From:	Sarah Watson
To:	Draft EIS Feedback; Gundersen, Heather;
CC:	Cortright, Bob; Crall, Matthew; Richard Whitman; WARNER Chris;
Subject:	Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Date:	Tuesday, July 01, 2008 4:22:26 PM
Attachments:	gundersen.070108..pdf

Heather -

S-005-001

Please find attached a letter from Richard Whitman of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Columbia River Crossing. A hard copy of the letter will also be sent.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Thank you.

-Sarah Watson

Sarah Watson, Assistant to the Director
Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150
Salem, Oregon 97301-2540
Phone: 503.373.0050 ext. 271
Fax: 503/378-5518
email: sarah.watson@state.or.us
http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/index.shtml

Oregon
Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol Street, Suite 150
Salem, OR 97301-2540
(503) 373-0050
Fax (503) 378-5518
www.lcd.state.or.us

July 1, 2008

Heather Gundersen
Environmental Manager
Columbia River Crossing
700 Washington Street, Suite 300
Vancouver WA 98660

Sent via email:DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org
gundersenh@columbiarivercrossing.org

Re: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Gunderson:

S-005-002 The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development is pleased to have had the opportunity participate in the planning process for the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) through the InterCEP group. The purpose of that collaborative process has been the early identification of issues that could preclude the CRC from obtaining the necessary permits and authorizations later in the process. Based upon our review of the information to date and of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), we do not see any such issues at this time.

We do, however, have several advisory comments regarding the DEIS. First, we have some procedural recommendations to better integrate the alternative selection process into the land use planning process. Second, there are several policy issues that we recommend be analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

S-005-003 **1. Clarify the land use decision-making steps for approval of the proposed action described in the EIS, and provide necessary supporting information for these decisions.**

Additional information is needed addressing relevant land use planning requirements as provided for in the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) State Agency Coordination, which is found in Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 731-015. The EIS should provide a clear description of what land use decisions will be needed to carry out the proposed action, and provide supporting information so that the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) can be readily reviewed by local and regional agencies that need to adopt plan amendments or other land use decisions.

S-005-003

OAR 731-015-0075(2) requires the DEIS to, "identify and address relevant land use requirements in sufficient detail to support subsequent land use decisions necessary to authorize the project."

Additionally, OAR 731-015-0075(3) requires that ODOT obtain, "all plan amendments and zone changes necessary to achieve compliance with the statewide planning goals and compatibility with local comprehensive plans … before completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement".

Chapter 9 of the Land Use Technical Report mentions the need for an Interchange Area Plan at the state level and various land development permits from the City of Portland. This chapter does not, however, address the process that will be necessary to amend regional and local transportation system plans to incorporate the details of the LPA.

The EIS should include a list of local, regional and state plans that will be need to be amended to incorporate the LPA. This list should include the applicable policies and standards in those plans and findings that the policies and standards are met or will be met by the LPA. The EIS should also include a procedural road map outlining how and when the necessary amendments will be made.

Our review suggests that the following plan amendments are likely to be needed:

- Amendment to the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (State Component) to include decisions about mode, function and general location of planned facilities, services and improvements. Currently the Metro RTP indicates only that additional capacity is needed at the Columbia River Crossing, but does not specify mode, function or general location. Amendments to the Metro RTP (State Component) are needed to express specific land use decisions about how that need will be met, the combination of modes that are planned, the function of planned facilities and improvements and their general capacity and location.

- Amendment to the Metro RTP (Federal Component) to include the LPA in the financially constrained project list.

- Other local, regional and state plan amendments or land use actions that will be necessary to carry out preferred alternative – including mitigation measures – such as an Interchange Area Plan. These plan amendments should be described in sufficient detail so that the local government agencies can readily understand what will be required of them.

S-005-004

2. Include measures, such as congestion pricing, to address transportation needs under the no-build alternative.

The no-build alternative in the FEIS should include analysis of alternative measures to address the purpose and need of the project. One measure to reduce congestion is tolling, specifically congestion pricing, on the existing bridges to better manage the limited capacity. Analysis of

S-005-004

tolling in conjunction with the no-build alternative would enable decision-makers to understand how much of the benefit of the build alternatives is a result of tolling and how much is a result of other elements (e.g. high capacity transit and increased highway capacity). We have previously suggested this in written comments on the evaluation criteria (April 2007), written comments on the preliminary DEIS (April 2008), and at meetings of the InterCEP group.

S-005-005

3. Clarify model assumptions to ensure the EIS correctly predicts likely impacts of build alternatives on land development patterns.

The FEIS should clarify several assumptions. One key assumption when projecting future vehicle travel is the cost of fuel. Recently fuel costs have risen significantly, but it is not clear what assumptions about future prices were used when preparing the projections within the DEIS.

Another assumption that should be clarified is the time flexibility of commuters. Currently the bridge is at capacity during peak hours, yet the DEIS suggests that commute related traffic growth will continue to increase through the year 2035. Given that most workers start work at sometime between 7 and 9 am and return home between 3 to 6 pm, over how many hours during the day is it reasonable that commute trips would spread? Do DEIS assumptions about total peak period commute trips in the no-build fit within capacity during the hours of the day when we expect people would commute?

A final issue that should be further analyzed is the possibility that traffic levels will be higher than projected in the DEIS. Higher traffic levels could result from the reduction in congestion that would lower the overall cost (even including tolling) for some travelers, and thus alter their decisions about route, time of departure, place of employment and where to live. The DEIS appears to assume that a $2 toll is sufficient to counterbalance the time savings from reduced congestion. This basis for this assumption is uncertainty, however, and additional explanation is warranted.

S-005-006

4. Transportation Effects on Land Use and Development

If additional vehicle capacity significantly reduces congestion, land use and development patterns may change in response. We recognize that the traffic projections show a net decrease in vehicle crossings in the build alternatives due to tolling and the addition of high capacity transit (HCT). We understand the argument that this decrease in trips makes it unlikely that significant land use changes would occur. However, a decrease in overall trips does not necessarily mean that the additional trips resulting from highway expansion are the same trips (i.e. same length and timing) that are eliminated due to tolling and HCT. Additional trips resulting from highway expansion may be trips from more distant origins that are now within a reasonable travel shed of destinations on the other side of the bridge. Trips eliminated by HCT are likely to trips from closer origins served by HCT. Trips eliminated by tolling are likely to be shorter trips for which the monetary toll is a significant increase in the total cost. This net shift towards longer trips could lead to land use changes.

S-005-006

We support tolling, and agree it would aid in mitigating land use effects of expanded bridge capacity. However, to extent adoption of tolling remains an open question, analysis of build alternatives should address land use effects of build alternatives if tolls are not imposed.

S-005-007

5. Mitigation Measure: Adjust tolls to meet traffic projections.

To address the uncertainty surrounding traffic projections and the potential for land use impacts beyond what is projected in the DEIS, we recommend that the LPA include a binding policy that adaptive management will be used to set tolls to ensure that the reductions in vehicle crossing and VMT anticipated in the DEIS are in fact achieved.

We appreciate your consideration of these comments, and we would be pleased to work with the CRC team on implementing these recommendations.

Yours very truly,

Richard Whitman
Director

cc: Matt Garrett, Director - Oregon Department of Transportation
Mike Carrier, Governor's Natural Resources Policy Director

rw/swjh/gundersen.070108

From: Bomar, Audri
To: feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org;
CC:
Subject: FW: CRC DEIS Commentsjuly3.doc
Date: Monday, July 07, 2008 8:31:14 AM
Attachments: CRC DEIS Commentsjuly3.doc

From: Gundersen, Heather
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2008 4:19 PM
To: Taylor, Megan; Bomar, Audri
Cc: Lifsey, Margi
Subject: FW: CRC DEIS Commentsjuly3.doc
Importance: High

Attached are comments from Ecology. Terry Swanson sent in the original comments on the 1st, but they were not reviewed and she asked that I wait until she could format them. The final comments are attached. Sorry that they are late, but the woman who was helping hurt her hand on Monday and had to go to the emergency room. Terry even sent photos of this to prove it. She apologized for the delay - she thought they would be ready on the 1st.

From: Swanson, Terry (ECY) [mailto:tswa461@ECY.WA.GOV]
Sent: Thu 7/3/2008 2:54 PM
To: Gundersen, Heather; Gundersen, Heather
Subject: CRC DEIS Commentsjuly3.doc

S-007-001

<<CRC DEIS Commentsjuly3.doc>> Heather, here are Ecology's substantive comments. Via regular mail, you will receive a signed cover letter with attachments.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks,

Terry Swanson

Department of Ecology

Columbia River Crossing Project
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments
July 1, 2008

The following comments address the environmental considerations for each of the headlined subject areas. Each comment section includes the staff contact information if needed for follow-up.

AIR QUALITY [Bob Saunders (360) 407-6888; rsau461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-002
1. In E2SHB 2815, the Washington legislature set goals for substantial reductions in vehicle miles traveled in the state. The CRC options provide for bus rapid transit or light rail as well as transportation system management and transportation demand management. It is crucial that this project's plans address the goals in E2SHB 2815 and include highly effective transit and demand management provisions that enhance the ability of the Vancouver area to meet the travel reduction goals in E2SHB 2815.

S-007-003
2. The EIS identifies the project's long-term and temporary effects on air quality and states that long-term effects, based on projected emission levels in 2030, are not significant and require no mitigation. That conclusion primarily is due to lower emissions levels from both light and heavy duty vehicles by 2030. We concur with the general expectation of lower emissions and no need for mitigation due to lower future vehicle emissions, but we have not reviewed the detailed analysis of the magnitude of changes resulting from the project.

S-007-004
3. WSDOT should ensure that the Southwest Clean Air Agency and Ecology's Air Quality Program have the opportunity to review the contractor's proposed pollution control plan and to periodically review its implementation. WSDOT should require that the contractors plan achieve a specified reduction in construction related emissions of diesel PM. WSDOT should consult with Ecology and Southwest Clean Air Agency to determine this amount, which should fall in the range of 40%. This approach allows the contractor maximum flexibility to determine how best to achieve the reduction target through cleaner fuels, cleaner engines, retrofitted engines, anti-idling measures, fuel additives, construction staging, and other measures.

S-007-005
4. The EIS also identifies "extensive" construction activities and resulting temporary air quality impacts. The temporary effects should also be described as extensive. The impacts of construction related emissions occurring continuously for many years are extensive and severe. Populations living near the construction areas will experience higher levels of adverse health effects and risk from diesel particulate than they would otherwise. The effects of diesel particulate are well documented and include increased risk of several kinds of cancer; asthma episodes, including those requiring medication or hospitalization; increased symptoms and acute episodes for people with respiratory and cardiac impairments.

S-007-006
5. The EIS indicates that "construction mitigation would include measures to control dust and exhaust emissions from demolition and construction activities and minimize the effects of traffic congestion." Requiring the plan to addresses exhaust emissions, in addition to dust

S-007-006 and congestion, is an essential and appropriate provision for this project. It's also a new and unique provision and we applaud WSDOT for addressing diesel emissions from construction equipment. To control these impacts, the contractor "would be required" to have a pollution control plan for temporary effects. The exhaust emission provision needs to remain a part of the CRC project plans, and it needs to be implemented robustly, including consistent and effective compliance checking and oversight to ensure proper implementation.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE [Millie Piazza; (360)407-6177; mpia461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-007 1. Accountability: While the DEIS notes efforts to provide extensive opportunity for public involvement and translation services – it is unclear what public concerns were raised or how/if they were addressed. Tribal and community concerns about environmental, economic, health, and other related impacts should be clearly reflected in the main body of the DEIS.

S-007-008 2. Representative Participation: It is unclear how demographically representative the public comments were.

S-007-009 3. Comment Period Length: A sixty-day comment period for the DEIS (that exceeds 1000 pages) may be inadequate. This is a particular concern for persons requiring technical support, such as community based organizations, tribes, people of color, low-income persons, and non-English or low-proficiency English speakers.

S-007-010 4. Baseline Conditions: To ensure that the five project alternatives neither perpetuate nor exacerbate environmental injustices, disproportionate impacts and mitigation plans should be clearly identified to the extent possible, including:

   a. Existing conditions of impacted communities
   b. Areas exceeding FHWA's traffic noise impacts criteria
   c. Areas exceeding air quality standards
   d. Areas exceeding other environmental quality standards
   e. Long-term plans for environmental monitoring
   f. Plans to bring non-compliance areas into compliance

S-007-011 5. Health Impact Assessment: The significant association of premature death with long-term exposure to fine airborne particulate matter (*EPA Final Rule* - 70 FR 943), raises concern about the health effects of air pollution on communities near transportation corridors. To the extent possible, the CRC proponents should clearly communicate to impacted communities whether the environment where they live or work (near the project area) is healthful or unhealthful. Particular attention should be paid to:

   a. Presenting existing data on health inequalities and excess death
   b. Planning for monitoring the health effects of air pollution
   c. Assessing cumulative risks for impacted communities
   d. Assessing community and health impacts during the construction phase of the project

S-007-012 6. Equitable Economic Development: An assessment be made. The proponents should assess the impact that the alternatives will have on economically disadvantaged businesses, including women and minority owned enterprises. To the extent possible, this

S-007-012 should include a proposal that ensures equal opportunity in project workforce and transportation contracting, and jobs training.

OTHER EJ RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 3: Existing Conditions and Environmental Consequences

3.5 Neighborhoods and Environmental Justice

S-007-013 1. Provide a summary of the primary public environmental justice concerns and comments gathered from the public involvement process.

S-007-014 2. Further document how increased vehicle capacity (Alternatives 2-5) will not have a significant impact on air quality (Reference DEIS: p. 80).

S-007-015 3. Articulate an alternative mitigation plan for those areas identified that currently exceed FHWA's traffic noise impacts criteria – with particular focus on the Shumway, Rose Village, and Esther Short neighborhoods (Ref: p. 161-162 Alternative #2). As identified in the CRC DEIS, these communities are disproportionately below the poverty level. In addition, Rose Village has a greater percentage of households without cars, persons with disabilities, minority population, and Hispanic population (Ref: p. 152).

S-007-016 4. Further assess an alternative or community mitigation proposal for the impacts from an expansion of the TriMet Facility in Gresham (Ref: p. 163).

S-007-017 5. Provide social and environmental impact assessments for the alternatives' construction phases, particularly regarding the impacts of truck traffic, vehicle congestion, and air quality (Ref: p. 177).

S-007-018 6. Articulate a process to ensure equity in the determination of property acquisition and relocation packages (e.g., grants for independent property appraisal and technical assistance). (Ref: p. 178)

S-007-019 7. Identify socio-economic impacts for areas that will become new border properties (i.e., abutting the expanded transportation corridor) after completion of a CRC build alternative.

S-007-020 8. Despite the suggested limitations of emissions modeling (p. 275), an evaluation of current and projected environmental and health impacts is integral to an environmental justice assessment. Alternative health impact assessment data include the measurement of inequities in: incidence of cardiovascular disease, asthma attacks, bronchitis, and hospital and emergency room visits. This assessment should highlight vulnerable populations including neighborhoods with high percentages of people who are over 65, under 5, below the poverty level, with disabilities, and minority or Hispanic.

3.19 Cumulative Impacts

S-007-021 1. This section provides a historical overview and impact assessment limited to the various elements of the CRC project. A conventional environmental justice approach to cumulative impacts would integrate a historical, socio-cultural, economic, and environmental analysis. This would incorporate impacts from multiple sources that impact a community's economic, social, and physical well-being. A more comprehensive cumulative impacts assessment should minimally identify other significant environmental impacts, such as facilities, mobile

S-007-021 pollution sources, clean-up sites, and transportation corridors that impact the communities of concern.

HAZARDOUS WASTE & TOXICS REDUCTION [Cristiana Figueroa-Kaminsky; (360)407-6342 cfig461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-022 1. Site Identification: The DEIS's hazardous material technical report contains a list of sites known or suspected to be contaminated by hazardous substances or petroleum products. That report can be further refined with data from two databases internal to Ecology (Environmental Report Tracking System and Revised Site Visit Program) and one federal database (RCRA-Info). The additional data is provided (see attached files) to enhance the identification of potentially contaminated or difficult cleanup sites within the project area.

S-007-023 2. Closure Procedures and Outreach: All impacted facilities that generate dangerous waste and store or manage hazardous materials will need to be closed appropriately and all waste and hazardous substances removed. The parties affected by purchase of their properties may need assistance, and Ecology will need to provide oversight to ensure that dangerous waste generator closures occur as required in WAC 173-300-630 (10). WSDOT and the other project proponents must conduct the necessary outreach effort to the affected parties so that closures and relocations happen in an environmentally sound manner. Ecology's HWTR Program can assist by identifying pertinent publications.

S-007-024 3. Soil or Groundwater Contamination**:** When soil and groundwater is contaminated with dangerous waste constituents as defined in WAC 173-303, then the soils and/or groundwater also are considered to be dangerous waste. If contaminant levels are lower than the Model Toxics Control Act standards for uncontrolled use, the generator can petition the agency to determine if the media instead can be handled as a solid waste.

S-007-025 4. Project Timeframe and Ecology/HW-TR Involvement: This project may generate more work than the HWTR program can currently manage. The proponents might consider an inter-agency agreement to provide resources to HWTR/Ecology to avoid delays resulting from excessive workload.

SHORELINES [Kim VanZwalenburg; (360) 407-6520; kvan461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-026 1. The project falls within the Aquatic and Urban High-Intensity shoreline environments in the Columbia River area and Urban Conservancy shoreline environment in the Burnt Bridge Creek area. These shoreline environments are designated and defined in the Vancouver Shoreline Management Master Program (VSMMP). This should be verified with the City of Vancouver.

S-007-027 2. It appears both Shoreline Substantial Development (SDP) and Shoreline Conditional Use permits (CUP) will be required. Transportation facilities are a permitted use in the VSMMP, but bridge piers waterward of the Ordinary High Water Mark and utility facilities installation require CUPs. (See VSMMP Regulation #66 and the Shoreline Use Table.)

S-007-028 3. It is unclear whether dredging is necessary to construct the bridge piers. Dredging is a shoreline conditional use under the VSMMP in both the Aquatic and Urban: High Intensity shoreline environments.

S-007-029 4. If fill is used during construction the project will need a CUP.

S-007-030 5. Utilities on the existing bridge may require relocation during construction and/or complete bridge replacement. It is unclear whether utility-relocation activities will be covered under applicable shoreline permits for the bridge project or whether utility owners will need to obtain separate permit(s) from the City of Vancouver. This issue needs to be addressed.

SOLID WASTE AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE [Anya Caudill; (360) 407-6084; acau461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-031 1. The Applicant must contact the Clark County health department to determine the need for a solid waste handling permit.

S-007-032 2. When possible, the applicant should reuse or recycle leftover construction materials and reduce generated waste. Recycling construction debris is often less expensive than disposing it in a landfill.

TOXICS [Cris Matthews; (360) 407-6388; crim461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-033 Many known contaminated sites lie within approximately half of a mile of the proposed project. The sites include, but may not be limited to, Ecology FS ID 197, 1050, 4380, 1066, 9189718, 3511806, 28846857, 45241242, 47231541 and 5007183. If environmental contamination is discovered within the project's boundaries it must be reported to Ecology's Southwest Regional Office. Contact the Environmental Report Tracking System Coordinator at (360) 407-6300.

WATER QUALITY [Shiela Pendleton-Orme; (360) 690-4787; shpe461@ecy.wa.gov and Kris Walters; (360)407-6655; krwa461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-034 1. The DEIS does not adequately address water quality protection during construction: A detailed adequate Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), including engineered drawings of the erosion and sediment control plan, must be submitted to Ecology before construction begins, and it must meet the requirements of the NPDES Construction Stormwater General Permit.

S-007-035 2. The DEIS's analysis of water quality impacts is incomplete: Burnt Bridge Creek does not meet Washington State water quality standards for fecal coliform and temperature, but there is no analysis of the increased water quality impacts from the project. While roadway surfaces technically do not produce fecal coliform, roadway runoff does convey it to receiving water bodies. The increase in impervious surfaces and expansion of stormwater ponds will produce a greater volume of stormwater runoff with elevated temperatures. The water quality impacts of these two constituents need to be fully characterized for Burnt Bridge Creek.

S-007-036 3. The DEIS analysis of pollutant increases is inadequate: Pollutant loading to Burnt Bridge Creek will increase for copper, zinc, TSS, and phosphorus**.** Do the concentrations exceed water quality standards? The DEIS and its supporting documentation lack an analysis and, specifically, a biological assessment. There is no mention of toxicity with regard to water quality, yet metals have toxic effects on aquatic life.

S-007-037 4. The conceptual stormwater design report is inadequate: This report is missing some key data used to assess the DEIS approach. There is no discussion of the method that will be used to design stormwater facilities. Which hydrology model will be used? Will there be

S-007-037

additional monitoring? Is it feasible to expand the Burnt Bridge Creek stormwater ponds? The report states that existing stormwater conveyance systems are assumed to have adequate capacity to handle future flows. The DEIS and its supporting documents should have already made such a determination.

S-007-038

5. The DEIS must evaluate the impacts of tolling booths to water quality: According to the DEIS, "Tolling scenarios have no notable effect on water quality," yet "The load of pollutants, like copper, could increase with more start-and-stop traffic, which increases brake pad wear." Although tolling is expected to reduce the overall volume of traffic, that traffic has a tendency to start-and-stop at toll booths. The California Department of Transportation, in their "Discharge Characterization Study Report" dated November 2003, characterized the increase in pollutants generated at various sites, notably Highway and Tolling Plazas. Cadmium, copper, and zinc all showed an 80% increase, and other metals to a lesser degree, in pollutant concentrations at tolling plazas. The DEIS must consider tolling scenarios in water quality analyses to account for increases in these pollutants.

S-007-039

6. The DEIS lacks transparency: The DEIS and supporting documentation (Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report and Conceptual Stormwater Design Report) lack transparency in pollutant loading calculations. Which pollutant concentration values were used to calculate mass loads? The Stormwater report summarized some results of highway runoff testing for dissolved copper, and stated three minimum standards used by OR, WA, and NOAA Fisheries, but didn't go any deeper into calculations or anticipated pollutant loading. What method was used to create the mass loading values as shown in DEIS Exhibits 3.16-6 through 3.16-9?

S-007-040

7. Analysis of water quality should have been in the hydrology and water quality technical report: The discussion of dissolved copper monitoring results, and water quality standards from regulatory agencies, is inappropriately placed in the Conceptual Stormwater Design Report. The Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report should have been used in this context to more fully flesh out water quality, including potential toxic effects from the anticipated increase of all pollutants of concern to Burnt Bridge Creek.

S-007-041

8. One way WSDOT could mitigate impacts from increased traffic along the Clark County I-5 corridor would be for WSDOT to re-evaluate and improve the inspection and maintenance of their stormwater conveyance and treatment systems. In addition to Burnt Bridge Creek, all streams in this corridor have temperature and/or other water quality impairments that would benefit from stormwater improvements.

Construction and Permitting Issues [Sheila Pendleton-Orme; (360) 690-4787; shpe461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-042

1. Coverage under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State Waste Discharge General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities is required for construction sites which disturb an area of one acre or more and which have or will have a discharge of stormwater to surface water or a storm sewer. An application can be downloaded from Ecology's website at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/#Application.

S-007-043

2. Erosion and sediment control measures must be in place prior to any clearing, grading, or construction. These control measures must be effective to prevent stormwater runoff from carrying soils and other pollutants into surface water or storm drains that lead to water of the

S-007-043

state. Sand, silt, clay particles, and soils will damage aquatic habitat and are considered to be pollutants.

S-007-044

3. During construction, all releases of oils, hydraulic fluids, fuels, other petroleum products, paints, solvents, and other deleterious materials must be contained and removed in a manner that will prevent their discharge to waters and soils of the state. The cleanup of spills should take precedence over other work on the site. Proper disposal of construction debris must be on land in such a manner that debris cannot enter the streams, storm drains or cause water quality degradation of state waters.

WETLANDS [Caroline Corcoran; (425) 649-7004; caco461@ecy.wa.gov]

S-007-045

Ecology submitted these comments to the CRC Team in October, 2007 during review of the Wetlands Technical report, but they are not included in the DEIS:

1. Please append Western Washington wetland rating forms to the report.

2. Please include wetland categories in the wetland summaries.

***Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they do not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.*

S-007-046

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

RECEIVED
JUL 01 2008
via fax
Columbia River Crossing

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
North Willamette Watershed District
17330 SE Evelyn St.
Clackamas, OR 97015
Phone: (971) 673-6000
Fax: (971) 673-6074

S-006-001

To: MARGI LIFSEY **From:** JIM BRICK

Fax: **Pages:** 3 (including cover) ✓

Phone: **Date:** 7/1/08

Re: **CC:**

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply ☐ Please Recycle

• **Comments:**

Oregon
John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

Department of Fish and Wildlife
Northwest Region
17330 SE Evelyn Street
Clackamas, OR 97015-9514
(503) 657-2000
FAX (503) 657-2050

6/30/08

Margi Lifsey
Environmental Coordinator
Columbia River Crossing

Re: Columbia River Crossing Comments on 2008 DEIS

S-006-001

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (department) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Interstate 5, Columbia River Crossing Project. The department offers the following comments:

S-006-002

Five alternatives are proposed in the DEIS. These alternatives range from a no build option to a supplemental crossing and a replacement bridge option. Each of the build options includes an alternative with light rail or rapid bus transit.

Currently no preferred alternative is identified, as a result the DEIS lacks specifics needed to assess impacts to fish and wildlife populations. The department offers a few general comments for this DEIS and will continue to work through the InterCEP committee to identify avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures as the project continues to develop and the local preferred alternative (LPA) is chosen.

Potential impacts and concerns include:

S-006-003
- Inwater work periods-This is a topic of extremely high importance to the department. Depending on timing of in-water work, impacts to a number of important, as well as ESA listed fish species, could be realized.

S-006-004
- Hydroacoustic effects-The effects of pile driving on fish have been studied and monitored. Vigilance in maintaining all mitigation measures need to be assured with knowledgeable staff on hand and back-up measures ready to be employed for emergency situations. Depending on the time of year pile driving is occurring a failure of the mitigative measures could result in a fish kill.

S-006-005
- Instream and riparian habitat-Piers, piles and pile caps placed within the floodplain of the Columbia River will occupy a certain amount of area. This area corresponds to a loss of fish habitat and will be realized for the life of the bridge. Riparian habitat will also be affected.

S-006-006
- Wildlife habitat and displacement of nesting raptors-The project will most likely have two layers of impacts on nesting raptors. The first will be relatively short term during construction and the second may be long-term depending on the LPA chosen.

S-006-007
- Fluvial impacts-Fill within the floodplain will impact fluvial processes and thus habitat forming processes for the life of the bridge.

S-006-008
- Water quality-Creation of new impervious surfaces and direct run-off to the river would allow a number of chemicals to enter the river and effect fish migration and health, impacts would vary with the LPA chosen.

S-006-009
- Predator fish-The Columbia River has a number of predatory fish that consume salmonid species rearing or migrating through the area. The addition of pile caps may create areas of hiding for ambush predators.

S-006-010

- Recreational fisheries-Depending on the time of year, construction sequencing and potential local area closures, could have a direct impact on the angling public.

S-006-011

- A Fish Passage Plan will need to be submitted for approval to ODFW. Per Oregon Revised Statute 635-412, any artificial obstruction located in waters of the state in which native migratory fish are currently or were historically present must address fish passage requirements. The Columbia River is home to many species of native migratory fish including multiple species of salmon and steelhead listed under the State and Federal ESA.

S-006-012

Based upon the assessment within the DEIS, the replacement crossing with the stacked bridge/highway transit option, is an improvement over the existing situation in the long term. This alternative will have less area and volume of fill below the ordinary high water line (10-20%). The result of less fill should improve fluvial processes and may provide less hiding space for predatory fish.

This alternative (amongst the build alternatives) can be completed in the shortest amount of time. This corresponds with less inwater work and less impacts to the angling public. This alternative allows treatment of stormwater which ultimately improves existing conditions.

Although discussions will continue through the InterCep Committee to avoid, minimize and mitigate unavoidable impacts, the department supports the replacement alternative with a stacked transit/highway bridge option.

Please feel free to call if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Jim Brick
Regional Transportation Coordinator
North Willamette Watershed District Office
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

RECEIVED
JUN 28 2008
Columbia River Crossing

State of Washington
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mailing Address: 600 Capitol Way N • Olympia, WA 98501-1091 • (360) 902-2200, TDD (360) 902-2207
Main Office Location: Natural Resources Building • 1111 Washington Street SE • Olympia, WA

June 25, 2008

Columbia River Crossing
c/o Heather Gundersen
700 Washington Street, Suite 300
Vancouver, Washington 98660

Dear Ms. Gundersen:

S-002-001 The Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) appreciates the opportunity to participate in the Columbia River Crossing committees, and to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Interstate Columbia River Crossing Project. The Columbia River Crossing presents complex issues and challenges for addressing transportation needs and the environmental impacts of the bridge. WSDOT has brought together diverse expertise, has worked conscientiously to develop solutions and a range of alternatives. Overall the work on this project and the DEIS is commendable.

S-002-002 WDFW through the InterCEP group has established early coordination through meetings and concurrence points. Your commitment to first avoid and then minimize unavoidable impacts to ecosystem, fish and wildlife is a high priority for WDFW hydraulic permitting. The DEIS is based on conceptual designs, therefore specific avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures will be further explored as this project develops and is closer to the actual permitting stage.

S-002-003 **Recommended Preferred Alternative**: From the perspective of providing the highest level of environmental protection for fish and wildlife WDFW is supportive of two of the proposed five alternatives:

Alternative 3: Replacement Crossing with Light Rail
Alternative 2: Replacement Crossing with Bus Rapid Transit.

S-002-004 Within each of these alternatives there is a "Stacked Transit/ Highway Bridge" option that would require only two new bridges. This design option is preferred by WDFW as the least environmentally damaging to fish life.

If there is additional information we can provide, please contact me at (360) 902-2575

Sincerely,

Teresa A. Eturaspe

Teresa A. Eturaspe
WDFW Responsible Official
SEPA/NEPA Coordinator

cc: Tim Rymer, RHPM
Anne Friesz, RHPM