


**From:** [NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page   
**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2008 9:05:50 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97239  
 Work Zip Code: 97224

Person:  
 Other -

Person commutes in the travel area via:  
 Car or Truck

- P-0118-001**
1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
 Supplemental Bridge
  2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:  
 Do Not Add HCT
  3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:  
 Lincoln Terminus: No  
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No  
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No  
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No

Contact Information:  
 First Name:  
 Last Name:  
 Title:  
 E-Mail:  
 Address:

Comments:  
 To: Columbia River Crossing

### P-0118-001

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-0118-002** | It appears from the open house meeting at the Red Lion most recently that business owners in the downtown Vancouver district are rather surprised at what is taking place with the Draft EIS. I understand that neighbors/business owners were not notified in person of the potential loss of their homes/businesses. The communication has not been clear and denial of the extension period for public response sounds like there is more to the story than what is apparent.
- P-0118-003** |
- P-0118-004** | I understand there is a deadline for the federal funding. Sounds like time has been manipulated here so that public comment would be minimized. I believe a vote is necessary by the people most affected in the region.
- P-0118-005** |
- P-0118-006** | There are negative environmental impacts, local ( not state) tax burden, lifestyle impact from the current Draft EIS.
- P-0118-007** |
- P-0118-008** | Quite frankly, I have been driving from Portland to Vancouver for over 20 years during rush hour traffic and I do not find that there is any significant improvement since the MAX Line was installed from Portland to Delta Park. I hear more about accidents, deaths, and criminal activity tied to the MAX Line than how it has improved transit time for the general public. I would not risk my life and ride the MAX Line to save money and be accosted by gang members.
- P-0118-009** |
- P-0118-010** | Light rail will not impact the traffic flow. That is very obvious to me. I work not far from Wilsonville OR. The traffic becomes a tie-up from much further South of Portland and much of it is due to the large transport trucks.
- P-0118-011** | I am opposed to the spending of multi-millions of dollars on the proposed CRC Light Rail project.  
I am not, however, opposed to a new, well constructed interstate bridge.  
  
Thank you for your time.

Joyce Namba  
Portland OR

### **P-0118-002**

Prior to publication of the DEIS, property owners potentially effected by project alternatives were notified directly via mail, and six meetings specifically focused on potential right-of-way needs were held in September of 2007.

### **P-0118-003**

NEPA requires a comment period for a DEIS to be no less than 45 days. Prior to issuing the CRC DEIS, FTA, FHWA and the other project Co-Leads (WSDOT, ODOT, RTC, Metro, TriMet and C-TRAN) decided to extend this to 60 days in order to allow additional time for review and comment. Section 6002 (g)(2)(A) of SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users), the federal transportation reauthorization bill, established a comment period of “no more than 60 days” for DEISs. FTA and FHWA did not see “good cause” (Section 6002 (g)(2)(A)(ii)) for extending the current comment period beyond the 60 days that were already being provided.

The DEIS comment period is only one opportunity during the NEPA process for the public, agencies and tribes to review information and provide input. As discussed in Appendix B of the DEIS, over the three years prior to the publication of the DEIS, the project provided opportunities for stakeholders to comment on numerous components of the draft including the Purpose and Need, Range of Alternatives, methodologies for analyzing impacts to various elements of the environment and preliminary findings. Project staff also participated in meetings with neighborhood groups, business organizations, and other potentially affected stakeholders.

In addition, since the DEIS comment period, there have been numerous community meetings, as well as open houses, and public hearings by project sponsors, providing more opportunities for public input and comment.

**P-0118-004**

Regardless of federal funding cycles, the CRC project provided ample opportunity for input from a diverse constituency of stakeholders and jurisdictions and followed a process that complies with all federal, state and local legal requirements. The project sponsors' intent is to progress at a deliberate pace to ensure that we meet public interests, meet the transportation needs, address the quality of local communities and the environment, and be financially and fiscally responsible. Following publication of the FEIS, there will be a record of decision. If that decision is to move forward with one of the build alternatives, then the sponsors will progress into final engineering, finance plan implementation, and then construction.

**P-0118-005**

There will not be a public vote on construction of the various CRC project elements. However, as a public project, it must be approved and funded by the decisions of elected officials who are themselves directly elected by voters. Long-term operation and maintenance of the new light rail line will be funded through C-TRAN and TriMet. For its share of the operations and maintenance funding, C-TRAN plans on pursuing a public vote.

**P-0118-006**

As discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS, the CRC project has more long-term benefits than adverse impacts compared with the no-build alternative.

**P-0118-007**

Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA.

**P-0118-008**

The current light rail alignment does not extend into Vancouver, does not offer a viable alternative option for those who need to cross the river. For more information on the likely impacts of extending light rail into Vancouver, please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the FEIS.

**P-0118-009**

Safety and security are high priorities for C-Tran and TriMet. CRC, C-TRAN and TriMet are partnering with local jurisdictions, police and neighborhoods to design, implement and operate a safe and secure transit system. A Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP) was created, in part, to address public concerns about safety, and is a requirement for funding from the Federal Transit Administration. Nationally, studies show that crime rates at the stations directly correlated to the amount of crime in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Between 2008 and 2009 TriMet has aggressively enhanced safety and security on its MAX and bus systems. During that time frame, the number of police officers working in the Transit Police Division doubled to 58 officers who spend up to 70 percent of their time patrolling the system. Additionally, TriMet added 15 new fare inspectors and granted authority for all 46 TriMet Road Supervisors to enforce fares.

Please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the FEIS for more information regarding potential impact on crime and plans for ensuring the safety and security of passengers using the light rail system.

**P-0118-010**

The average weekday traffic volume in the project area is expected to be lower with the LPA than with the no-build alternative because of the introduction of high-capacity transit and a toll on the I-5 crossing. For more information on the transportation impacts of the LPA, please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the FEIS.

**P-0118-011**

Thank you for your comment. 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.