by the RTC, ODOT, and WSDOT that the guidelines are too specific. Commissioner Loehrke said he supported specifying certain elements like the pedestrian and bike access. Commissioner Wooster said he was inclined to give deference to the transportation agencies as they are the experts on this type of project. Bennett said the cost estimate was not solid at this time and that
the Commission should make sure the guidelines meet their policy goals. Titus said it would be best to allow some flexibility allowing for arches incorporated into the bridge design and not to specify an arched bridge. Bennett suggested using language other than “structure” as this may be interpreted as prescriptive.

Commissioner Wooster made a motion to make the following changes in the final draft of revisions for the guidelines for the replacement Hood River Bridge: 1) delete “motorists” from Visual Quality Guideline 1.B; 2) delete “including the Historic Columbia River Highway” from Historic Design Elements Guideline 1; 3) delete “main” and “structure” from Historic Design Elements Guideline 2.A; 4) delete all text in parentheses in Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Guidelines 2.B and 2.C; 5) delete “with significant views from both sides of the bridge” in Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Guideline 2.D. Commissioner Adcock seconded the motion.

Commissioner Sheehan suggested an amendment to the motion to add "with significant upstream and downstream views" to the end of Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Guideline 2.D. Commissioner Wooster did not accept Commissioner Sheehan’s suggestion.

Commissioner Sheehan moved to amend the original motion to add the phrase “with significant upstream and downstream views” to the end of Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Guideline 2.D. Guideline 2.D would thus read: “provide multiple sitting and viewing areas with significant upstream and downstream views;“.

Commissioner Palena seconded the motion. It passed by a voice vote of 11-0-1 with Commissioner Wooster abstaining.

A vote was taken on the main motion as amended and passed 11 to 1.

Kenn Adcock -aye
Doug Crow -aye
Judy Davis-aye
Michael Farrow -aye
Jane Jacobsen -aye
Walt Loehrke-aye
Joe Palena-aye
Joyce Reinig-aye
Dave Robertson-aye
Kathy Sheehan-aye
Anne Squier-no
Wayne Wooster-aye

Page II-108 Guideline #1B
Commissioner Loehrke suggested amending the language pertaining to consolidation of lots as suggested by Skamania County. He made a motion for this item to read as follows:
April 23, 2004

Ms. Anne Squier, Chair
Columbia River Gorge Commission
PO Box 730
White Salmon, WA 98672

Dear Ms. Squier:

On behalf of the Klickitat County Transportation Policy Committee, the SR-35 Advisory Committee, and RTC as the project manager for the SR-35 Columbia River Crossing Feasibility Study and DEIS, I would like to express our thanks to the Columbia River Gorge Commission for an opportunity to comment on the Management Plan Revision for a Columbia River Replacement Bridge. We support the amendment of the Management Plan to permit a replacement bridge in the Hood River and White Salmon/Bingen urban areas, but are concerned with the prescriptive wording in the proposed GMA Guidelines.

It had been our understanding that the Guidelines would provide policies or guiding principles by which to determine a course of action. We believe that some of the wording in the Gorge Commission’s Guidelines are too specific and in fact could predetermine certain final engineering elements of the proposed Columbia River Replacement Bridge. While we welcome the Gorge Commission’s responsibility to guide these decisions, our concern is that the very specific language being suggested could result in conflicts with safety standards, community input, and push the costs for the new bridge beyond a level of financial feasibility.

As you are aware the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council and the Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation have over the last four years conducted a public process to determine the feasibility of replacing the current Hood River Bridge with a new bridge. This replacement bridge will improve and make safe the multi-modal movement of people and goods across the Columbia River between Hood River, Oregon and White Salmon/Bingen, Washington. We have seen this process led by the SR-35 Advisory Committee and with considerable input from a series of public open houses all of which included a wide range of stakeholders, produce a recommended alternative that no one single person or entity could have initially envisioned. This recommendation
has been brought to the local community for their input and endorsement. However, the final design engineering of the new replacement bridge is not done and still requires a final EIS process and a higher level of engineering. We would hope that the Gorge Commission would see their Guidelines as the policies under which the final design and EIS would occur, but allow engineering decisions to be made within and not prescribed by the Guidelines.

We would submit that the draft Management Plan Revision Guidelines as initially proposed conflict with the recommendations developed by the Advisory Committee and will not allow the best engineering practices to determine the final bridge design. Our biggest concern is with the Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Guidelines 2D, which specifies that pedestrian and viewing facilities shall be provided on both sides. The Advisory Committee's recommendation, which were based on a lengthy and informed discussion, resulted in a recommendation to provide an enhanced pedestrian facility on one side of the bridge that would provide views of the Gorge, ensure pedestrian safety and access, and be the most cost effective.

In conclusion we would request that Gorge commission reword the Guidelines to be applicable to not just the Columbia River Replacement Bridge but also any future Columbia River replacement bridge. In regard to pedestrian and viewing facilities we would ask that the GMA Guidelines not include the prescriptive language that required a pedestrian facility on both sides of the replacement bridge. This change along with our other more minor comments are attached and we believe would still provide for the Gorge Commission policy guidance but would also allow the design process with community input the flexibility it deserves.

Sincerely,

Dean Lookingbill
Transportation Director

Attachment

cc: Klickitat County Transportation Policy Committee
   SR-35 Advisory Committee
   Matthew Garrett, ODOT Region 1 Manager
   Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

GMA Goal

1. Ensure that a replacement Columbia River bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas provides for regional transportation and public safety needs while being consistent with both purposes of the Scenic Area Act.

GMA Guidelines

Visual Quality

1. A replacement Columbia River bridge shall:
   A. be located in an existing Columbia River bridge corridor or between two urban areas.
   B. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall be visually unobtrusive and harmonious with the surrounding Gorge landscape and the Columbia River. A replacement bridge shall:
   C. utilize recessive dark natural or earth-tone colors for steel components of the bridge, a thin and open structural design that allows views through it to the extent practicable, and consistent design character and ornamental elements;
   D. employ lighting that provides a safe and pleasant atmosphere for motorists, bicycles and pedestrians while not casting glare directly into the sky or onto the river.

Historic Design Elements

1. A replacement Columbia River bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall incorporate elements that reflect historic design features of Scenic Area roadways and bridges, including the Historic Columbia River Highway. The historic themes should be an integral component of the design of the bridge structure, incorporated from “shore to shore”.

April 19, 2004 CRGC Revision with RTC Comments
2. A replacement bridge should include:

A. arches and/or other traditional structural forms into the main bridge structure;

B. historic style benches, lighting, other pedestrian furnishings, and signage/graphic materials consistent with the USFS Graphic Signing System for the Scenic Area;

C. ornamental concrete or steel railings.

Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access

1. A replacement Columbia River bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall encourage and promote pedestrian and bicycle use, for recreational enjoyment and to enhance multi-modal transportation connections between the Urban Areas it connects.

2. The bridge shall include facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists that:

A. are permanent;

B. are wide enough to safely accommodate and encourage walking, bicycling, and other uses. (such as rollerblading, skating, skateboarding, or wheelchair access);

C. meet safety standards to prevent conflicts among automobiles, trucks, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other users (such as elevated sidewalks or other barriers between the motor vehicle lanes and the pedestrian facilities);

D. provide multiple sitting and viewing areas with significant views from both sides of the bridge;

E. are safe to approach from both the north and south ends of the bridge and provide strong multi-modal connections, both east-west and to the nearby Urban Areas.
Ms. Anne Squier, Chair
Columbia River Gorge Commission
P. O. Box 730
White salmon, WA 98672

Re: Response to Columbia River Crossing
Management Plan Amendment

Dear Ms. Squier:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your Columbia River Bridge Replacement Amendment to the Management Plan. We appreciate that you modified your previous draft amendment based on comments from RTC, WSDOT, and ODOT. These modifications eliminated various prescriptive points, which will allow greater flexibility in the design of a replacement bridge.

We support your Columbia River Bridge Replacement Amendment, dated April 19, 2004, to the Management Plan with the following recommendations.

1. The Policy as currently drafted is only for the bridge crossing between Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon. We recommend that the Policy be written generically for any bridge crossing the Columbia River within the Gorge Management Plan Area.

2. In 1A of the Visual Quality Section and Section 2C of the Historical Design Elements Section, you use the word “ornamental.” We are requesting clarification on what this means to the Commission, so that we better understand your expectations. In the SR 14 Corridor Management Plan there are some structure descriptions that may be helpful in clarifying these expectations.

3. In 1B of the Visual Quality Section eliminate the term “motorists.” Based on our design standards we would not install lighting for motorists on the bridge. Generally, we only install lighting at channelized intersections, and interchanges. We agree with your approach for providing lighting for pedestrians and bicyclists in the sidewalk area.

4. In Section 2A of the Historical Design Elements Section, please clarify what you mean by the terms “traditional structural forms,” and “main bridge structure.”
5. In Section 2D of the Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Section, we appreciate that you have modified this section. We are concerned that you might interpret this to mean that there would be viewing areas on either side of the traveled way on the bridge. Requiring viewing areas on both sides of the bridge, and hence a sidewalk on both sides of the bridge, may create an impossible challenge for funding this project. Though the facilitators of the March 9th workshop pushed for sidewalks with viewing areas on both sides of the bridge, stating that bigger can be better, the analogy they chose did not fit this particular situation.

As it stands, funding the replacement of this bridge will be very challenging. It will be competing for revenue with other bridge crossings that have higher volumes, and much higher mobility and safety benefits. Hence, it is important that the costs for this bridge replacement be limited as much as possible in order for it to have the best opportunity of being funded in the future.

Pedestrian and bicycle facilities were discussed in the development of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) with local community leader groups and open house attendees. These groups, as well as the open house attendees recognized and acknowledged the importance of reducing the cost for a replacement bridge, wherever possible, in order to compete for revenue to fund this project. From these discussions a 15-foot wide pedestrian/bicycle sidewalk was proposed on the west side to create a promenade type facility on one side of the bridge.

We recommend that you leave this part of the Policy as flexible as possible, so that the community has an opportunity to weigh-in further on this issue during the design process.

Thank you for considering our comments. If it would be beneficial, we welcome the opportunity to meet with you and refine this Policy.

Sincerely,

H. Michael Clark, P.E.
Regional Planning Manager

HMC:mc

cc: RTC
     ODOT
     file
COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

**GMA Goal**

1. Ensure that a replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas provides for regional transportation and public safety needs while being consistent with both purposes of the Scenic Area Act.

**GMA Guidelines**

**Visual Quality**

1. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall be visually unobtrusive and harmonious with the surrounding Gorge landscape and the Columbia River. A replacement bridge shall:

   A. utilize recessive dark natural or earth-tone colors for steel components of the bridge, a thin and open structural design that allows views through it to the extent practicable, and consistent design character and ornamental elements;

   B. employ lighting that provides a safe and pleasant atmosphere for motorists, bicycles and pedestrians while not casting glare directly into the sky or onto the river.

   *Note: The above guideline consolidates two previous guidelines in the April 9 Final Draft (prior Guidelines 1 and 2, “Visual Quality”, page II-163)*

**Historic Design Elements**

1. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall incorporate elements that reflect historic design features of Scenic Area roadways and bridges, including the Historic Columbia River Highway. The historic themes should be an integral component of the design of the bridge structure, incorporated from “shore to shore”.

2. A replacement bridge should include:

   A. arches and/or other traditional structural forms into the main bridge structure;
B. historic style benches, lighting, other pedestrian furnishings, and signage/graphic materials consistent with the USFS Graphic Signing System for the Scenic Area;

C. ornamental concrete or steel railings.

Recreation and Pedestrian/Bicycle Access

1. A replacement Columbia River Bridge between the Hood River and Bingen/White Salmon Urban Areas shall encourage and promote pedestrian and bicycle use, for recreational enjoyment and to enhance multi-modal transportation connections between the Urban Areas it connects.

2. The bridge shall include facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists that:

A. are permanent;

B. are wide enough to safely accommodate and encourage walking, bicycling, and other uses (such as rollerblading, skating, skateboarding, or wheelchair access);

C. meet safety standards to prevent conflicts among automobiles, trucks, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other users (such as elevated sidewalks or other barriers between the motor vehicle lanes and the pedestrian facilities);

D. provide multiple sitting and viewing areas with significant views both upstream and downstream of the bridge;

E. are safe to approach from both the north and south ends of the bridge and provide strong multi-modal connections, both east-west and to the nearby Urban Areas.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the guidelines for the Columbia River bridge replacement.

**Replacement**

The proposed guidelines address the replacement of the current bridge across the Columbia River. Replacement means that once the replacement structure becomes operational, the use of the old structure will cease and it will be removed.

Most replacements proposals are made by the owner of an existing structure who wished to replace the existing structure with a new structure. This does not appear to be the case with the SR-35 Columbia River Bridge crossing proposal. While the Port of Hood River owns the existing bridge, ownership of the new bridge would likely be either single ownership by ODOT or WSDOT, or joint ownership by these two agencies.

At the Commission meeting on April 13, Commission Director Martha Bennett said, “This is not a new bridge. This is a replacement. The old bridge has got to go.” Friends agrees, but we believe that a minor clarification reinforcing this point is in order.

**Recommendation:** Friends supports clarifying the guidelines by explicitly stating that once the replacement bridge is completed and becomes operational, the use of the existing bridge will cease and it will be removed.

**Columbia River Bridge Replacement**

**Guideline 1.** Upon completion of the replacement bridge the use of the existing bridge will cease and it shall be removed.

**Visual Quality**

Guideline 1. This guideline introduces some new terms to the Management Plan. The terms are “visually unobtrusive” and “harmonious with the surrounding Gorge landscape and the Columbia River.” There are several different landscapes settings within this general area of the Columbia Gorge. There is no description for the Columbia...
River setting within the Management Plan. In order for these terms to have meaning and for the this guideline to be properly implemented, these terms need to be defined.

**Recommendation:** Delay adoption of the Management Plan until these terms are defined. Alternatively, add definitions of these terms as plan amendments prior to the submission of a replacement bridge application.