

Hello, my name is Captain Joshua Landry and I represent Hayden Island and Jantzen beach moorage where I am a director. I've been an avid bike rider my entire life. I've lived in many cities in our country and seen them all by bike. Austin, Texas at 5 in the morning was far more dangerous than New York city at any time of day. Riding in New Orleans means you're in for a very bumpy ride. I spent 6 months sailing up and down the west coast on an 18th Century tall ship and would use our salt corroded "boat bike" to explore ports of call from San Diego to Seattle. We lost our trusty boat bike in West Hollywood when I biked there from Marina Del Rey to meet a girl I "thought" I was in love with. Oh the places you'll go. None however compares to our city of roses.. Having a bike in Portland is having a key to the city.

This morning I visited Wallis Engineering Firm in Vancouver and had the privilege of seeing a model of the IBR's bike/pedestrian off ramp that exits northbound off the Interstate bridge. This monstrosity rises 90 feet in the air. If the height is to satisfy the Coast Guards marine traffic clearance approval for the IBR, it will have to transition a whopping 178 feet down to ground level, nearly TWICE that.

I used to live in inner SE Portland and biked to work everyday in Northwest. Occasionally on my way home, I'd take the Broadway bridge to cross the river. The Broadway bridge, like the model, is about 90 feet high. I, like many, many others, would rather square the frame over our left shoulder, and quickly hike up the 100 steps to the top than slog up the slow incline off Lovejoy (also significantly more dangerous).

Everything in life has what's called an "effort threshold," if something is too difficult, people are less likely to engage.

A 90 foot Incline bears a steep effort threshold. 178 foot incline is an untenable. No one in their right mind is going to climb an 18 foot building to cross the Columbia. To put things in perspective, the Megler bridge which spans the Columbia river connecting Astoria to Washington has a 196 clearance. Imagine taking a bike across that! I used to live out there and would cross that bridge everyday. I don't ever recall seeing many bikes.

There are advocates for a submerged tunnel to cross the Columbia connecting Portland to Vancouver which Greg Johnson of the IBR vociferously renounces. It would go 43 feet under the seabed. I can't say I love the idea of biking through a tunnel, but a 43 foot transition and three fourths of a mile? I can absolutely hazard that. Short and sweet. Just look at the Maastunnel in Rotterdam in the Netherlands if you need some easy visualization. The Dutch lead the world in bike culture.

Another idea that the tunnel advocates pitched is keeping the existing historical bridge and using it as our light rail/pedestrian/biking pathway. Have you ever driven down the middle of a bridge, free of vehicular traffic? It's absolutely magical.

Greg Johnson called it a myth, saying maintaining the bridge would cost 270 million dollars in capital improvements by 2040 with yearly maintenance of 1.2 million a year.. True, but ALL bridges have maintenance costs, to the tune of 9% of their initial cost every year. The ACTUAL bridge replacement and its approaches range in price anywhere from 1.64-2.45 billion dollars. Averaged out, that's a little over 2 billion dollars. Nine percent of 2 billion dollars is 180 million. So 1.2 million vs 180 million a year? A number one hundred and fifty times the yearly cost of the original. 270 million spread out across 15 years, is 18 million a year. By that same 15 year metric, 15 years at 180 million a year chalks up to a hefty 2.7 billion dollars for the IBR. That makes the IBR TEN times more expensive.

This doesn't yet bring up the issue of light rail which would condemn Oregon communities to service Clark county commuters. These services are already provided via the Trimet's #6 bus line and C-trans line #60. I don't have the ridership numbers but my eyes don't lie, I see a lot of empty seats on both buses. That 1.8 miles of light rail will cost anywhere from 1.32-1.99 billion dollars (I would hazard the high side) also making THEE most expensive light rail project of all time. It's difficult to see any return on investment, especially when existing infrastructure already exists. The bridge replacement is already designed with buses in mind, enlarged shoulders allow buses to pass unimpeded during rush hour.

I would encourage ODOT to reevaluate their relationship with the IBR and explore other cheaper options like the aforementioned. Not only does it save taxpayers on both sides of the river billions, it removes the need for tolling. The modular nature of its construction allows it to be built off site, sections completed simultaneously, and then towed and dropped into place. Not only does it get done faster (and faster usually means under budget) the disruption to wildlife and impacted communities is greatly mitigated. Destruction and disposal of the historic I-5 bridge also bears with it more even monetary and ecological expense. Once again mitigated. Reusing is still the greenest of the 3 R' afterall.

If transparency and accountability is their goal, distancing themselves from the IBR would do much to restore the public's confidence and save an enormous amount of money in the process so we can relieve our already overburdened taxpayers.

Yes to accountability.

Yes to saving money. Savings means not having to raise taxes.

Yes to our environment.

Yes to our communities.

And a big ole yes for Oregon.

Thank you for your consideration, sincerely Joshua