

Columbia River Crossing Light Rail Tolling Project Resolution References

The “Whereas” statements of the Integrity Resolution are numbered so that associated supporting documents can be easily referenced. The following table lists files with brief descriptions to indicate their source and relevant notes.

Referenced documents supporting each “Whereas” statement are listed in the table located at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/IntegrityResolution>

The “Whereas” statements are numbered so each associated reference document starts with that number. The “Whereas” number is followed by “**w**” to indicate that the referenced file is the **whole** document. Otherwise, the number is followed by “**e**” to indicate that the referenced file is an **excerpt** of a larger document.

References Table

Whereas# Document	Explanation and external links
1w1	Definition of Integrity in this context: honesty, soundness, trustworthiness to fulfill commitments, truth-loving, worthy of belief or reliance, trustable, believable, forthrightness, good for one's word, a reliable witness to the truth, worthy of reliance or trust See letter from Majority Coalition Caucus of Washington State Senate calling for a formal independent investigation of the CRC
2w1	Tiffany Couch curriculum vitae (CV), experience and qualifications
3w0	Tiffany Couch, Acuity Forensic Certified Accountant testimony
3w1	Forensic Report #1 - Open Public Meetings White Paper A video interview detailing Report #1 can be found at: http://couv.com/community/crc-investigation
3w1ex1	Exhibits for Forensic Report #1
3w2	Forensic Report #2 - Contract and Task Order Analysis A video interview detailing Report #2 can be found at: http://couv.com/community/crc-investigation2
3w2ex1	Exhibits for Forensic Report #2 A-M
3w2ex2	Exhibits for Forensic Report #2 N-Z
3w3	Forensic Report #3 - Ruby Junction and Steel Bridge Costs A video interview detailing Report #3 can be found at: http://couv.com/community/crc-investigation3-2
3w3ex1	Exhibits for Forensic Report #3
3w3ex2	A transcript of Ms. Boyd’s testimony for report #3
3w4	Forensic Report #4 - Funding Plan White Paper A video interview detailing Report #4 can be found at: http://couv.com/community/crc-investigation4
3w4ex1	Exhibits A&B for Forensic Report #4
3w4ex2	Exhibits C-K for Forensic Report #4
3w5	Forensic Report #5 - Contractor Analysis
3w5ex1	Exhibits for Forensic Report #5: Gleason Summary and Exhibits

3w5ex2	Exhibits for Forensic Report #5: Kitchin Summary and Exhibits
3w5ex3	Exhibits for Forensic Report #5: McCaig Summary and Exhibits
3w5ex4	Exhibits for Forensic Report #5: OTHER Exhibit
3w6	Forensic Report #6 - Cost Allocation Discrepancies
3w6ex1	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: A - Base Cost Estimate - Deck Truss Option - Phase 1
3w6ex2	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: B. CEVP Report Summary
3w6ex3	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: C - CRC Cost by Component Map Per CEVP
3w6ex4	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: D - Base Cost Estimate Summary
3w6ex5	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: E - CEVP to Base Cost Reconciliation Allocation
3w6ex6	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: F - Escalation of Base Costs to CEVP Report - 60% Confidence
3w6ex7	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: G - Escalation of Base Costs to CEVP Report - 90% Confidence
3w6ex8	Exhibits for Forensic Report #6: H. Reallocate Overpass Costs to Bridge
4e1	Excerpt from page 44 of the 4w2 document which incorporated C-TRAN Board Resolution BR-08-019. "Any means chosen to finance operations of the HCT component of the CRC project shall be submitted to impacted C-TRAN voters for approval." The same can be found in C-TRAN staff report #13-023, Page 35, marked page 32 at: http://www.c-tran.com/assets/20 Year Plan/C-TRAN 20 Year Plan-Adopted June 8 2010.pdf
4w2	Whole CRC Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) document http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/IRP/IRP_TabG.pdf The LPA is also found at http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/GeneralProjectDocs/LPA_Resolutions.pdf
4w3	C-TRAN Board Resolution BR-08-019
5e1	Excerpt from page 56 of the 4w2 document above which incorporated the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) Resolution 07-08-10 which added the following requirement to the LPA: "Any means chosen to finance operations of the HCT component of the CRC project shall be submitted to impacted C-TRAN voters for approval." The same can be found on page 16 of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County at: http://www.rtc.wa.gov/reports/mtp/Mtp2008.pdf
5e2	The minutes of the RTC meeting where RTC resolution 07-08-10 state "the bottom line is that we all have said that the voters need to approve this." and "Mr. Stuart said 81104, the legislation that would be used to bring high capacity transit to Washington does require a vote on the system plan and financing." http://www.rtc.wa.gov/meetings/board/brdminutes.080722.htm
5w3	Whole document where the 5e2 excerpt can be found (within 80% of the bottom)
5e4	Regional Transportation Council (RTC) Resolution 07-08-10 which was incorporated into the LPA: "Any means chosen to finance operations of the HCT component of the CRC project shall be submitted to impacted C-TRAN voters for approval.", excerpt from page 63 of 5w5, Locally Preferred Alternative resolutions
5w5	The Locally Preferred Alternative resolutions, whole document, page 63 is referenced by 5e4
6w1	C-TRAN Board Resolution PBD-015

	Prohibits using any of the 0.7% voter approval sales tax revenue for any aspect of the CRC project. http://c-tran.com/assets/Board/Board_Policies/PBD-015_CRC_Project_Policy_REVISED_Sept_10_2013.pdf
6e2	Excerpt from CRC_FEIS_Chapter4 Financial Analysis, Page 4-31 of 6w3 states “C-Tran’s existing revenues are required for meeting C-TRAN’s fixed-route and paratransit service costs”, not available for HCT. HTC funding would require voter approval.
6w3	CRC_FEIS_Chapter4, Financial Analysis, whole document referenced by 6e2 http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/FINAL_EIS_PDFs/CRC_FEIS_Chapter4.pdf http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/ProjectInformation/ResearchAndResults/FinalEIS.aspx#FEIS
7e1	C-Tran staff report #13-024 states that the purpose of PBD-015 was to reassure voters that any sales tax revenue that was already approved by the voters, would not be used to fund the CRC project. Page 237 of 7w2 (page 179 of pdf file)
7w2	Whole document – May 21, 2013 Agenda, Page 237 (page 179 of pdf file) shows 7e1 excerpt http://www.c-tran.com/board_meeting_files/May_21_2013_agenda_no_QandA_.pdf
8e1	Page 76 of 2011 Voters’ Pamphlet:
8w2	Complete 2011 Voters’ Pamphlet referenced in 8a1 above: http://www.clark.wa.gov/elections/documents/2011/2011GeneralVotersPamphletpamphlet.pdf
9e1	http://highcapacityerp.com/about.html
10e1	Page 9 of C-TRAN High Capacity Transit Expert Review Panel Findings and Recommendations: must follow strict FTA requirements
10e2	Page 14 of C-TRAN High Capacity Transit Expert Review Panel Findings and Recommendations: “The FTA specifically prohibits transit agencies from degrading local bus service by transferring funds from existing service to finance high capacity transit operations.”
10w3	Complete High Capacity Transit Expert Review Panel Findings and Recommendations for 10e1 and 10e2 excerpts above: http://www.highcapacityerp.com/Presentations/FindingsandRecommendations6_28_12.pdf
11e1	Page 11 of C-TRAN High Capacity Transit Expert Review Panel Findings and Recommendations. See 10w3 for whole document.
12e1	Light Rail funding showing insufficient funds excerpt from Page 22 of September 26, 2013 C-Tran agenda, HCT costs do not provide required revenue as specified by HCT Expert Review Panel.
12w2	Complete September 26, 2013 C-Tran agenda, page 22 shows 12e1 excerpt: http://c-tran.com/board_meeting_files/092613_Special_Mtg_Board_Agenda_Packet.pdf
13e1	Since the original 0.5% sales tax was insufficient “to preserve core bus service”, voters approved 0.2% additional sales tax rate “to preserve core bus service”, not for HCT http://www.c-tran.com/news/detail/id/25
14w1	Email exchange between C-Tran CEO Jeff Hamm and David Madore, November 18, 2013
15e1	Page 100 of November 2012 Clark County Voters’ Pamphlet

	http://www.clark.wa.gov/elections/documents/2012/NOVEMBER201206/Clark%20County%20general%20election%20pamphlet.pdf
15e2	Page 12 of November 2012 Election Results: http://www.clark.wa.gov/elections/results/2012/2012Nov6ElectionResults.pdf
16w1	2 nd question and answer on page 2, confirms that previous voter approved sales tax was to preserve core bus service and expected to be enough only for 5 years. New tax is “to fund bus and C-Van service only” http://www.c-tran.com/assets/Fact_Piece/C-TRAN_Ballot_Measure_Fact_Piece_2011.pdf
16e2	Pages 76 – 77 explanatory statement of the voters’ pamphlet, 0.2% sales tax “saves bus service and nothing more”, “Prop 1 will fund bus service only, not light rail.”, “This measure has nothing to do with light rail.” http://www.clark.wa.gov/elections/documents/2011/2011GeneralVotersPamphlet.pdf
16e3	C-Tran BR-05-021 page 9 of the September 20, 2005 voters pamphlet 0.2% sales tax increase for local buses and C-Van service http://www.clark.wa.gov/elections/documents/2005/primary2005_voter_pamphlet.pdf
17e1	Page 94 of the Voters’ Pamphlet, “opposes any Light Rail project in Clark County unless it is first supported by a majority of the voters in a county-wide advisory vote of the people” http://www.clark.wa.gov/elections/documents/2013/NOV_5/2013GenCompleteVotersPamphlet.pdf
17e2	Page 110 of the November 2012 Voters’ Pamphlet , create a policy “to oppose every Light Rail project in Clark County unless it is first supported by a majority of the voters in a county-wide advisory vote of the people” – Excerpt includes complete text of Light Rail Resolution 2013-07-17
17w3	Letter from Washington Legislators strongly encouraging an advisory vote on the CRC Light Rail project. The CRC Project was dead and stop work orders had been issued at the time (August 5, 2013) that the Clark County Commissioners passed the resolution to place Light Rail Advisory Vote#1 on the ballot. An Oregon Only plan was created after that decision. Otherwise a direct vote on the CRC (whatever version) would also have been placed on the ballot. As is, the people voted to oppose all Light Rail Projects in Clark County including the CRC Light Rail project. The project “died June 30 when the Washington Senate killed its funding. Gov. John Kitzhaber and Washington Gov. Jay Inslee immediately announced they were shutting down the project.” http://www.wweek.com/portland/article-20906-zombridge_.html
18e1	Page 2 of the November 2012 election results: http://www.clark.wa.gov/elections/results/2013/2013Nov5ElectionResults.pdf
18e2	November 2012 election results by precinct http://vote.wa.gov/results/current/clark/Precincts-108553.html
18w3	Map of Clark County Advisory Vote Election Results – November 2013 http://gis.clark.wa.gov/Election/2013
19e1	CRC Record of Decision, page 1 shows the ROD to include 5 miles of freeway improvements and seven interchanges
19e2	CRC Finance plan, 2011 excerpt, page 2, grants that later disappeared
19w3	CRC Record of Decision, whole document referenced in 19e1

	http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/ROD/CRC_ROD.pdf
19w4	CRC Finance plan, 2011, whole document referenced in 19e2 http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/WA_Vancouver_Columbia_River_Crossing_complete_profile.pdf
20e1	Current CRC Finance plan, Page 2 excerpt shows all Washington freeway improvements indefinite deferred except what is needed for Light Rail, shows Oregon unilateral control of toll rates, shows original LPA was swapped for an Oregon-only Light Rail-only plan
20e2	Current CRC Finance plan, Page 4 excerpt shows current finance plan, all grants are gone except for Light Rail, all remaining funding is debt backed by tolls, does not cover \$84.6 million payment for losses to three Clark County businesses.
20e3	Current CRC Finance plan, Page 3 excerpt shows no identified source for \$86.4 million to pay for losses to three Clark County businesses.
20w4	Current CRC Finance plan, whole document referenced in 20e1 - 20e3 http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/CRC/RevisedFinancePlan_9-12-13.pdf
21e1	CRC Record of Decision, page 25 showed the ROD to have maximum toll rates of \$2.50, excerpt from 19w4
21w2	CRC Traffic Analysis, by Joe Cortright, Impresa April 2013 https://www.dropbox.com/s/pzgmjqxnz24f6nv/Cortright_CRC%20Diversion%20Analysis_April_2013.pdf
21w3	CRC Traffic Analysis CDM Smith, February 22, 2013 with CRC memorandum, shows \$100 million to \$180 million per year going toward tolls, draining mainly from Clark County commuters, harming Clark County economy, with tolls of \$4.34 each way. http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/TechnicalReports/PreliminaryTollFundsEstimateUpdate_022813.pdf
21e4	Toll findings excerpt from Sec1:4 (5 of 34) from 21w5 CRC Toll Study stating that minimal traffic will be diverted from I-5 Bridge
21w5	CRC Toll Study, whole document, see Sec1:4 for 21e4 http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/Tolling/CRC_TollingStudyCommitteeReport.pdf
21e6	Excerpt from Pages of Oregon Treasurer letters 25w2, states that Oregon will be the unilateral authority to set toll rates.
21e7	Oregon Treasurer, Ted Wheeler states that the majority of toll payers will be Washington drivers, excerpt from 25w2
23w1	ODOT website the I-5 Bridge “in top operating condition”, “has kept spans healthy and free of weight restrictions”, “can serve the public for another 60 years”
24w1	CRC Project oversight document shows CRC defined as a bi-state project with both Oregon and Washington http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/ProjectInformation/WhoIsCRC/RegulatoryOversight.aspx
24w2	2011 FTA application says “The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) proposes to construct the Columbia River Crossing” (not Oregon-led).
24w3	2012 FTA financial application “The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) proposes to construct the Columbia River Crossing” (not Oregon-led). Changes were not approved by the project sponsors (RTC and C-Tran)
24w4	2013 FTA application Shows Oregon-only Light Rail only plan was substituted for the original LPA with completely different financing and scope. Non-Light Rail costs were changed from grant sources to debt-only paid by tolls-only. Changes were not approved by the project sponsors (RTC and C-Tran), 2011 FTA financial application

	http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/CRC/RevisedFinancePlan_9-12-13.pdf
25e1	Page 5 of Letters from Oregon Treasurer, Ted Wheeler, excerpt from 25w2 documenting the fact that an Oregon-Only plan has replaced the original bi-state plan defined in the Locally Preferred Alternative
25w2	Letters from Oregon treasurer, Ted Wheeler, whole document referenced in 25e1 http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/CRC/OregonStateTreasurer_letteroffindings_9-26-13.pdf
25e3	Letter from Laura Lockwood, Director or Oregon Debt Management Division, states that the original bi-state LPA was changed to an Oregon-Only plan in August 2013, excerpt from page 7 of 25w2
25w4	Sept 11 letter from Congresswoman Jaime Herrera Beutler calls the CRC project “a completely different project from the plan originally submitted by the CRC” http://herreraeutler.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=349217
26e1	Excerpt from page 10 of 19w3, Record of Decision specifies tolls subject to both Washington and Oregon. But 24w4 changed to Oregon having unilateral control of toll rates.
26w2	Compare 24w1 to 24w4 CRC 2013 Finance plan
27w1	See pages 3,4 and 5 of Coast Guard Letter from Vice Commandant Sally Brice-O’Hara, December 7, 2011, Requires CRC to ensure to maintain sufficient bridge clearance for existing and future commerce. Requires examples such as Schooner Creek Boat Works to not be harmed http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCwQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcolumniarivercrossing.org%2FFileLibrary%2FTechnicalReports%2FCG%2520Vice%2520COMDT%2520letter%2520to%2520DOT%2520S2%2520Dec%25202011.PDF&ei=Q42OUumeE4qaiAK6m4A4&usg=AFQjCNEK6F3H_ZL1p7_E6WhSPxf26d8x7w&sig2=5NBg7lk_A3OcKolsM45eFA
27w2	Letter from Steve Rander, Schooner Creek Boat Works states that the CRC has not done so. By phone call, Rander stated that the CRC has not even tried.
27w3	Letter from JT Marine states that their business will be negatively impacted by the bridge height and no mitigation has been provided. Requirements of Coast Guard letter have not been fulfilled.
28w1	See 12w2 to see that revenue for Light Rail O&M has not been provided or sufficiently identified. Sales tax on general transportation projects may not be a reliable revenue source for Light Rail O&M, 4:15 marker of the following video http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E9YGfRwygtU&feature=share
29w1	C-Tran Board Resolution BR-13-014 to sign agreement with TriMet without satisfying C-Tran’s requirement of BR-08-019 and C-Tran 2030 plan which require a vote of the people for any means of funding Light Rail, grossly violates of C-Tran policy PBD-015 and those same requirements written into the LPA. See 31w2 for contract.
30e1	C-Tran bylaw section 4.8.2 excerpt from page 5, such actions “shall be by Resolution or Ordinance” Board Members did not see the TriMet contract before it was signed. Contract violates fundamental C-Tran policies that were adopted by resolution including BR-08-019 which requires a vote of the people, C-Tran’s 2030 plan which requires a vote of the people, cites nonexistent funding partnerships, in violation of C-Tran policy PBD-015
30w2	C-Tran bylaws – whole document referenced in 30e1 http://www.c-tran.com/assets/Board/Resource_Documents/C-TRAN--Bylaws_FINAL_2012.pdf

31e1	C-Tran / TriMet contract excerpt shows \$5 million liquidated damages clause not approved by the C-Tran Board
31w2	C-Tran / TriMet 40-page contract signed Sept. 27, 2013

Additional references may be added as they become available.