


**From:** [Fran Rutherford](#) 

**To:** [Draft EIS Feedback;](#)

**CC:**

**Subject:** Columbia River Crossing - DEIS - Public Comment

**Date:** Tuesday, July 01, 2008 9:26:50 PM

**Attachments:**

---

To: Columbia River Crossing

**P-0796-001** | I have followed this project for several years and make these comments based on my personal experience at meetings, phone conversations and letters, to CRC personnel.

#### PUBLIC OUTREACH

**P-0796-002** | There has been no outreach on east side (65,000+ taxpayers) of Vancouver City. Outreach was only to downtown Vancouver groups. The major part of the taxing/ financial burden for this undertaking will be borne by east Vancouver taxpayers.

**P-0796-003** | Prior to the publication of the DEIS study, CRC was unwilling to have "open" meetings with input/ discussions/ suggestions from the citizens of this community. At the end of the few public meetings, citizens could ask questions or make comment. HOWEVER, NO RESPONSES WERE GIVEN AT THAT TIME, NOR WAS THERE FOLLOW-UP AFTER THE MEETINGS. Now that the study is complete, you want to open up for public input. Why now?

Did CRC consider the valuable expertise available in the community?  
Did CRC consider advertising and inviting these individuals into your meetings as participants, not spectators?

Hundreds of retired/ semi-retired professional engineers of all disciplines were willing to contribute in meaningful discussions -- many, with years of experience with State(s) and Federal Transportation agencies.

#### P-0796-001

At least 30 neighborhood or community meetings were held in East Vancouver between March 2006 and June 2008. All community outreach events are listed in Appendix B of the Final EIS.

In addition, CRC hosted several open houses that were advertised throughout the Portland-Vancouver region before publication of the Draft EIS:

- In the fall of 2005, three public open houses were held to provide staff with public input to help define the primary problems in the project area. This information was relevant to the development of the purpose and need statement for the project.
- In the spring of 2006, two open houses were held to discuss and receive public feedback on 23 initial river crossing ideas and 14 initial public transportation ideas.
- In the fall of 2006, four open houses were held to discuss and receive public feedback on the project's draft staff recommendation for alternatives to move forward for further evaluation into the Draft EIS.
- In the fall of 2007, two open houses were held to share detailed information with neighborhood and business groups about potential high-capacity transit alignments and streetscape design tradeoffs, and to receive feedback.
- In the spring of 2008, two public hearings on the project's Draft EIS were held in conjunction with an informational open house.

#### P-0796-002

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

- P-0796-004** DISINGENUOUS TREATMENT OF CRC COMMITTEE VOLUNTEERS
- It has come to my attention that an “unpaid” community member serving on a CRC committee was dismissed because of difference(s) of opinion with the “paid” committee members. Further insult was heaped on this volunteer in a public meeting where the entire committee openly discussed these differences (with the dismissed person in the audience). The dismissed person was ridiculed and her contributions diminished. [An additional insult/embarrassment to this volunteer was the detailed recording of this committee’s tirade, posted on the CRC PUBLIC website.](#)  
To date, no apology has been given to this community volunteer. Why?
- P-0796-005** Does CRC employees and its consultants have any training in professional decorum, business courtesy and inter-personal skills?  
It is not surprising that you have shown no interest in meaningful, citizen input – your actions towards community volunteers is one of disrespect and intolerance.
- P-0796-006** CRC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)
- The 50 Million dollar CRC study and the recent additional millions allocated by the State of WA for further studies has not yielded/revealed any financial plan or dollar amounts. CRC claim they have the expertise of in-house and consulting engineers who worked on this study. Why is there no data of their findings in the DEIS publication?
- P-0796-007** According to the study, there seems to be a concerted effort to highlight only one alternative to the congestion (most is on the Oregon side of the Columbia river) on I-5 and that is “light rail”. Very little data is given on other alternative mass transit; including existing rubber-tire bus system.
- P-0796-008** The bottleneck at Delta Park is one (1) of the main contributors of this congestion and a mile or so further south on I-5 is the second bottleneck - Rose Garden. The DEIS study does not show any correction for bottleneck at Rose Garden. Why? If both of these congestion spots are not corrected simultaneously, correcting only one will not resolve the current problem.  
When you consider that one of the bridge options under consideration is a twelve (12) lane bridge - squeezing 6 lanes each way into a 2-3 lane at Delta Park and Rose Garden is nothing short of insanity.

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-0796-003**

Multiple methods have been used to engage the public so as to address the needs of a wide variety of people and the project decision-making process. Public feedback has helped guide the outreach effort. Examples include workshops with facilitated small-group discussions, open houses where participants can talk one-on-one with staff, public hearings, presentations and discussion at community and neighborhood-sponsored meetings, often at the group’s request, and advisory group meetings where CRC seeks recommendations from a citizen committee. These events and meetings have taken place at a variety of locations, days of the week and times of the day to meet the needs of the entire community. For more information on the project’s public outreach, please see Appendix B of the FEIS.

**P-0796-004**

Thank you for your comment. The CRC project notes your concerns. The project is committed to keeping records of relevant committee work available for public review; specific conversations and communication with this individual regarding the project’s request that they leave the group are between the individual and the project. The project continues to work with this citizen and respond to this citizen’s requests.

**P-0796-009** DEIS STUDY, VOLUME 2 OF 2 – APPENDIX B “PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT”

Appendix “B” – Public Involvement Approach - page B-3, 3rd paragraph reads “Staff are engaged in an ongoing door-to-door outreach campaign to businesses near the proposed high-capacity transit alignment in Vancouver”. This statement is false.

In June, 2008, I and others personally hand-delivered to over 250 residents/ businesses, the “Potential Property Acquisitions for South downtown Vancouver residents” – (see Appendix D, pages D-1 through D-22). NOT ONE of them had been contacted by CRC or its consultants/contractors.

**P-0796-010** I request a written acknowledgment of my comments and request this document be inserted with other public comment documents which will be forwarded to Federal Transportation Committee in Washington, D.C.

Frances Rutherford  
1514 SE 119 Avenue  
Vancouver, WA 98683  
360-896-2283

**P-0796-005**

WSDOT and ODOT staffs and the CRC consultant teams have received varying levels of training on all aspects of communication, ranging from interpersonal to public speaking, depending on their job requirements. Some training has been provided through the agencies or employers and some has come through college education. The opinion of the commenter is noted for future public involvement efforts.

**P-0796-006**

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-0796-007**

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-0796-008**

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) completed Phase I construction of the I-5 Delta Park widening project in fall 2010. Phase I of the project involved widening I-5 and lengthening the entrance and exit ramps at Victory Boulevard and Columbia Boulevard. Phase II involves improving local streets and will begin when funding is secured. Phase I of the Delta Park project widened the current 2-lane segment of southbound I-5 to 3 lanes. There are currently no immediate plans to widen I-5 south of Delta Park. Neither the CRC project nor the Delta Park projects are intended to address the southbound traffic congestion that currently exists near the I-5/I-405 split. However, traffic analyses show the congestion at the split will not be worsened because of the Columbia River Crossing project. The main reason is that fewer cars are expected to cross the river with a project in 2030 than without a project. This is due to the provision of improved transit service and tolling.

Beyond the CRC and Delta Park projects, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan recommended a comprehensive list of modal actions relating to: additional transit capacity and service;

additional rail capacity; land use and land use accord; transportation demand/system management; environmental justice; additional elements and strategies (such as new river crossings); and financing. RTC and Metro are tasked with initiating recommendations as part of their regional transportation planning role. Examples of current efforts include RTC's evaluation of future high-capacity transit in Clark County, and evaluation of needs for future river crossings. Regional planners have investigated solutions to existing bottlenecks at the I-5 connections with I-405 and I-84. ODOT is responsible for conducting ongoing studies to identify other congestion problems on I-5 in Oregon that may need to be addressed in the future.

**P-0796-009**

During summer 2007, door-to-door outreach was conducted to focus on downtown Vancouver businesses. This effort resulted in reaching 184 businesses to provide them with general information about light rail and the project and gather public feedback on the project and light rail alignment. The following blocks were reached during this effort:

- 100 block of W 13th St., W 9th St., E 8th St.
- 200 block of Columbia, W McLoughlin, E McLoughlin, W Evergreen, W 6th, W 13th, W 12th, E 17th
- 300 block of E 17th, W Mill Plain, W 11th, W 6th, E 15th, E Mill Plain, W 12th, W Evergreen, E McLoughlin
- 400 block of E 13th, W 8th, E 15th, E Mill Plain
- 500 block of Main, W 8th
- 600 block of Broadway, Main
- 700 block of Broadway, Main, Washington
- 800 block of C St., Broadway, Columbia, Main, Washington
- 900 block of Daniels, Main, Washington
- 1100 block of Broadway, Main, Washington
- 1200 block of Broadway, Main
- 1300 block of Main, Columbia, Washington, Franklin

- 1400 block of Broadway, Columbia, C St.
- 1500 block of Broadway, Columbia, D St.
- 1600 block of Columbia, C St., Main, Washington
- 1700 block of Broadway
- 1800 block of Broadway, Columbia
- 1900 block of Main
- 2600 block of Kauffman Ave.
- 5000 block of SW Macadam Ave.
- 7000 block of NE Greenwood
- 12000 block of SW Tualatin Rd.

During the Draft EIS public comment period, post cards to notify residents and businesses about the document, open houses, and public comment period were mailed to every address in the project area. The same post cards were distributed door to door to a variety of locations in Vancouver. The list of the locations can be found on the project Web site:

[www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/PublicInvolvementReports/DraftEIS\\_CommentReport\\_May2toJuly1\\_2008.pdf](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/PublicInvolvementReports/DraftEIS_CommentReport_May2toJuly1_2008.pdf)

Fliers were developed for distribution to Vancouver neighborhoods during the Draft EIS public comment period. The flier highlighted the Draft EIS alternatives, document availability, public comment period, and open houses. Six Vancouver neighborhood associations in the project area chose to distribute the fliers.

**P-0796-010**

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