From: bgranval@swmedicalcenter.org
To: Columbia River Crossing;
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 1:33:22 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 98660
Work Zip Code: 98664

Person:
- Lives in the project area
- Works in the project area
- Owns a business in the project area
- Commutes through the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:
- Bicycle
- Car or Truck
- Walk

P-0474-001

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
Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No
Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No
Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:
First Name: Brian
Last Name: Granvall
Title: Physician Assistant
E-Mail: bgranval@swmedicalcenter.org

P-0474-001

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.

Address:
,

Comments:

P-0474-002 In my observations it seems the traffic bottlenecks occur on I-5 beginning at Mill Plain heading south because of two conditions: 1) the S-curve leading up to the Interstate Bridge and 2) the 3-lane to 2-lane at Delta Park. Why have none of the models proposed carried the new bridge straight across the river from I-5, through Jantzen Beach and rejoining I-5 at the Delta Park interchange? This takes all of the curves out of play and adds lanes down at Delta Park.

In addition, this allows for the existing Interstate Bridge to be converted to light rail, pedestrian and local vehicle traffic between Jantzen Beach and eliminating the need for the interchanges that also foul traffic.

P-0474-003 Regarding Pearson Airpark, this is an anachronism that, while historical, nostalgic and cool will never expand and serves some 50-70 takeoffs/landings daily. With the price of aviation fuel this will surely subside in the future. Included in the transportation plan should be the relocation of a civil aviation terminus in the Vancouver are, perhaps at the west end of the Port property...

P-0474-004 Finally, I cannot condone any light rail project into Clark County that a) does not lessen
P-0474-005 the number of commuter cars on our freeways, b) increases the crime rates on the train
P-0474-006 and/or in our neighborhoods c) takes longer to commute than does existing alternative
P-0474-007 methods (i.e. cars and express buses), and d) adds exorbitant costs to construction.
P-0474-008 TriMet's MAX system has not been demonstrated to solve or even mitigate any of these concerns. It is shameful that voters in Oregon repeatedly vote against this inefficient and ineffective system, yet selfish activist groups, government officials, and politicians press onward anyway. We in Clark County should not fall victim to this malfeasance.

P-0474-002

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 a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), 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 a third corridor, arterial crossing of the Columbia River, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need. For a general description of the screening process see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS. It should be noted that every proposal received from the public was considered, and many of the proposals that were dropped from further consideration included elements that helped shape the alternatives in the DEIS.

P-0474-003

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-0474-004

The addition of tolling, light rail transit and other transportation demand measures is expected to reduce the number of vehicles crossing the river compared to the No-Build alternative. Please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the FEIS for more information.

P-0474-005

Safety and security are high priorities for C-Tran and TriMet. Though studies show that crime rates at transit stations are directly linked to the amount of crime in the surrounding neighborhoods, CRC, C-TRAN and TriMet are partnering with local jurisdictions, police and neighborhoods to design, implement and operate a safe and secure transit system. The

project team has developed a Safety and Security Management Plan for the transit component of the project, which outlines a variety of potential safety measures. These measures include working with local governments to develop supportive land-uses near transit stations; enforcing fare payment; installing closed-circuit TV at light rail stations, park and rides, and on trains; and patrolling stations and trains by Transit security and local police officers. For more information about how safety and security associated with light rail is being addressed by the CRC project, see Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the FEIS.

P-0474-006

Travel times vary by time of day, direction of travel and travel mode. Travel times for transit improve with the LPA compared to the 2030 No-Build Alternative. More specifically, the addition of light rail:

- Improves transit travel times region-wide,
- Improves transit travel times relative to automobile travel times, and
- Improves reliability of transit travel times.

The in-vehicle and total transit travel times for all of the origin and destination pairs that were studied would improve with the LPA, compared to the No-Build Alternative.

For more information, please see FEIS Chapter 3 (Section 3.1).

P-0474-007

As described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the DEIS, the operations and maintenance (O&M) costs associated with light rail (LRT) would be less than those associated with bus rapid transit (BRT), largely because LRT operates on electricity while BRT is dependent on the volatile fuel market. LRT costs approximately $3.50, or 31%, less than BRT, per incremental rider when comparing both capital and operating costs.

Long-term operation and maintenance of the new light rail line will be funded through C-TRAN and TriMet. For more information on how O&M costs will be shared between TriMet and C-TRAN, and how C-TRAN may finance these additional costs, please see Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

P-0474-008

Light rail has been endorsed by every local 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.

Annual light rail passenger trips crossing the I-5 bridge in 2030 are projected to be 6.1 million, with daily ridership around 18,700. The travel time for the morning commute by light rail between downtown Vancouver and Pioneer Square in downtown Portland will be approximately 34 minutes. Light rail would travel on a dedicated right-of-way, with more reliable travel times than auto drivers dealing with unpredictable road conditions, traffic congestion, and parking challenges.

The CRC project planning for light rail incorporates and supports the principles of the Vancouver's City Center Vision Plan. Downtown Vancouver has seen recent growth in higher density mixed use projects from three to 12 stories in height. In addition, another 4,000 downtown condominiums are proposed or pending as part of new developments. The core of Vancouver has, along with many of the larger corridors such as Fourth Plain Blvd, medium to high density residential development and an urban mix of uses. Transit demand in these areas is quite high, and ridership will increase with the introduction of light rail.

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 having a public vote.