

From: christi@chaikana.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 10:43:50 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97217

Work Zip Code: 97217



Person:

Person commutes in the travel area via:

1. In Support of the following bridge options:
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:
Lincoln Terminus: No Opinion
Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion
Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion
Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

First Name: christine

Last Name: denton

Title:

E-Mail: christi@chaikana.org

Address: 1111 N Winchell

Portland, OR 97217

Comments:

NEPA regs at 1506.6 say that Agencies shall make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures, which has frequently been pointed to in court to make the case that agencies needed to inform the public what their role is during scoping periods, public comment periods, etc. NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1503.3) say that the purpose of the public comment period after the draft is released is in order for the public and agencies to comment on the adequacy of your analysis. The

public comment period on this Draft appears to be a vote regarding the alternatives. While I do appreciate your efforts to poll the public on their opinions at this stage, it appears that you're deflecting the true purpose of the role of the public comment period.

(And by the way: NEPA regs at 1502.7 say that an EIS should normally be less than 150 pages and for proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages.)

At the same time, you're doing a public poll but apparently only among the public who is interested enough to read the EIS and choose to comment, which isn't an adequate representation of the public. What purpose does this poll serve? Is the decision maker going to use this informal poll in their decision?

An analysis of the adequacy of DEIS would include such issues as:

- * A base assumption of this EIS appears to be that traffic will continue to increase. Given other issues such as rising gas prices, a shifting demographics in the population who seem to want to find other options to transport besides burning fossil fuels (irregardless of the price of gas), and a limit on parking spaces in downtown Portland, I don't agree with your base assumption, and think that you need to take a very close study as to whether traffic will really increase.
- * You fail to discuss carpool lanes.