From: Jon T. Haugen
To: Draft EIS Feedback;
CC: jonthaugen@msn.com;
Subject: *** Detected as Spam *** Senate, 10MAY08, Public Comment, Columbia River Crossing
Date: Saturday, May 10, 2008 12:01:56 PM
Attachments:

Saturday, 10 May 2008

DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org
Columbia River Crossing
700 Washington Street, Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660
360-737-2725; 1-866-396-2726
Fax: 360-737-0294

Hello,
Columbia River Crossing I have several questions.

P-0125-001 1. Under Alternative 4 and 5 why will the existing bridges be re-stripped decreasing travel lanes from six total lanes to four total lanes?
a. What is the congestion hours if current stripping remains with six total lanes? (Re-stripping, four total lanes, hours of congestion 10.75 hours per day.)

P-0125-002 2. Will I-5 be widened on any of the plans before or after the river? If yes how much wider will I-5 be and for how many miles on each side of the Columbia river (not including dedicated bus lanes)?

P-0125-003 3. The exclusive bus lanes extend 2.07-4.22 miles north of the Expo Center. Why the difference from 2.07 to 4.22? What determines whether these lanes will be 2.07 miles or 4.22 miles?

P-0125-004 4. Why the difference in buses and light rail required units between supplemental and replacement bridges?
Supplemental: Buses: 38, 60 foot buses, 143 standard buses; Light Rail: 18

P-0125-001

The re-striping was intended to help improve safety and congestion. The lack of shoulders and the narrow lanes contribute to high accident rates at the Hayden Island and other interchanges. Also, accidents can not be removed from the travel lanes, as the bridge has no shoulders currently.

Keeping the striping as is, and the traffic results of such, are documented as the No-Build alternative.

P-0125-002

Following the selection of the LPA in July of 2008, the CRC Project Sponsors Council (PSC) was developed to provide recommendations to the project on a variety of issues, including the number of add/drop lanes over the river crossing. Over the course of several months, PSC was provided with operational characteristics and potential environmental impacts of 8-, 10-, and 12-lane options. These technical evaluation criteria included, but were not limited to, traffic safety, congestion, traffic diversion onto local streets and I-205, regional vehicle miles travelled, transit ridership, regional economic impact, effects to neighborhoods, and protected species and habitats. In additional to the technical information, PSC received input from CRC advisory groups and reviewed public comment submitted to the project and obtained during two public Q&A sessions in January 2009 regarding the number of lanes decision, as well as hearings conducted by Portland City Council and by Metro Council. In August 2010, the PSC voted unanimously to recommend that the replacement bridges be constructed with 10 lanes and full shoulders. For more information regarding the number of lanes decision making process, see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS.

The proposed new lanes are add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges), which are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area, and

P-0125-004 rail cars, 147 standard buses.
Replacement: Buses: 27, 60 foot buses, 12 standard buses; Light Rail: 14 rail cars, 27 standard buses.

P-0125-005 5. S-Curve effect on river traffic. Current rail bridge built in 1908. Has consideration been given to replacing the rail bridge to eliminate S-Curve effect on river navigation?

Thank you.

Jon Haugen
13502 NW 49th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98685
360-907-8340
18th LD Senate candidate
www.HaugenSenate.com

Letter to the Editor, The Columbian
Friday, 9 May 2008

Columbia River Crossing DEIS

P-0125-006 I have read the Columbia River Crossing Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Seems three years and $80 million dollars ago the planners were told to produce a document to support spending $4.1 Billion to replace six lanes of traffic with six lanes of traffic plus light rail. That document has been produced.

P-0125-007 Fatal flaws: 1. Replacement of the BNSF Rail Bridge, built in 1908, was not considered. Because of this oversight the Supplemental Bridge options are specious. 2. Supplemental Bridge: leaving current I-5 bridges but re-stripping six lanes of traffic to four lanes of traffic invalidates any meaningful traffic reduction comparisons.

P-0125-008 I have testified and advocate building an eight mile elevated highway between SR-500 in Vancouver and I-84 in Portland. This expressway with four lanes would relieve I-5 congestion by adding 66% more lanes.

accommodate the 68 to 75% of traffic that enters and/or exits I-5 within two miles of the Columbia River.

P-0125-003

The DEIS evaluated four transit terminus options that varied in length from 2.07 to 4.22 miles.

The bus rapid transit option, which was evaluated in the DEIS, was not included in the LPA. For a more detailed description of how the LPA was adopted, please see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS.

P-0125-004

The difference in vehicle needs was not dependent on bridge type but rather assumed transit headways. The DEIS
evaluated "efficient operations" and "increased operations". Increased operations had reduced headways and therefore needed additional vehicles. Increased or efficient operations could be utilized on either bridge type.

P-0125-005

Replacing the BNSF railroad bridge could have beneficial effects on river navigation, but would not solve other river navigation issues. The I-5 bridge would still need to lift for regular monitoring and maintenance and for occasional taller vessels such as construction barges and high-mast recreational vessels. More importantly, replacing the BNSF railroad bridge, which is private property, would address almost none of the stated Purpose and Need for the proposed action as described in Chapter 1 (Section 1.3) of the DEIS.

P-0125-006

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the

P-0125-009 No light rail. At $250 million per mile, serving only downtown Vancouver, it is too expensive and too limited.

P-0125-010 I have testified and advocate using heavy rail not light rail. A third rail line from Kelso to Portland with stops in Kalama, Woodland, Ridgefield and Vancouver. Replace the Columbia rail bridge with a new three rail pair bridge. This idea would increase commerce. On existing rails: a route from Washougal and Camas to Vancouver and Portland; a route from Battle Ground to Vancouver and Portland.

Jon Haugen
13502 NW 49th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98685
360-907-8340
www.HaugenSenate.com

CRC project's Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) and Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS explain how the project's Sponsoring Agencies solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, and tribes for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, such as a possible third transportation corridor across the Columbia River, alternative transit modes, and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and found that alternatives that do not include improvements to the existing I-5 facility generally do not address the seismic vulnerability of the existing I-5 bridges, traffic congestion on I-5, or the existing safety problems caused by sub-standard design of I-5. Traffic modeling showed that even significant investment in improving transit options in the corridor or building a third corridor was not enough to alleviate future traffic demand and existing safety hazards on I-5. It is important to note that transit and river crossing components were not eliminated simply because they could not accommodate future vehicular trips. For example, both light rail and tolling help to decrease vehicular demand. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the screening process used to develop project alternatives.

P-0125-007

Please see response to comments P-0125-001 and -005.

P-0125-008

As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the project's Purpose and Need reflects "previous planning studies, solicitation of public input, and coordination with stakeholder groups." This outreach, and prior planning studies, identified improving transit service along the I-5 corridor as an important element of this project. This need is included in the project's Purpose and Need. As such, any alternative (except No-Build) evaluated in the DEIS must address this need to improve transit service.

P-0125-009

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 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-0125-010

Please see response to comments P-0125-005 and -006.