

From: [McEnery/Ogle Family](#)
To: [Draft EIS Feedback; Berry, June;](#)
CC:
Subject: Shumway Neighborhood Association Position Paper
Date: Monday, June 30, 2008 10:44:42 PM
Attachments: [SNA position paper Final.doc](#)

TO: Columbia River Crossing
C-TRAN
FROM: Anne McEnery-Ogle, Chair
Shumway Neighborhood Association
DATE: June 30, 2008, 10:44pm
RE: SNA Position Paper attached

*** eSafe scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

TO: Vancouver City Council
C-TRAN Board of Directors
Clark County Commissioners
Columbia River Crossing

FROM: Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Chair
Shumway Neighborhood Association

DATE: June 30, 2008

RE: Shumway Neighborhood Association Position on the Columbia River Crossing project.

N-017-001 Shumway Neighborhood Association (SNA) has been studying the I-5 Bridge and widening project since the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership task force in January 2001. Our due diligence has led the neighborhood to rewrite and adopt its revised Neighborhood Action Plan and to actively participate in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process.

We have attended seven years of workshops, meetings, hearings and open houses on the issues involving the freeway, which serves as our eastern boundary, Main Street, which serves as our western boundary, and changes to both the 39th Street and 4th Plain onramps to I-5, which serves as our northern and southern boundaries. The 71 square blocks of our neighborhood, consisting of 541 homes, is completely surrounded by transportation projects involved in the Columbia River Crossing project.

Goals for our neighborhood association can be found in our latest Neighborhood Action Plan (NAP). There are action steps for public safety, mobility management, community appearance, historic preservation, housing, social services and economic development.

Our neighborhood goals focus on:

- Improving air quality and noise levels, especially near major transportation arterials.
- Increasing the level of public safety and security.
- Managing mobility in and around our neighborhood, including issues with truck traffic, cut through traffic, on-street parking, sidewalks and alleys.
- Preserving existing housing stock
- Preserving and supporting local businesses
- Maintaining current zoning designations

The SNA requests that the Shumway NAP goals be considered when the final impacts, and subsequent mitigation measures, are developed. We are concerned that they have not received adequate consideration to date.

N-017-002 also developed a survey for all Shumway Neighborhood residents to express their opinions on the proposed project. The surveys were hand delivered to all 541 residents and businesses within the Shumway Neighborhood boundaries in May 2008 and collected in June. The responses have been compiled and the responses mirror what the residents have been saying about the project for the last several years.

Specifically, there is general support for improving the existing crossing, with the respondents about evenly split over replacing the structures and adding a supplemental crossing. The respondents were also generally supportive of mass transit coming across the bridge with equal division between light rail and bus rapid transit. There was also general consensus that the transit should only go to Clark College, with decided opposition to the terminus at Kiggins Bowl or 39th and Main.

N-017-001

Thank you for taking the time to submit your comments on the I-5 CRC DEIS. In the neighborhoods analysis (which is combined with Environmental Justice issues in the DEIS), we completed a thorough review of the Neighborhood Action Plans for potentially impacted neighborhoods. The summaries of this analysis can be found in the Neighborhoods and Population Technical Report.

Specific to the goals listed in your communication:

1. Air quality - This project will reduce auto use, construct an electric light rail system, and overall result in improved air quality conditions.
2. Public safety - We understand the importance of this topic. We have addressed this issue, and will provide additional detail in the final design with principles of CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design).
3. Managing traffic and trucks - By making the interstate and transit systems more efficient, the project may help to reduce neighborhood cut-through traffic.
4. Preserve existing housing stock - We have gone out of our way to avoid displacing residents in Washington. There will be six residential displacements by the project in the Shumway neighborhood.
5. Preserve businesses - There will be no business displacements in the Shumway neighborhood.
6. Maintain current zoning - The project is designed to be constructed and operated within the existing plan context with the existing zoning pattern.

N-017-003 The greatest concerns for dedicated and separated mass transit, in order of number of responses, were disruptions to the neighborhood, security (increase of crime in the area), safety for traffic and pedestrians, and traffic and pedestrian volume. The majority of the respondents supported using increased light rail/bus fares to pay for the maintenance and operation of the proposed mass transit system. An overwhelming majority favored Vancouver and Clark County citizens being allowed to vote on any funding mechanism for the mass transit system.

N-017-005 comments were received with the survey, and we are requesting that each comment be included as a separate public comment for the DEIS and be responded to as such in the Final EIS. They are attached at the end of this letter.

N-017-006 ly, the Shumway Neighborhood demographics are such that it qualifies for consideration under the Environmental Justice requirements for these types of projects. We are concerned that the impacts to the neighborhood, from the proposed project alternatives, have not been fully identified. We request that the impacts to the Shumway Neighborhood be more fully identified and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement and that the proposed mitigation for these impacts be more fully developed in cooperation with the affected residents of the Neighborhood. The project, no matter which alternative is selected to go forward, will have significant impacts on the residents of the Shumway Neighborhood. They should not be overlooked as the process moves forward.

N-017-002

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.

N-017-003

Nationally, studies have shown that economic development and land use intensification opportunities arise from investment in high-capacity transit, such as light rail. It is expected that Vancouver businesses will benefit from increased visibility to those riding light rail, and that the increased retail, office and high density residential development plans adopted by the City of Vancouver will result in an increase of potential new customers living and working in Vancouver.

**Shumway Neighborhood Association
Columbia River Crossing Project DEIS Survey Comments**

N-017-007 Question #1 What should we do with the existing I-5 bridges?

3rd bridge west of existing
3rd bridge west of existing
Just add a new bridge for the transit
Brace both existing bridges. Put a new one at Camas Troutdale area.
New third bridge west of I-5 Bridge
Add another bridge elsewhere on the river – at least one more
New bridge for buses
Keep old bridges
Move whole mess to the east where all the new building and homes are. Leave original Vancouver alone.

N-017-008 Question #2 Should the bridge have dedicated and separated mass transit lanes?

I'm for gradual change. Rapid bus that can be adapted later to light rail possibly.
Either light rail or rapid bus
Current bus
It should be HOV
Yes, and it should be at peak morning and night hours
Yes and it should be light rail if the blind adopt the new bridge
No and it should be regular buses
No and it should be bus
No and it should be C-TRAN bus
Yes and it should be express buses
Cannot decide which way would be best
Should not involve I-5 bridge (go east) If any mass transit, leave it out of original Vancouver and old neighborhoods

N-017-009 Question #3 Should Vancouver have dedicated and separated mass transit lanes leading to and from the bridge?

Yes, and it should be with a supplemental bridge
Yes, and it should be at peak morning and night hours
Yes and it should be express buses
People should car pool and stagger work hours etc.

Questions #12 – Greatest Concerns

N-017-010 Problems caused by building/widening streets
N-017-011 Mass transit does not connect to Vancouver Mall and I-205 to PDX airport
N-017-012 Funding
N-017-013 Taking away homes
N-017-014 Safety already a concern. All listed are a definite impact. Great loss of original Vancouver and Historical buildings and homes and lowering of already overtaxed home values.

N-017-015 Question #13 – Funding options

Bonding/bridge toll
Toll the bridge
Funding as determined by vote
Oregon funding light rail
Toll on the bridge
Toll fees
Don't like any but so far haven't come up with anything
Property taxes are too high already.
Vancouver will never be the same and future mass transit should be much farther east.

Planning for safety and security on and around light rail is a top priority. The light rail system will be designed to promote safe interactions between light rail trains, cars, bicycles and pedestrians. Through a cooperative team effort and the systematic application of safety and security principles, the project will be designed and constructed to run safely, securely, dependably, and efficiently.

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. Safety will be designed into every phase of the project. Examples of safety measures which maybe designed into the project include 1) physical barriers such as medians, fencing, landscaping or chain and bollard to help channel automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists; 2) signage, tactile pavers, audio warnings, and pavement markings at the track crossings to alert individuals who are approaching tracks; 3) active treatments such as flashing lights, bells, illuminated and audible warning devices and traffic signals; 4) well-lit platforms and station areas; 5) clear sight lines for the oncoming train; and 6) a public safety education campaign before the start of service. According to the United States Bureau of Transportation Statistics, public transportation represents less than one percent of the national average of all street and highway fatalities. Light rail is one of the safest forms of public transportation. As described on page 3-56 of the DEIS, collisions on TriMet's light rail system have decreased over the years. For more information on how the CRC project is accounting for safety in the design of light rail, please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the FEIS.

N-017-004

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

N-017-016 Question #14 – Vancouver vote

Only Vancouver proper should vote as concerns them mostly. This whole stupid idea will only benefit areas away from our town, so would only benefit rest of county outside of Vancouver.

Other Comments/Concerns

N-017-017 As Shumway neighborhood residents, we understand the need to ease congestion on I-5 and support mass transit to 15th and Main and Clark College which in itself will mean major changes for us. We think the impact would be too negative for us if brought any further north at this time. A gas saving pedestrian/bike/scooter bridge crossing should be included.

N-017-018 Don't mess with downtown Vancouver. The city is finally looking better and light rail could reverse the changes.

- I feel that the decision to bring light rail to Clark County was the hidden agenda from the get go. So put it along I-5 all the way to the fair ground with intermittent park and ride and parking structures along the way. Not through town as it is detrimental to businesses and pedestrian and vehicle travel.
- I am hesitant to fully support the light rail throughout Vancouver because I have doubts that it can feasible integrate into the current road system without redoing a lot of roads and cutting off regular traffic, but otherwise it sounds like a good idea.

N-017-019 Working out the funding is the responsibility of our elected representatives. The electorate can't be well enough informed to make these decisions. There's just too much to consider.

N-017-020 Wait until the slow down at Delta Park is fixed.

N-017-021 The environmental impacts to my neighborhood for light rail are unacceptable. The only light rail is would accept is as far as Clark College.

N-017-022 I don't feel that safety concerns are being adequately addressed with implementing a mass transit system. Loss of business and housing to a thriving neighborhood is also a concern.

N-017-023 The cost of one bridge at Camas/Troutdale area would help congestion you have at 164th and 205 bridge and cost a lot less.

N-017-024 Absolutely no tolls: now or in the future!

N-017-025 Fewer lanes on freeway would be less expensive and impactful.

N-017-026 Can't decide what would be best so either light rail or rapid bus would be ok I guess.

N-017-027 Have to be out of state or would attend June 5th meeting, so this is reason for all I felt I had to say. Have lived here for almost 26 years on 32nd and F and Hough area before that. I pray our town won't be ruined. If they ruin our neighborhoods will probably have to move away.

- This whole thing is very unfair to all of us who treasure Vancouver small town and Historical businesses and neighborhoods which make up true Vancouver and will only benefit areas away from us. It is already an impact and our taxes have gone beyond present home values in many cases. It is so wrong to displace people and we are being bullied. It will not benefit our town.already favored far north and east areas at our expenses.

operations and maintenance funding, C-TRAN plans on pursuing a public vote.

N-017-005

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

N-017-006

All neighborhoods in the project area, including Shumway, were assessed for the presence of Environmental Justice (EJ) populations using data from the U.S. Census Bureau and other sources. As discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the FEIS, since publication of the DEIS, potential project impacts have been further evaluated and the project team has worked to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, including impacts to the Shumway neighborhood. Where impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation has been developed based on the specific needs of the affected individuals or community. The project team has worked with the Shumway Neighborhood both prior to and after publication of the DEIS. We look forward to continued discussions with the neighborhood as the project progresses.

N-017-007

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 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.

N-017-008

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.

N-017-009

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.

N-017-010

The proposed new add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges) are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area and are not designed to increase capacity generally on I-5. 68 to 75% of I-5 traffic enters and/or exits I-5 within the CRC project area, and these add/drop lanes provide space for this traffic to do so without disrupting cars and trucks traveling to destinations further north and south of the project area. The project does not propose to add lanes north or south of the project limits.

The DEIS evaluation found that the project, with a toll and light rail, would actually reduce the total daily volume of traffic using the I-5 and I-205 river crossings by approximately 3%. The FEIS analysis of the project has been updated to include an evaluation of how the CRC project would affect Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.1). Rather than inducing sprawl, the CRC project will likely reinforce the region's goals of concentrating development in regional centers, reinforcing existing corridors, and promoting transit and pedestrian friendly development and development patterns. In 2010, Metro ran the MetroScope model (an integrated land use and transportation model) to forecast growth associated with transportation improvements of a 12-lane river crossing and light rail to Clark College. The model showed only minimal changes in employment location and

housing demand compared to the No-Build. For more information see FEIS Chapter 3, Section 3.4.

N-017-011

The CRC Project is focused on providing a high-capacity transit option through downtown Vancouver to Clark College. Once this light rail extension is built, riders originating in Vancouver would be able to take light rail to the Portland International Airport with one transfer at the Rose Quarter Transit Station.

RTC has completed a High-Capacity Transit System Study which recommends specific high-capacity transit improvements, including light rail, bus rapid transit and bus service improvements that will best serve Clark County residents in the mid-term (by 2030) and long-term (beyond 2030). To view their Final HCT System Study, visit RTC's website at www.rtc.wa.gov. Though these recommendations are designed to connect with CRC transit improvements, they are not part of the CRC project.

N-017-012

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.

N-017-013

The DEIS disclosed all known property acquisitions required to construct the project alternatives. These acquisitions were summarized in the DEIS in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) and were listed in full in Appendix D of the DEIS. The information associated with each property, such as an address, was pulled directly from the Clark and Multnomah County tax assessors' databases, and therefore was only as up-to-date as that County's information.

Since the publication of the DEIS in May of 2008, and the selection of the LPA by project partners in July 2008, the CRC project team has been working to minimize the potential property impacts associated with the projects' improvements. Though the project team has been working to stay within the existing right-of-way, some property right acquisitions will be unavoidable. Property owners will receive just compensation for the estimated value of land and improvements acquired and for other impacts that result in a measurable loss of value to the remaining property. Following the publication of the FEIS, property owners will be notified of impacts to their property and acquisition negotiations will begin. The acquisition and relocation process will follow The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act of 1970 (as amended).

Potential property acquisitions that will be required to construct the LPA are described and summarized in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) of the FEIS and listed by property in Appendix E. The process by which acquisitions will occur is described in the Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan and summarized in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) of the FEIS.

N-017-014

Potential residential and business displacements are discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) of the FEIS. Impacts to historic properties are discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.8).

N-017-015

Please see response to comments N-017-011 and N-017-012.

N-017-016

Regarding a public vote, please see response to comment N-017-004. 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, including Vancouver, 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 of the FEIS for more discussion on the process used to develop project alternatives and select a Locally Preferred Alternative.

N-017-017

Please see response to comment N-017-002.

N-017-018

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an extensive evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) explains how the project's Sponsoring Agencies generated ideas and 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, many of which were non-auto oriented options such as various transit modes and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently without any capital investment. These options were evaluated for whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and the findings were reviewed by project sponsors, the public, agencies, and other stakeholders. Alternatives that included only TDM/TSM strategies, or provided only transit improvements, would provide benefits, but could only address a very limited portion of the project's purpose and need. This extensive analysis found that in order for an alternative to meet the six "needs" included in the Purpose and Need (described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS), it had to provide at least some measure of capital improvements to I-5 in the project area. Alternatives that did not include such improvements did not adequately 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 the highway in this corridor. The DEIS evaluated alternatives with more demand management (higher toll) and increased transit service with less investment in highway infrastructure improvements (Alternatives 4 and 5) compared to the toll and transit service levels included in Alternatives 2 and 3. The additional service and higher toll provided only marginal reductions in I-5 vehicle volumes, and they came primarily at the cost of greater traffic diversion to I-205. This analysis found that a more balanced investment in highway and transit, as represented by Alternatives 2 and 3, performed considerably better on a broad set of criteria.

N-017-019

See response to comment N-017-003.

N-017-020

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

N-017-021

The I-5 Delta Park improvement project was included in the analysis of the No-build alternative. Though the I-5 Delta Park project will provide some congestion relief in the project area during morning rush hour, it will not significantly meet the CRC project's objectives of improving travel safety and traffic operations on the Interstate 5 crossing's bridges and associated interchanges; improving connectivity, reliability, travel times and operations of public transportation modal alternatives in the BIA; improving highway freight mobility and addressing interstate travel and commerce needs in the BIA; and improving the Interstate 5 river crossing's structural integrity.

N-017-022

Please see response to comment N-017-002.

N-017-023

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.

N-017-024

The current project design would require the displacement of two residences and no businesses in the Shumway Neighborhood. For additional information about impacts to neighborhoods, please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.5), Neighborhoods and Environmental Justice, of the FEIS.

N-017-025

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 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.

N-017-026

Tolling was evaluated in the DEIS and FEIS, and included in the LPA for two important reasons. First, a toll may be necessary to pay for the construction of this project, as discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. Second, a toll provides a valuable travel demand management tool that encourages travelers to take alternative modes (including light rail provided by this project), travel at off-peak periods, or reduce their auto trips. This demand management reduces congestion and extends the effective service life of the facility. When the existing I-5 northbound bridge was built in 1917, it was paid for with a toll. The southbound I-5 bridge, built in 1958, was also funded partially by tolls. In 2008, the Washington legislature passed enabling language for tolling on I-5, provided that each facility is later authorized under specific legislation. Once authorized by the legislature, the Washington Transportation Commission has the authority to set the toll rates. In Oregon, and the Oregon Transportation Commission has the authority to toll a facility and to set the toll rates.

N-017-027

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

N-017-028

Please see response to comment N-017-008.

N-017-029

Thank you for taking the time to comment on the I-5 CRC DEIS. The project team has worked with neighborhoods during the planning and design of the CRC project. The project formed a Community and Environmental Justice Group (CEJG) and attended hundreds of neighborhood meetings to understand neighborhood values and resources. The historic character of neighborhoods within the project area was a value commonly expressed by community members. Potential impacts that could affect the historic character of project area neighborhoods were described in Chapter 3 (Sections 3.5 and 3.8) of the DEIS, and in more detail in the Historic Built Environment Technical Report.

The CRC project team has been working to minimize the potential property impacts associated with the project's improvements. Though the project team has been working to stay within the existing right-of-

way, some land purchases will be unavoidable. Potential property acquisitions that will be required to construct the LPA are described and summarized in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) of the FEIS and listed by property in Appendix D. The process by which acquisitions will occur is described in the Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Plan and summarized in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3).