From: JAMES FARBER
To: Columbia River Crossing;
CC:
Subject: *** Detected as Spam *** CRC-Eis Comment
Date: Thursday, May 08, 2008 11:54:11 AM
Attachments:

P-0111-001 Of the five alternatives I would go with bus mass transit in either a "replacement" or supplemental scenario but never light rail. The latter is capital intensive, totally inflexible without adding more capital intensity, as monumental as the Roman coliseum and viaducts and unable to take up even 10% of the current I-5 bridge load. And from my experience (not an expensive study) the I-5 Bridge is NOT the problem. The problem is the bottleneck and multitude of short on-off ramps south of the bridge and has been for the 30 years I have been in the NW.

P-0111-002

P-0111-003

P-0111-004 First of all proof has not been provided that the I-5 Bridge is a problem "important to our region and society". I would like to know: a. Who is pushing this and why? b.How did the OR Freeloaders get WA to provide the millions of dollars for studies that always include the light rail to meet OR's light rail vision already brought to the river bank along the I-5 and I-205 corridors. c. Why does OR get to name the bridges? d. How does OR get away with saying that light rail will be included or we will not approve any bridge???

P-0111-005

P-0111-006

P-0111-007 OR screws WA every chance they get. I challenged one Oregonian reporter about Delta Park funnel being the problem not the bridge. His response was "Why should we care, it only affects WA residents not Oregonians". In other words we will illegally take your money (income tax) but we will not give you any of ours. Perhaps the millions spent studying CRCs might have been better spent bring jobs over to WA rather than moving people to OR. After all it would save your constituents both tax and, now especially, gas money.

P-0111-008

P-0111-009 Secondly, I have yet to see graphics showing the population

P-0111-001

Preferences for specific alternatives or options, as expressed in comments received before and after the issuance of the DEIS, were shared with local sponsor agencies to inform decision making. Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected a replacement I-5 bridge with light rail to Clark College as the project's Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). These sponsor agencies, which include the Portland City Council, Vancouver City Council, TriMet Board, C-TRAN Board, Metro Council, RTC Board, considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force when voting on the LPA.

With the LPA, new bridges will replace the existing Interstate Bridges to carry I-5 traffic, light rail, pedestrians and bicyclists across the Columbia River. Light rail will extend from the Expo Center MAX Station in Portland to a station and park and ride at Clark College in Vancouver. Pedestrians and bicyclists would travel along a wider and safer path than exists today.

For a more detailed description of highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements associated with the LPA, see Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

P-0111-002

Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected light rail to Clark College as the project's preferred transit mode. These sponsor agencies, which include the Vancouver City Council, Portland City Council, C-TRAN Board, TriMet Board, RTC Board and Metro Council considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force (a broad group of stakeholders representative of the range of interests affected by the project - see the DEIS Public

P-0111-009 movements and trends over the past 30 years. The impression is that the Clark County trend is east ward and/or north ward. Am not sure about OR. Seems like their movement is more south and west while retaining the eastern direction toward Gresham as is. Where the traffic is coming from and where it needs to go strike me as extremely important considerations for any bridge work. I idea of simply getting across the river is not viable justification for more bridge work

P-0111-010 Third, I have not seen a lot of consideration given to tiering, building one highway on top of what is already here. In the same amount of space the number of traffic lanes is automatically doubled. There are numerous examples of this around the country, one in Portland, a number of them in the SF area (Bay Bridge).

My comments as requested.
Jim Farber, Amboy, WA,

Involvement Appendix for more information regarding the CRC Task Force) before voting on the LPA.

As illustrated in the DEIS, and summarized in Exhibit 29 (page S-33) of the Executive Summary, light rail would better serve transit riders than bus rapid transit (BRT) within the CRC project area. Light rail would carry more passengers across the river during the PM peak, result in more people choosing to take transit, faster travel times through the project area, fewer potential noise impacts, and lower costs per incremental rider than BRT. Additionally, light rail is more likely to attract desirable development on Hayden Island and in downtown Vancouver, which is consistent with local land use plans.

P-0111-003

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) completed Phase I construction of the I-5 Delta Park widening project in fall 2010. Phase I of the project involved widening I-5 and lengthening the entrance and exit ramps at Victory Boulevard and Columbia Boulevard. Phase II involves improving local streets and will begin when funding is secured. Phase I of the Delta Park project widened the current 2-lane segment of southbound I-5 to 3 lanes. There are currently no immediate plans to widen I-5 south of Delta Park. Neither the CRC project nor the Delta Park projects are intended to address the southbound traffic congestion that currently exists near the I-5/I-405 split. However, traffic analyses show the congestion at the split will not be worsened because of the Columbia River Crossing project. The main reason is that fewer cars are expected to cross the river with a project in 2030 than without a project. This is due to the provision of improved transit service and tolling.

Beyond the CRC and Delta Park projects, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan recommended a comprehensive list of modal actions relating to: additional transit capacity and service; additional rail capacity; land use and land use accord; transportation

demand/system management; environmental justice; additional elements and strategies (such as new river crossings); and financing. RTC and Metro are tasked with initiating recommendations as part of their regional transportation planning role. Examples of current efforts include RTC's evaluation of future high-capacity transit in Clark County, and evaluation of needs for future river crossings. Regional planners have investigated solutions to existing bottlenecks at the I-5 connections with I-405 and I-84. ODOT is responsible for conducting ongoing studies to identify other congestion problems on I-5 in Oregon that may need to be addressed in the future.

P-0111-004

As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the CRC project's Purpose and Need Statement highlights the problems associated with the existing I-5 Bridge. These problems include growing travel demand and congestion; impaired freight movement; limited public transportation operation, connectivity and reliability; highway safety; substandard bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and seismic vulnerability. The Purpose and Need Statement is based on extensive analysis of the existing transportation problems in the I-5 CRC corridor, and reflects extensive feedback from the public and stakeholder groups.

P-0111-005

In 2006, WSDOT and ODOT agreed to a goal of contributing equally to the costs of the environmental process needed to reach a Record of Decision. This goal was agreed to in recognition that this project would contribute to the economic and freight mobility needs of both states and would include transit, highway and bridge improvements in both states. Though it is WSDOT and ODOT's shared goal to keep the project as close to equally funded as possible, it is understood that at any moment in time the total funds provided by WSDOT and ODOT may not be equal, owing primarily to the fact that each state's legislature operates on its

own schedule and federal earmarks dedicated to this project are of unequal amounts and have been earmarked at different times.

P-0111-006
Light rail has been endorsed by every Sponsoring Agency (Vancouver City Council, C-TRAN, RTC, Portland City Council, TriMet, and Metro), whose boards are comprised of the elected leadership of the region.

P-0111-007
See discussion above regarding the I-5 Delta Park widening project.

P-0111-008
The project's improvements for freight, reliability and transit access area expected to stimulate economic activity and job growth. The economic analysis indicates that job growth in Vancouver and at the Port of Vancouver will benefit from the project. The construction of the project itself will also provide jobs to workers in Clark County. Vancouver, Clark County, the Columbia River Economic Development Council, and other organizations work together to increase the jobs to population ratio in Clark County.

P-0111-009
By 2030, the region's population is expected to increase by one million people. This increase will result in more people needing to travel between home, work, school, recreation, etc. Currently, 135,000 vehicles cross the Columbia River on the Interstate Bridge which leads to 4-6 hours of congestion each weekday. By 2030, 184,000 are predicted to cross the river, which would lead to 15 hours of daily congestion if no action is taken.

P-0111-010
The Stacked/Transit Highway Bridge (STHB) option, which would allow

transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians to travel beneath the highway bridge deck, was included as part of the LPA. The DEIS indicated that the two bridges required for this bridge option would put less bridge sub-structure in the Columbia River, likely resulting in less environmental impact. After publication of the DEIS, additional engineering studies were conducted that confirmed the feasibility of the STHB design.

The STHB is described in greater detail in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2) of the FEIS. Impacts associated with a STHB are discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the FEIS.