02985 1 of 2 **P-0219-001**

Thank you for taking the time to submit your comments on the I-5 CRC DEIS.

P-0219-002

Based on modeling and analysis, the CRC LPA is expected to significantly increase transit ridership and reduce the number of vehicles crossing the river. This shift toward transit, reduction in auto crossings, reduced congestion, removal of bridge lifts, and lower accident rates are all factors that contribute to lower CO2 emissions with the project than without it. These factors will also make it easier for the region to meet goals for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

While there was no standard threshold or standardized methodology for estimating GHG emissions when the DEIS was being developed, the project team worked with federal and state agencies to develop an appropriate analysis methodology that would allow disclosure of impacts and a comparison of alternatives. Chapter 3 (Section 3.19) of the DEIS summarized the results of GHG emissions and climate change analysis conducted for the DEIS alternatives. Further detail was included in the Energy Technical Report that was released along with the DEIS. Following the public comment period on the DEIS, the Metro Council and Portland City Council requested the CRC project team secure independent review of the GHG evaluation conducted for the DEIS. The "Columbia River Crossing Greenhouse Gas Emission Analysis Expert Review Panel Report" (January 8, 2009) describes the activities and findings of the independent review panel. The panel concluded that the GHG evaluation methods and the findings in the DEIS were valid and reasonable. They also found that the findings were likely conservative, and that the LPA would likely reduce GHG emissions even more than estimated in the DEIS. The GHG and climate change analysis in Chapter 3 (Section 3.19) of the FEIS updates the analysis that was in DEIS, but the basic conclusion that the LPA would have lower emissions than No-

From: Julia Peters

To: <u>Columbia River Crossing</u>;

CC: Martha Koenig; Annie Wilkins; Bruce Brown; Meghan

Buckner; Sarah Knuth; Michael Knapp; Thomas Bruketta;

Teresa Duffey;

Subject: I-5 Bridge

Date: Thursday, June 26, 2008 11:03:05 AM

Attachments:

Hello!

P-0219-001

Thanks so much for taking public feedback on this project! I am a Portland resident who lives near I-5 off Killingsworth. I have been watching this project with a lot of interest. I appreciate the hard work of everyone involved and am especially excited to see all the environmental measures being considered (recycled materials, wind and solar power, carbon sequestering, fish habitat protection, stormwater treatment, etc.).

P-0219-002

That being said, I am not in support of spending \$4+ billion. But that is only one factor. Indeed, I want to see our region thrive (economically and in all other ways), but I see this traffic expansion as going directly against Portland and the State of Oregon's goals to reduce our carbon emissions 20% below 1990 levels. Studies show that traffic flow increases with capacity. If we're serious about climate change and our environmental impact, it's time to start making some difficult decisions and be creative about ways to meet everyone's needs while reducing our impact.

P-0219-003

I urge you to consider other options and also encourage massive public education efforts. It's time to take advantage of rising gas prices and encourage folks to do transportation differently (carpool, public transit, bike!, etc.). It is my belief that as gas prices rise and hit people where it hurts (in their pocketbooks), behaviors will change. At least, that is my hope.

I am encouraging my friends to weigh in on this topic, too. I hope you get a lot of responses.

Thanks again for your many hours of work and discussions with the public. Peace...

~Julia Peters

Julia Peters

Education and Prevention Services Coordinator Volunteers of America Men's Residential Center

2 of 2

2318 NE MLK Jr Blvd Portland, OR 97212 jpeters@voaor.org 503-802-0299 The CRC project embodies nearly all of the Governor's Climate Change Integration Group's recommendations for planning transportation projects to reduce GHG emissions. These recommendations include highway tolling, relieving chronic highway bottlenecks, increasing transit, and increasing pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Meeting the legislative goal to reduce future statewide emissions below 1990 levels will require numerous actions in all sectors. There is no requirement or expectation in law or policy that any single action by itself should or can have the effect of reducing future emissions below existing emissions. Such broad reductions can only result from a wide variety of actions. As stated in the DEIS, the preferred alternative by itself would reduce GHG emissions compared to No-Build Alternative. This helps move GHG emissions in the right direction, and when combined with other actions, can play an integral role in helping the state meet its overall greenhouse gas reduction goals.

P-0219-003

Significant increases in oil prices can have both short term and long term effects on travel behavior. In the short term, the options for responding to rising gas prices are more limited, and include driving less and/or changing from driving to walking, biking or transit for at least some trips. During recent increases in gasoline prices transit use increased and offpeak highway travel decreased. Peak period highway travel changed little.

Over the long term, there are more options for adjusting to changes in gasoline prices, besides changing driving behavior. Technological advances and legislative mandates can increase fuel efficiency standards in the long term. In turn, as older vehicles wear out, more consumers can replace them with more fuel efficient vehicles.

Automobile manufacturers are developing and will continue to develop

new vehicle and engine technologies that require much less, or even no, petroleum-based fuels. This trend is already happening as evidenced by the growing popularity of gasoline-electric hybrid and small electric vehicles.