

From: MICHAELCAMPBELL@YAHOO.COM
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Friday, June 27, 2008 3:42:45 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97210
 Work Zip Code: 97210

Person:

Lives in the project area
 Works in the project area



Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle
 Car or Truck
 Walk
 Other - light rail and street car

P-0439-001

1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 Supplemental Bridge
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
 Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland
 Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland
3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:
 Lincoln Terminus: No Opinion
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

First Name: MICHAEL
 Last Name: CAMPBELL
 Title: DIRECTOR OF SALES AND MARKETING
 E-Mail: MICHAELCAMPBELL@YAHOO.COM
 Address: 530 NW 23RD AVE #408

P-0439-001

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.

PORTLAND, OR 97210

Comments:

- P-0439-002** I believe this organization is jumping to a 20th century solution for a 21st century problem. 1) We need to use less oil. Building more roads will create more traffic, more auto emissions, more greenhouse gases. If we are serious about dealing with global climate change, we must match our actions to our intentions. Building more roads is an answer from the past, not the future. 2) The current congestion, while serious, is caused primarily by one-way commuters living in Washington (lower housing prices) and working and shopping in Oregon (higher wages, no sales tax). The solution proposed is a bridge paid for 50/50 by Oregon and Washington, when 90% of the personal benefits flow to Washington. This is wrong. Other than at peak rush hours (and even then, only one way), there is no congestion. 3) Another source of the current traffic and congestion is trucking. For the short term, we can enforce and strengthen existing regulations to move more truck traffic to I-205. In the long term, we must move more freight by rail -- a solution that uses less gas and helps save the planet. Far more than 50% of the benefits from a new bridge go to the trucking industry, yet the funding for the project is coming from taxes on residents, not businesses. Here's a suggestion: put electronic (no-stop) tolls for trucks only type tolls on I-5, with none on I-205. Watch the current congestion melt away. 4) A third source of the current congestion is busines-related automobile traffic in the Vancouver (BC) to Eugene corridor, primarily Seattle-to-Portland . Improving high-speed Amtrak service in this corridor would eliminate many car trips, and also oil-wasting flights. But improving Amtrak is not an option I have seen discussed in the many articles about a new bridge. In business, time is money. Make it faster and easier to take the train than drive or fly, and cars will get off the road. Finally, designing any new structure while the height limitations caused by Pearson Field are still in place is foolish.
- P-0439-003**
- P-0439-004**
- P-0439-005**
- P-0439-006**
- P-0439-007**
- P-0439-008**
- P-0439-009**
- P-0439-010**
- P-0439-011**
- P-0439-012**
- This landing strip is an anachronism, located next to a National Historic Site. Although historic, it should not limit our vision of a new crossing. What would the Golden Gate look like if it had been designed around this restriction? In conclusion, I believe the rush to a new bridge is a mistake, not carefully thought out, being pushed heavily by business interests who have much to gain, ignoring ordinary citizens driving less each day because of the pain of high gas prices.

P-0439-002

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-Build Alternative remains unchanged.

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-0439-003

CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects would remain dedicated to those projects, and anticipates needing to find new funds to finance the project. Funding for the project will come from a variety of sources including federal grants that would not be available to other transportation projects in the region, State of Oregon, State of Washington, regional and local sources. In addition, it is assumed that the replacement bridge will be tolled. Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA.

P-0439-004

Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA. This discussion provides an updated assessment of likely funding sources for this project, though it is not common practice to receive funding commitments prior to completion of the alternative selection process. As described in the FEIS, project funding is expected to come from a variety of local, state, and federal sources, with federal funding and tolls

providing substantial revenue for the construction. As Oregon and Washington businesses and residents will benefit from the project's multi-modal improvements, both states have been identified as contributors to the project. As jurisdictions on both sides of the river seek to encourage non-auto travel, tolls are not anticipated for bikes, pedestrians, and transit users. Lastly, CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects and purposes would remain dedicated to those projects and purposes.

P-0439-005

You are correct that the peak periods, largely in one direction, result in the greatest levels of congestion. However, there are other times during the day now, and many more times by 2030, when the congestion would be a detriment to quality of life and economic development in Portland and Vancouver. Under the No-Build scenario, the morning peak period congestion in the I-5 corridor could last until nearly 2:00 PM.

P-0439-006

The Vancouver-Portland region is a trade hub, acting as a gateway and distribution center for domestic and international markets. The region has become a trade hub, in large part, because of its direct access to the freeway system, navigable rivers, rail lines, and international air shipping. The region's continued competitiveness as a trade hub is dependent on the ability to efficiently move freight on and between these transportation facilities. Though I-205 is a convenient, cost-effective route for some freight trips, it cannot replace the role of I-5 as a freight route. For many freight trips, I-205 would be out of direction, adding to travel time and shipping costs. In addition trucks will travel on I-5 because it is shorter and faster than I-205. In 2005, the I-5 Interstate Bridge carried approximately 3,240 more trucks per day or 42 percent more than the I-205 Glenn Jackson Bridge. Trucks try to avoid congestion and travel during uncongested periods and because the travel distance on I-5 from junction to junction is only 19.3 miles

compared to 25.5 miles on I-205 trucks will travel on I-5. Increased shipping costs can have a significant impact on the overall costs of doing business in our region, making us less competitive and threatening our status as a trade hub.

P-0439-007

According to the Feasibility of Diverting Truck Freight to Rail in the Columbia River Corridor Technical Memorandum produced by CRC project staff in April 2006, trains cannot move smaller loads as cost-effectively as trucks and may even be more costly for shipping distances under 500 miles. This is a key point, as the average trip distance by truck in the Portland/Vancouver region is 199 miles. While there are certainly some commodities that could shift from truck to rail in the region, it is probably a very minimal amount, probably not part of a consistent and regular shipment schedule, and would not significantly ease congestion along I-5 in the project area.

Additionally, the Vancouver-Portland region is the "last mile" for 85 percent of the freight traveling in the region. That is, goods are produced, assembled, and/or delivered within the region, and the overwhelming majority of the local shippers and customers are not located on a rail spur or within a rail/intermodal terminal. Even if there was a targeted effort to use railroads more frequently, the goods would need to travel by truck on regional roads and freeways to arrive at rail terminals. In fact, most of the goods produced or received from the rail system must drive those goods by truck to or from the rail lines; and, increased rail service would likely lead to greater use of trucks for this very reason.

P-0439-008

Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA. This discussion provides an updated assessment of likely funding sources for this

project, though it is not common practice to receive funding commitments prior to completion of the alternative selection process. As described in the FEIS, project funding is expected to come from a variety of local, state, and federal sources, with federal funding and tolls providing substantial revenue for the construction. As Oregon and Washington businesses and residents will benefit from the project's multi-modal improvements, both states have been identified as contributors to the project. As jurisdictions on both sides of the river seek to encourage non-auto travel, tolls are not anticipated for bikes, pedestrians, and transit users. Lastly, CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects and purposes would remain dedicated to those projects and purposes.

P-0439-009

The project has assessed a number of tolling scenarios. These are summarized in an online report: <http://tolling.columbiarivercrossing.org/>. Freight mobility is critical to the economic growth of the Ports and many businesses in Portland and Vancouver. For the project to only toll trucks would disproportionately harm local business and fail to generate sufficient revenue.

P-0439-010

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included high speed rail, an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River, and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why high speed rail, arterial crossing, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need.

P-0439-011

The protection of Pearson Field, although important from the perspective of historic resource protection, the local economy, the provision of public services, and preferences stated by the City of Vancouver, is not the only factor influencing bridge heights over the Columbia River. Possible intrusions into Portland International Airport airspace, maintenance of marine navigation, construction staging, maintaining I-5 traffic, and constraints imposed by the location and alignment of the river crossing all constrain the ultimate design of the bridge. The upstream river crossing alignment was dropped for further consideration in October 2007. The downstream option has a curved alignment primarily for construction staging purposes, and connecting into existing I-5. The curved alignment limits the feasibility of several different structure types.

Since the publication of the DEIS, the Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) met multiple times to discuss the design of the bridges and ultimately endorsed the two-bridge concept in January 2009 and also endorsed the open-web concept in September of 2009. The Project Sponsors Council endorsed a two-bridge option in June of 2009, and also endorsed the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee recommendations for a covered pathway with the conditions of the maintenance and security plan in September of 2009. Then in February 2011, the CRC Bridge Review Panel recommended that the project discontinue work on the open-web concept and instead select either a composite deck truss, tied arch or cable-stayed bridge type. Following additional analysis and outreach, the governors, in April 2011, announced selection of the composite deck truss as the preferred bridge type. For a more detailed description of the limitations and opportunities that influenced the bridge type selection process, please see Technical Screening Study Final Report December 2008, Aesthetic Screening Study Final Report March 2009, Final Type Study Report October 2009, CRC Project Bridge Review Panel Report, February 2011, CRC: Key Findings and Recommendation Related to Bridge Type, February 2011

and the memo from the governors offices – Moving Forward; CRC Background, Bridge-type Major Factors, Next Steps, April 2011. Much of this information is also summarized in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

P-0439-012

Significant work has gone into developing the CRC project, including an ongoing public involvement effort. The public involvement program includes numerous advisory groups to ensure the values and interests of the community are reflected in project decisions. These groups include representatives of public agencies, businesses, civic organizations, neighborhoods and freight, commuter and environmental groups. Feedback from the general public and advisory groups has been generally supportive of the project, including support for the transit, bicycle, pedestrian, highway, interchange, and financing elements of the project. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the process used to develop project alternatives and select a Locally Preferred Alternative.