



From: [Jim Karlock](#)
To: [Draft EIS Feedback](#)
CC:
Subject: Karlocks comments attached with exhibit, comments only below To REPLACE earlier version
Date: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 11:48:31 PM
Attachments: [DEIS errors-Full.pdf](#)

E-mail: DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org

Karlock's comments on the CRC DEIS

- P-0817-001** The DEIS didn't consider the effects of tolling on low income people who must drive across the bridge to get to work.
- P-0817-002** The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Vancouver, of Portland criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Vancouver.
 The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Portland, of Vancouver criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Portland.
 The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on the various criminal justice systems around the region, of criminals having a wider geographic range due to transportation on light rail.
- P-0817-003** The DEIS didn't consider the effects of bridge tolling on business in Jantzen Beach
 The DEIS didn't consider the effects of possible I205 bridge tolling on business in Cascade Station.
- P-0817-004** The DEIS didn't consider the effects of construction and of the presence of light rail, on Vancouver business: How many will go out of business? How many will have to move? How many jobs will be lost? How many people will be forced on to the welfare rolls due to job loss?
- P-0817-005** The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of seldom, if ever, being able to find empty seats on peak period trains due the all the seats having being taken by upper income Vancouver residents well before the trains reach the low income neighborhoods. Having to stand on the long (timewise) commute may affect their job performance by making them fatigued.
 The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of full trains skipping stops in the low income areas of North Portland because the train was already full of upper income Vancouver residents (in addition to Portland residents up the line.)
 The DEIS did not consider if there will be capacity on Interstate line after the Interstate Ave. Portion achieves its full zoned build out (1) of up to 23,000 new people along the Portland portion of the line. If 80% of these 23,000 new, low income, people are transit dependent (there will be few other options for mobility as Interstate Ave. is at capacity and surrounding streets have little capacity, especially as many streets already "calmed"), that would be 18,400 people in the morning and afternoon, or MORE 19,000 "riders", this almost would triple the largest number estimated in DEIS Table 30.
- P-0817-006** The DEIS did not consider that the highway has been overcapacity and is badly needed now, while there is little actual, current, need for the transit portion of the project as transit ridership is only 3,300 per day!²

P-0817-001

As discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.5) of the DEIS, tolling could impact low-income or minority populations by introducing a new expense that could be proportionally a greater share of total income for low-income individuals, requiring that all users obtain transponders for electronic toll collection, and instituting a new tolling system that could be confusing or difficult to communicate to individuals with limited English proficiency.

However, without a toll, the project likely could not be funded, the new capacity on the bridge would be filled faster, and transit ridership would be lower. Including a toll would reduce congestion, improve travel times, and could result in a slight improvement in air quality by reducing emissions, which would benefit all users. See Chapter 3 (Section 3.5) of the DEIS and Chapter 3 (Section 3.5) of the FEIS for a description of all benefits of the project, including tolling, to Environmental Justice (EJ) populations. Proposed measures to reduce the potential impacts to low-income or minority residents as a result of instituting a toll are listed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.5) of the FEIS and described in more detail in the environmental justice technical report. Potential impacts to EJ populations would be offset by the provision of new transit options in the project corridor.

P-0817-002

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

E-mail: DraftEISfeedback@columbiarivercrossing.org

Karlock's comments on the CRC DEIS

- P-0817-007** The DEIS didn't consider the effects of tolling on low income people who must drive across the bridge to get to work.
- P-0817-008** The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Vancouver, of Portland criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Vancouver.
- The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on Portland, of Vancouver criminals using light rail to get to new victims in Portland.
- The DEIS didn't consider the effects, on the various criminal justice systems around the region, of criminals having a wider geographic range due to transportation on light rail.
- P-0817-009** The DEIS didn't consider the effects of bridge tolling on business in Jantzen Beach
- The DEIS didn't consider the effects of possible I205 bridge tolling on business in Cascade Station.
- P-0817-010** The DEIS didn't consider the effects of construction and of the presence of light rail, on Vancouver business: How many will go out of business? How many will have to move? How many jobs will be lost? How many people will be forced on to the welfare rolls due to job loss?
- P-0817-011** The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of seldom, if ever, being able to find empty seats on peak period trains due the all the seats having being taken by upper income Vancouver residents well before the trains reach the low income neighborhoods. Having to stand on the long (timewise) commute may affect their job performance by making them fatigued.
- The DEIS did not consider the effect, on the low income people of North Portland, of full trains skipping stops in the low income areas of North Portland because the train was already full of upper income Vancouver residents (in addition to Portland residents up the line.)
- The DEIS did not consider if there will be capacity on Interstate line after the Interstate Ave. Portion achieves its full zoned build out⁽¹⁾ of up to 23,000 new people along the Portland portion of the line. If 80% of these 23,000 new, low income, people are transit dependent (there will be few other options for mobility as Interstate Ave. is at capacity and surrounding streets have little capacity, especially as many streets already "calmed"), that would be 18,400 people in the morning and afternoon, or MORE 39,000 "riders", this almost would triple the largest number estimated in DEIS Table 30.
- The DEIS did not consider that the highway has been overcapacity and is badly needed now, while there is little actual, current, need for the transit portion of the project as transit ridership is only 3,300 per day⁽²⁾.
- P-0817-012** The DEIS did not consider adding enough road capacity to ensure free flow and running frequent buses in the general purpose lanes.
- The DEIS did not consider running frequent buses in HOV/HOT lanes.
- The DEIS did not consider a simple bus system upgrade in service, such as increasing bus routes and frequency, instead of fancy stations and exclusive lanes.
- The DEIS did not consider eliminating park and ride by increasing bus routes and frequency.
- P-0817-013** Did the DEIS specify the East and West boundaries of the "bridge influence area" in a clear 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.

P-0817-003

This issue was addressed as part of the Economics analysis and is described in detail in the Economics Technical Report. This report, and Section 3.4 of the DEIS, note that the increased costs of the tolls would generally be offset by the improved travel options and travel times. Under existing and No Build conditions, congestion delays and high crash rates have significant costs for local businesses and travelers; and improving these conditions is one of the purposes of the project.

Tolls could discourage home-based shopping trips from Clark County to points in northern Oregon, such as Hayden Island. However, the variable-rate toll structure that was evaluated in the DEIS allows for different rates to be charged by time of day. Therefore, discretionary trips, such as those between Oregon and Washington for retail purposes could be taken in off-peak hours when toll rates are at their lowest, reducing the effect of the tolls on these types of trips. Also, CRC would provide improved transit connections between Clark County and Oregon, offering travelers alternative methods to paying the tolls to reach destinations across the river.

P-0817-004

Construction activities associated with transit and highway improvements have the potential to negatively and positively affect nearby businesses,

- P-0817-013** | consistent manner?
- P-0817-014** | The DEIS did not consider highway only.
The DEIS did not consider transit only.
The DEIS did not individually consider improving the on/off ramps that cause the most congestion.
- P-0817-015** | The DEIS did not provide separable costs for the various components in a clear manner (if at all).
- P-0817-016** | The DEIS did not consider the death rate of light rail which is over twice that of buses.
- P-0817-017** | It appears that only live load on bridge foundations was assigned to rail (the rest presumably being allocated to the highway component):
the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the "live load" on the foundation⁽³⁾
- P-0817-018** | The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to become much more energy efficient in the future due to Federal mandates.
- P-0817-019** | The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to emit much less CO2 in the future due to Federal energy mandates.
- P-0817-020** | The DEIS failed to give costs in common units like cost per passenger-mile. This makes comparisons difficult.
The DEIS failed to give have supporting data readily locateable. Many times a number would appear in the report with no obvious source in the technical documents.
- P-0817-021** | The funding sources listed in the DEIS may overstate the available Federal funding for the transit portion.
The funding sources listed in the DEIS may understate the available Federal funding for the road portion.
- P-0817-022** | Some alleged data in the DEIS, appears to be unsupported assertions.
- P-0817-023** | This phase of the project is apparently managed by a company that has given money, in the past, to support one of outcomes under consideration.⁽⁴⁾
- P-0817-024** | Some task force members own land in the affected areas and may profit from their decisions.
- P-0817-025** | The task force did not consider the cost and benefit of each of the various options (and their components) before they were eliminated for consideration in the DEIS. This could have caused combinations of options (or parts thereof) that might have met the selection criteria to be rejected.
- P-0817-026** | Task Force was not representative. It had only two automobile users representatives (of the 39 members), although automobile users are the majority of the transportation system users.
Task Force was not representative. A number of groups with an anti-automobile agenda were given memberships on the 39 member task force, although such radical views are only shared by a tiny minority of the general population. Several such groups were formed by one individual (Burkholder) who is also a task force member himself. He effectively had three (or more) votes.
- P-0817-027** | The project management has refused numerous requests for information, relying on dubious legal distinctions or hiding behind the differences between Oregon and Washington public records laws.

as described in Chapter 3 (Sections 3.4) of the DEIS. For example, construction could temporarily block visibility and access to specific businesses, cause traffic delays, and reroute traffic to detours, all of which could divert customers and hamper business activities. Potential positive construction effects could include increased spending in the project area during construction, which can, for example, increase sales at local shops and restaurants.

The project team will work to minimize negative business impacts and encourage positive impacts. Construction will be carefully planned to minimize road closures and to avoid completely closing access to businesses. When needed, signs would be used to identify temporary access points and the businesses they serve. Detours would be carefully routed to reduce travel times and be signed to reduce confusion. Programs to help businesses affected during construction could include business planning assistance, low-interest loans, marketing and retail consulting, business-oriented workshops, or promotions to generate patronage in construction areas. See Chapter 3 of the FEIS for more discussion on temporary construction effects and possible mitigation measures.

Additionally, 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.

P-0817-005

The income level of the riders of light rail who will be boarding the trains at specific stations in the alignment is unknown. However, the demographic data of the neighborhoods which are included in the project

- P-0817-027** For instance, although this is a joint project of both Oregon and Washington, they claimed that they did not have to give out copies of drafts because Washington law does not require them to, while Oregon law does require the release of drafts. Regardless of applicable law, this indicates a clear desire to hide information in what is claimed to be an open process. Some of the requests were never filled, including the projected bike and pedestrian volumes, costs (broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches) of the general purpose lanes; Pedestrian; Bike and Transit rail. See Exhibit 2. (Attachment 2 has the complete history.)
- P-0817-028** The project has failed to fill a request for information, sent on 6/3/2008, in time to complete this comment document by the deadline. The only response received was the email auto responder and an email a few days ago claiming that they had found my request in their spam filter. This fails to “ring true” as many of their replies, in the past, have had a subject header (from the original email request) with the line “flagged as spam” added. For an example see the email exchange in Attachment 1. This strongly suggests that most of their incoming email goes into the spam filter and, by implication, they check the spam filter on a regular basis. (Exhibit 2)
- P-0817-029** The proposed project will actually cause more CO2 emissions than “no-build”. Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to emit more CO2 than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 11 tons of CO2 per day at a construction cost of about 600,000 tons. It will take 150 years of savings to make up for the construction emissions. This is a longer payback time than the likely life of the project. (Exhibit 3)
- P-0817-030** The proposed project will actually use more energy than “no-build”. Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to use more energy than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 140 million BTU per day at a construction cost of 7,000,000 million BTU. It will take about 137 years to make up for the construction energy consumption. (Exhibit 4)
- P-0817-031** The cost of the rail portion is excessive, especially when compared to the cost of driving. The cost of the rail component is estimated at \$1.1 Billion, about \$55 million per year when annualized at 5%. The projected 6 million annual trips will cost \$9 each. This is for just the 4.2 mile project area, so the cost is \$2.04 per passenger-mile. (See Exhibit 5) For comparison, the average American pays \$0.324 per mile. (AAA gives a higher number because they assume the upscale usage patterns of its members, mostly their 2.5 year old car age, while the national average is 9 years. AAA reports cost per vehicle-mile, while we use passenger-mile to match transit data.) Gasolene would have to get to \$43 /gal. to cost as much per mile as just the construction cost of this project with today’s cars. With current hybrid cars, gas would have to cost over \$100 / gal. (Exhibit 6)
- P-0817-032** Conclusion: reject the project with a recommendation that they propose a modest road only project solution to serve the actual needs of the near future. If rail turns out to be needed in 20 years, then build it in 15 years. To build it earlier is merely to shove billions of dollars to construction companies and to satisfy Portland’s numerous profession prophets of impending doom.
- P-0817-033**
1. Portland zoning proposals and Metro’s density recommendations. See Exhibit 1 for details
 2. DEIS, page 3-24
 3. DEIS, chapter 4, page 4-2
- P-0817-034** 4. David Evans & Associates donated \$5000 in favor of building N-S light rail 1996 on the measure 32 campaign; \$2,500 in favor of building light rail N-S 1998 on the measure 26-74 campaign. See Line 4 of Exhibit 7

area (FEIS Exhibit 3.5-2) shows that the Kenton neighborhood in North Portland has 14% of the population below poverty, which is lower than that of the Esther Short, Hough, Arnada, and Central Park neighborhoods of Vancouver which have 35%, 20%, 15%, and 25% respectively.

As described in Chapter 3 of the DEIS (Section 3.1) Portland’s local street operations would improve system-wide relative to no-build conditions. The improved operations on I-5 under the build alternatives would draw traffic from nearby parallel roadways including Interstate Avenue, Vancouver Avenue, and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard back to I-5. Traffic volumes along key east-west local streets between Columbia Boulevard and Going Street would decrease by about five percent relative to no-build conditions, while traffic volumes on key north-south local streets between Greeley Avenue and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard would decline by up to 15 percent. The reduction in duration of congestion along northbound I-5 during the afternoon/evening peak period at the river crossing would also reduce congestion on north-south local streets. The increased transit service along Interstate Avenue, and the reductions in cut-through traffic in Portland neighborhoods (due to reduced congestion on I-5), as well as improved air quality, would tend to improve livability in these neighborhoods. Without the improvements to I-5, and resulting congestion reduction, the increased number of light rail trains on Interstate Avenue would increase traffic delays on local east/west and north/south streets in North Portland.

Analysis done for the FEIS, which can be found in FEIS Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) and in the Traffic Technical Report and Transit Technical Report, indicate similar impacts. Through coordination with the City of Portland, FEIS Chapter 3, (Section 3.1) proposes specific measures to mitigate traffic impacts on Interstate Avenue as a result of the CRC project.

Exhibit 1 - Zoning proposed for Interstate Ave.**P-0817-035**

Metro code (from <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/files/about/chap307.pdf> bold added):

(Effective 4/25/07) 3.07 - 10
 3.07.170 Design Type Density Recommendations
 A. For the area of each of the 2040 Growth Concept design types, the following average densities for housing and employment are recommended to cities and counties:
 Central City - 250 persons per acre
 Regional Centers - 60 persons per acre
Station Communities - 45 persons per acre
 Town Centers - 40 persons per acre
 Main Streets - 39 persons per acre
 Corridor - 25 persons per acre
 Employment Areas - 20 persons per acre
 Industrial Areas - 9 employees per acre
 Regionally Significant Industrial Area - 9 employees per acre
 Inner Neighborhoods - 14 persons per acre
 Outer Neighborhoods - 13 persons per acre

NOTES:

Station Communities are defined in ns of these "design types" is in Metro Code 3.07.130 as:
 Station Communities--Nodes of development centered approximately one-half mile around a light rail or high capacity transit station that feature a high-quality pedestrian environment.

Calculations:

There are five "station communities" along Interstate avenue between Overlook and Lombard, inclusive shown on the Portland Planning Department map at <http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=202013>
 The "station communities" overlap such that one can consider the area to be approximately rectangular. The abovementioned map, printed at a scale about 0.75" = 600 ft., shows this area as 2.5" x 14" after allowing for the freeway area to the East.

This is an area of about 514 acres (2000 x 11,200 / 43,560 = 514). At Metro's recommended average density of 45 persons per acre gives 23,140 people.

P-0817-006

The Purpose and Need is based on extensive analysis of the existing and projected transportation problems in the I-5 CRC corridor, and reflects extensive feedback from the public and stakeholder groups. This includes analysis and input during the CRC study as well as the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Study and Strategic Plan that preceded CRC. The Purpose and Need focuses largely on metrics that do not inherently require substantial, or exclusive, increases in highway capacity. The purpose statement is intentionally worded so as to allow consideration of a wide range of solutions including demand management, transit, highway, tolling, and other options for addressing the stated needs. Following the development of the Purpose and Need statement, analysis of a wide range of alternatives, and input from the public, agencies and stakeholders on those alternatives and analysis, it became clear that that the Purpose and Need could not be met by any single type of improvement. It is best met by a multimodal alternative that improves highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the I-5 corridor, and adds tolling to the highway river crossing.

P-0817-007

Please see response to comment P-0817-001.

P-0817-008

Please see response to comment P-0817-002.

P-0817-009

The Economics Section of the FEIS provides an analysis of the effects of tolling on local businesses. The Economics Technical Report (an appendix of the FEIS) provides additional detail. Tolling I-205 is not part of this project, but could be implemented separately if Oregon and Washington, in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration, determine it is needed to advance regional transportation objectives.

Exhibit 2 - Refused Information Requests**P-0817-036**

2/21/07 Request: (Excerpt, highlights added, See Attachment 1 for the complete history of this exchange)
 From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
 Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 1:31 PM
 To: Gleason, Tonja
 Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Please note that the 30 period stated on March 14, the data that I emailed your "communications and public outreach" person.

I might add that it has been almost two weeks for this simple request.

Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

~~Automobile (and how many person per vehicle)~~
~~Truck~~
~~Other motor vehicle~~
Pedestrian
Bike
~~Transit~~
~~Other than above~~

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

General purpose lanes
 Automobile if other than General purpose lanes
 Truck if other than General purpose lanes
 Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes
 Pedestrian
 Bike
 Transit bus
 Transit rail
 Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?

Thanks
 JK

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records
 Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 14:15:20 -0700
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Hello Jim-
 I have logged your additional request and have attached a letter of acknowledgment to this email.
 Regards-

Traffic modeling indicates that tolling I-5, but not I-205, would divert some traffic to I-205. However, under existing and No-build conditions, trips already, and would continue to, divert to I-205 because of the unreliability and congestion in the I-5 corridor. With the CRC improvements to I-5, many of those diverted trips would shift back to I-5 because it would be a shorter and more reliable trip than I-205. Tolling the I-5 crossing causes some trips to shift to I-205 in order to avoid the toll. Thus the net difference in the number of trips crossing on I-205 is only slightly higher with the CRC project as without it. Section 3.1 of the DEIS discusses the effects of the project on traffic levels in the I-5 and I-205 corridors.

P-0817-010

Please see response to comment P-0817-004.

P-0817-011

Please see response to P-0817-005.

P-0817-012

Four of the 12 alternative packages that received detailed analysis included bus transit components with no or limited use of exclusive right-of-way. These alternative packages were designed to assess how each alternative package performed generally, and to see how individual features of the alternative packages performed in different combinations. Project staff used the criteria outlined in the Evaluation Framework to assess the performance of each alternative package, focusing on the performance of river crossing types and transit modes. Based on this analysis, bus rapid transit and light rail provided the best transit performance, particularly when paired with express bus service. One primary advantage is that their use of dedicated right-of-way minimizes hours of delay and improves modal choice. In addition, light rail, and to

P-0817-036
Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660
 360.816.2188

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 3:54 PM
To: Gleason, Tonja
Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks. However your attached letter left out these requested items:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

Pedestrian
Hike
 Other than above

Also please note that this request was made on Feb 21, 2007 to your Communications and Public Outreach" person, Danielle Cogan, not March 26 as indicated on your letter.

Thanks
 JK

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records
 Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 15:41:05 -0700
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Thanks Jim-
 We have revised your request to reflect the three additional items.
 Regards

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660
 360.816.2188

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 5:15 PM
To: Gleason, Tonja
Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks,

I note that your letter still shows a request data of March 26, 2007 while the request was originally made on February 21, 2007 to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person.

Please make the appropriate correction.

a lesser degree bus rapid transit, better meet local and regional plans and policies. The alternative package analysis process is described in section 2.5.4 of the Draft EIS. In addition, the Development of the Range of Alternatives memo, prepared in June 2007, contains detailed information about the evaluation of these alternative packages. The body of the memo explains the process for developing the range of alternatives, including the latter stage screening which evaluated the 12 alternative packages. The findings from this evaluation of the 12 alternative packages are included in Attachment G of that memo.

P-0817-013

Over the course of the CRC project, the project team analyzed a variety of geographic areas. The boundaries of these areas were designed to meet specific purposes, such as analyzing the impacts of project alternatives. The boundaries of the Bridge Influence Area (BIA) were developed by the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership as a way of defining the problems to be addressed, and determining how effectively project components and alternatives met the project's Purpose and Need. The project area extends from approximately Columbia Boulevard in the south to SR 500 in the north, along the I-5 corridor. This did not, however, limit the extent to which impacts were evaluated or limit consideration of potential transportation improvements. As shown on Exhibit 2.7-1, five other corridors were evaluated during this screening process, located from 2 to 3 miles downstream to 10 to 12 miles upstream of the project area.

P-0817-014

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) 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

Thanks

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records
 Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2007 08:00:31 -0700
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
 To: "Jim Karlock" <jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Jim-

The letters that you sent to me on the 23rd and the other on the 26th do not officially qualify as public records request. The request that I received on the 23rd was asking how to do something ie request records. I am giving you the benefit of the doubt and treating it as a request. The request that you believe was sent to Danielle Cogan on February 21st and was received by me on March 26th was already answered by Danielle. We will answer your request again, however it likely won't change. There are no corrections to make on the letters.
 Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
 Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660
 360.816.2188

Subject: Your Requests for Information
 Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 09:45:57 -0700
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
 To: "Jim Karlock" <jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock-

In response to your request for records dated March 23,2007, we have the records requested:

"(Danielle was apparently unable to simply forward my request form several weeks ago, so I am sending it directly to this address.)"

How do I get copies of all sign in sheets from all open house type events of the CRC, plus the task force meetings.

*Thanks
 JK."*

Please provide an address that we can send them to or provide a time that you would like to pick them up.

With respect to your request dated March 26, 2007:

*"How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge currently and projected for 2030 in each of these categories:
 Pedestrian
 Bike
 Other Than Above"*

Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

long list of potential solutions. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need. This evaluation found that, on their own, individual transit, highway, and interchange improvements would not satisfy the project's Purpose and Need. For example, alternatives that did not include such improvements in the highway generally 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. Similarly, improved transit service along the I-5 corridor is an important element of Purpose and Need, and therefore, alternatives that do not include transit investments would not meet the project's Purpose and Need.

P-0817-015

It is difficult to precisely assign costs between transportation modes. However, in response to questions such as yours, an estimate of the costs for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure has been developed and may be requested from the CRC office.

P-0817-016

Planning for safety and security on and around light rail is a high 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 measures that will be designed into the project as appropriate include 1) physical barriers such as medians, fencing, landscaping or chain and bollard to help channel automobiles, pedestrians and

General purpose lanes
 Automobile if other than General purpose lanes
 Truck if other than General purpose lanes
 Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes
 Pedestrian
 Bike
 Transit bus
 Transit rail
 Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?"

As stated in Danielle's previous response to you dated March 23, 2007, we will study the cost of the alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative, we will estimate its cost during this period as well. There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide.

Sincerely,

2 Jul 2007 07:12:34 (excerpt):

Since that time, you have asked for a citation regarding exemption from public disclosure laws. Although that doesn't apply to your original request because we don't have completed estimates, we offer the following:

RCW – 42.56.280 Preliminary Drafts

Preliminary drafts, notes, recommendations, and intra-agency memorandums in which opinions are expressed or policies formulated or recommended are exempt under this chapter.

Estimates under preparation fall under this RCW.

Once again, we intend to have completed estimates prepared and available in September of this year.

bicyclists; 2) signage, tactile pavers, audio warnings, and pavement markings at the track crossing to alert individuals they are approaching tracks; 3) active treatments such as flashing lights, bells, illuminated and audible warning devices in traffic signals; 4) Creating inviting, well-lighted platforms and station areas; 5) maintaining clear sight lines for the oncoming train and 6) implementing a public safety education campaign before the start of service.

According to the United States Bureau of Transportation Statistics, public transportation represents less than 1 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.

P-0817-017

In 2006, the project had developed a schematic design which did not allow for a precise cost estimate. Best available information was used at each project stage. Later in project development, the project team was able to develop more detailed cost estimating and conduct advanced risk analysis. Since 2002, WSDOT has been developing a process of determining cost and schedule estimates, the Cost Estimate Validation Process® (CEVP®), to help deliver major projects. Compared to conventional cost estimating, CEVP® is a risk-based estimating process, iterative in nature, and represents a "snapshot in time" for that project under the conditions known at that time. CEVP® is the expression of project cost and schedule as a range rather than as a single number. Providing cost information as a range accounts for risk factors that might otherwise cause costs to balloon over time. The cost information is given for the year of expenditure and addresses even "unknown" issues that may arise. CEVP® is a construction cost estimate tool and does not estimate long-term operations and maintenance costs. WSDOT now

6/3/08 EMAIL

P-0817-036

Date: 04:47 AM 6/3/08

To: feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org

From: Jim Karlock <Jkarlock@gmail.com>

Subject: Some questions

Please supply the following information about the project:

Provide separated data for the transit and highway components for the Daily energy use and CO₂e emissions for each of the alternatives listed in your Exhibit 1-2

Provide separated data for the transit and highway components for the Construction-Related Energy Use and CO₂e Emissions for each of the alternatives listed in your Exhibit 1-4

What is the cost of each element of the project broken down generally as:

Each highway interchange

Each highway segment between interchanges

Each bridge (Columbia slough, Columbia River and any Hayden Island portion not in the above request.)

Each light rail station

Each light rail segment

Each bridge (Columbia slough, Columbia River and any Hayden Island portion not in the above request.)

What are the projected bike and pedestrian volumes. (I can only find a chart of current daily volumes)

Cost estimate for the bike and pedestrian elements.

Of the total transit cost, of each option, what is the upper and lower limit of expected federal funding in dollars and percent of the total.

Of the total highway cost, of each option, what is the upper and lower limit of expected federal funding in dollars and percent of the total.

Your DEIS, chapter 4, page 4-2 (last paragraph) contains the statement:

To divide the bridge cost into highway and transit components, the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the "live load" on the foundation, and the superstructure cost of the bridge was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the deck area on the bridge.

With respect to the above quote:

What constitutes the "live load"?

What constitutes the foundation?

Does this mean that the cost of the foundation to support the weight of the transit deck area was not allocated to transit?

If so, where was it allocated?

What is that cost?

On what basis was this allocation decision made?

Thanks

JK

(Over)

mandates all projects over \$25 million use the process. Chapter 4 of the DEIS, and the Cost Risk Assessment included as an appendix to the DEIS, include information about how costs were estimated for the DEIS. See Chapter 4 of the FEIS for more discussion on how project costs were estimated in the CEVP® that was conducted following publication of the DEIS.

P-0817-018

See the Energy technical report for a discussion of the vehicle fleet assumed for the 2030 analysis. It takes into account current law that requires specific fuel efficiency standards, but does not assume any extraordinary changes beyond that. It does not acknowledge that market forces or future regulatory requirements could result in more efficient vehicles or more alternative fuel vehicles. As such, the estimate of operational emissions and energy consumption for the FEIS is likely conservative.

P-0817-019

The GHG analysis in the DEIS and FEIS (Section 3.19.10) included an assumption that the vehicle fleet would generally meet the future CAFE standards based on legislation current at the time. The analysis did not assume extraordinary changes in the vehicle fleet.

P-0817-020

The level of detail in the DEIS was intended to inform the public and other stakeholders with relevant information in order to understand the impacts and trade-offs associated with various alternatives. While some readers felt that the DEIS did not have enough detail, others felt that it was too long and detailed. For those who wanted more detail, the DEIS referred them to the technical reports that informed the analysis presented in the DEIS. These were made available on CD and on the project web site, as well as in hard copy. For those who felt that the

P-0817-036 ONLY RESPONSES RECEIVED**1:**

Date: 04:46 AM 6/3/08
 Subject: Your email was received
 To: "Jim Karlock" <jkarlock@gmail.com>
 Cc: "Columbia River Crossing" <feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org>

Thank you for contacting the Columbia River Crossing project. This email is to confirm that your information was received. If you asked a question or provided information that requires an immediate answer, we will respond soon in a separate message.

All comments are considered by the project on an ongoing basis. Comments received between May 2 and July 1, 2008, are identified as Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) comments and will be formally responded to in the Final EIS, expected in 2009.

Your involvement in the project is important and appreciated. Please contact us again if you have additional comments or questions.

Sincerely,

Columbia River Crossing

2:

Date: Mon, 30 Jun 2008 14:49:42 -0700
 Subject: RE: Some questions
 From: "Francis, Carley" <francisc@columbiarivercrossing.com>
 To: <jkarlock@gmail.com>

Hello Mr. Karlock,

Please find attached a letter acknowledging receipt of this request for information. We will proceed on gathering the requested data.

After hearing your testimony at the June 24, 2008 Task Force meeting, we revisited our feedback box and found this request was flagged as spam. We recovered the request today. We are sorry for any inconvenience regarding your request for information.

Thank you,
 Carley

Carley Francis

Outreach and Planning Assistant

Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Street, Suite 300 | Vancouver, WA 98660
 T 360.816.8869 | F 360.737.0294

DEIS was too detailed, an executive summary was distributed along with the DEIS and made available separately in hard copy and on the project website.

Public open houses and numerous public meetings were also held to provide opportunities for public participation. Additionally, the project team attempted to respond to questions about the location of certain information in the DEIS during the DEIS comment period. Staff, with the help of the Community and Environmental Justice Group, also developed a reader friendly table of contents and DEIS guide, to help individuals locate the information most important to them, develop and submit comments on the DEIS, and to understand next steps. Both of these documents were distributed with DEIS materials as inserts, and were available on the project website.

P-0817-021

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.

Exhibit 3 & 4 - CO2 & Energy**P-0817-022**

See discussion regarding level of detail in the DEIS, above.

P-0817-037**Energy & CO2 Emissions Data & sources**

Data (from Energy Tech. Report):			
Alt 4&5 use more than baseline			(Ex. 1-2)
Alt 1 Daily (baseline):	5,384.2 mBTU	463.3 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-2)
Alt 2 Daily (Replacement+bus)	5,248.1 mBTU	452.3 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-2)
Alt 3 Daily(Replacement+LRT)	5,242.3 mBTU	452.4 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-2)
Alt 2 Construction Energy	6,997,371.9 mBTU	585,536 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-4)
Alt 3 Construction energy	7,221,671.3 mBTU	603,472 tons CO2e	(Ex. 1-4)

Exhibit 3 - CO2**Energy Analysis:**

Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.2 = 5,384.2 - 5,248.1 = 136.1 mBTU saved per day with bus
 Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.3 = 5,384.2 - 5,242.3 = 141.9 mBTU saved per day with LRT

Considering construction:

6,997,371.9 mBTU / 136.1 mBTU saved per day = 51,451 days (141 years) to recover construction energy
 7,221,671.3 mBTU / 141.9 mBTU saved per day = 50,893 days (139 years) to recover construction energy

Exhibit 4 - Energy**CO2 Analysis:**

Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.2 = 463.3 - 452.3 = 11.0 tons CO2e saved per day with bus
 Daily savings = Alt. 1 Daily (baseline) - Alt.3 = 463.3 - 452.4 = 10.9 tons CO2e saved per day with LRT

Considering construction:

585,536 tons CO2e / 11.0 tons CO2e saved per day = 53,231 days (146 years) to recover construction energy
 603,472 tons CO2e / 10.9 tons CO2e saved per day = 55,364 days (152 years) to recover construction energy

P-0817-023

There are no provisions against a firm contributing money to a public policy objective in its own community. The consultants on this project are not the decision makers.

P-0817-024

The Task Force was an advisory group and did not have responsibility for making decisions for the CRC project. Each of the task force members has one or more interests in the project area, including home owners, business owners, property owners, citizen groups, environmental groups and local governments. They all have the potential for both adverse and beneficial impacts to themselves as well as to groups they represent. This does not exclude them from being members of the task force. In fact this is the primary reason that their input is relevant.

P-0817-025

Please see response to comment P-0817-014.

P-0817-026

The representatives from the 39-member, bi-state advisory Task Force served to represent a variety of interests, including neighborhoods, business, transit, local government, freight, and the environment. Most of the interests represented rely upon and advocated for an efficient and safe I-5 corridor that serves motorists. The list of all Task Force members can be found in Appendix B of this FEIS.

P-0817-027

The project apologizes that you did not receive the answers expected to

Exhibit 5 & 6 - Cost of Rail & Driving a Calculation

P-0817-038

Exhibit 5 Cost of the rail element

Data: (from DEIS)

Cost of LRT to Kiggins Bowl:	\$1.148 Billion	(DEIS, Ex. 4.2-2)
Guideway Length, Kiggins Bowl:	4.22 miles	(DEIS, Ex. 2.3-14)
Annual transit ridership:	6,673,420	(DEIS, Ex. 3.1-32)
Amortization rate	5.0%	

Analysis:

\$1.148 Billion x 5% = \$57.4 million annual cost
 \$57.4 million annual cost / 6,673,420 passenger = \$8.60 per 4.22 mile passenger trip
 \$8.60 / 4.22 mile = \$2.04 per passenger-mile

Exhibit 6 Cost of Driving a Car

AAA's 52.2 cents/mile is based on driving habits of their upscale members, not the USA average. This mainly shows in the cost of the car itself which is based on a new car every 5 years, an average car age of 2.5 years, while the actual national average is about 9 years. The latest AAA report (2007) used gas at \$2.256 per gallon.

Here is how we corrected for the above: Major differences between AAA and the actual USA average

Variable Cost item:

	AAA	Estimated USA average	Difference
Fuel	8.9 ¢/ mile (\$2.256 /gal)	15.8 ¢/ mile (\$4.00/gal)	+6.9

Fixed Cost items:

	AAA	Estimated USA average	Difference
Depreciation	\$3,392	\$1,100	-2,292
Finance	\$733	\$387	-346
Insurance	\$985	\$600	-385
		TOTAL Fixed difference	-3023

Adjusted AAA variable cost per mile: $14.5 \text{ ¢} + 6.9 \text{ ¢} = 21.4 \text{ ¢/ mile}$
 Adjusted AAA ownership cost per mile: $\$5,648 - 3,023 = \$2,625$; divide by 15,000 = 17.5 ¢/ mile

At 15,000 miles/yr (numbers in parentheses are passenger-mile at 1.2 passengers)

Variable costs per mile	\$0.214 (\$0.178)
Ownership cost at 15,000 annual miles:	\$0.175 (\$0.15)
	TOTAL \$0.389 (\$0.324)

Question:

Cost of gas increase for \$2.04 per passenger-mile (MPG of average car: 22.9 mi/gal=27.5 pass-mi/gal):

New cost - current cost: $\$2.04 - 0.324 = \$1.716/\text{mi}$,
 Increase in \$/gal = $1.716\$/\text{mi} * 27.5 \text{ mi/gal} = \$47 / \text{gal}$; add the current \$4 = \$51 /gal

Cost of gas increase for \$2.04 per passenger-mile at 50 MPG (60 pass-mi/gal):

New cost - current cost: $\$2.04 - 0.324 = \$1.716/\text{mi}$,
 Increase in \$/gal = $1.716\$/\text{mi} * 60 \text{ mi/gal} = \$103 / \text{gal}$; add the current \$4 = \$107 /gal

AAA is from: <http://www.aaaxchange.com/Assets/Files/20073261133460.YourDrivingCosts2007.pdf>

your questions or requests for information. The project strives to respond to questions and requests in a timely manner. The project did not respond to comments that were received during the Draft EIS comment period. Those comments are addressed in the Final EIS. If there is still information you are looking for, please feel free to contact the project at feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org.

In regards to your past requests for a cost breakdown of highway interchanges and other project elements, project records show that these requests were responded to. Information was provided that explained the project did not currently have a cost breakdown by interchange or project element at that time. Before a Locally Preferred Alternative was selected in July 2008, it was unknown what would be built. When the type of river crossing and transit mode were selected, project staff began to refine designs and develop more detailed cost estimates and financial information. This information is included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

P-0817-028

Please see response to P-0817-027.

P-0817-029

Chapter 3 of the FEIS estimates the project's impacts on operational GHG emissions (Section 3.19.10) as well as construction GHG emissions (Section 3.19.24). The operational analysis is based on a travel demand model and an EPA emissions model. This method captures the primary energy savings associated with changes in trips and speed, but does not capture the energy savings from eliminating the congestion associated with bridge lifts or reducing the congestion associated with crashes. Bridge lifts and crashes both result in increased back-up, traffic idling and higher GHG emissions. This model also does not reflect the secondary energy savings associated with reduced fuel consumption. As such it is only a partial estimate of GHG reduction

P-0817-030

Rev. 11/97 **Cash Contributions, Loans Received and In-Kind**

Please type or print legibly in black ink.

Candidate or Political Committee Name: **Yes on South-North** Committee ID Number: _____ Page **9** of **33**

Election: Primary 19 _____ General 19 **98** Other _____
 Report: 1st Pre-election 2nd Pre-election Post-election September Supplemental

SEE BACK FOR INSTRUCTIONS AND CODE DEFINITIONS

CODE 1: Contributor Type	CODE 2: Contribution Type
B Business Entity	CA Cash
C Political Committee (includes business and union PACs)	CO Cosigner Obligation
F Candidate's Immediate Family (includes candidate)	IK In-Kind
I Individual	LR Loans Received
L Labor Organization	
O Other	
P Political Party Committee	

Line #	Name and Address of Contributor	Amount of Contribution	In-Kind Purpose (see manual for suggested purpose codes)	
Date Received	Occupational Information, Contributing Committee's ID#, or Description if Code 1 is "O"	Contributor Aggregate	Code 1	Code 2
1.	G.B. Arrington, Jr. 3801 NE Couch Portland, OR 97232	\$ 200.00		
√ 9/1/98	Dir.Strategic Planning, Tri-Met	\$ 200.00	I	CA
2.	Bruce C. Harder 2555 NE 28th Portland, OR 97212	\$ 1,000.00		
√ 9/1/98	Finance director	\$ 1,000.00	I	CA
3.	Hoffman, Hart & Wagner LLP 1000 SW Broadway 20th Floor Portland, OR 97205	\$ 2,500.00		
√ 9/1/98		\$ 2,500.00	B	CA
4.	David Evans & Associates 2828 SW Corbett Portland, OR 97201	\$ 2,500.00		
√ 9/1/98		\$ 2,500.00	B	CA
5.	Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. One Penn Plz. New York, NY 10119-0061	\$ 25,000.00		
√ 9/1/98		\$ 25,000.00	B	CA
See Instructions on Back and in Campaign Finance Manual	Page Totals (Add all amounts with the same contribution type. Do not include aggregates.)	Accounting Period Totals (Complete only for last page and transfer amounts to the Summary Statement, PC 1.)		
	Cash (CA) \$ 31,200.00	Cash (CA) \$ _____	Enter on Summary Statement, Column A, Line 1	
	In-Kind (IK) \$.00	In-Kind (IK) \$ _____	Enter on Summary Statement, Column A, Lines 4 & 9	
	Loans Received (LR) \$.00	Loans Received (LR) \$ _____	Enter on Summary Statement, Column A, Line 2	

associated with operations.

The construction analysis uses a CALTRANS model that reflects the comprehensive energy "costs" associated with all construction activities and materials (both primary and secondary energy use and GHG emissions). Therefore, because the construction estimates and operational estimates are not comparable, there is no estimate of a GHG "payback" period.

P-0817-030

The FEIS estimates the project's impacts on operational energy and GHG emissions as well as construction energy and GHG emissions. The operational analysis is based on a travel demand model, energy multiplier and an EPA emissions model. This method captures the primary energy savings associated with changes to trips and speed, but does not capture the energy savings from eliminating the congestion associated with bridge lifts or reducing the congestion associated with crashes. Bridge lifts and crashes both result in increased back-up, traffic idling and higher energy consumption and higher GHG emissions. This model also does not reflect the secondary energy savings associated with reduced fuel consumption. As such it is only a partial estimate of energy savings and GHG reduction associated with operations.

The construction analysis uses a CALTRANS model that reflects the comprehensive energy "costs" associated with all construction activities and materials (both primary and secondary energy use and GHG emissions). Therefore, because the construction estimates and operational estimates are not comparable, they cannot be validly compared to estimate an energy or GHG "payback" period.

P-0817-031

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

Attachment 1

From: jim karlock [mailto:jkarlock@ipns.com]
 Sent: Friday, February 23, 2007 2:27 PM
 To: Cogan, Danielle

Danielle.

P-0817-040

Thanks for your offer to supply information about the I-5 project.

Would you be kind enough to supply the following information with regard to the current alternative packages (In the below, substitute whatever date that you use for my 2030):

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

Automobile (and how many person per vehicle)
 Truck
 Other motor vehicle
 Pedestrian
 Bike
 Transit
 Other than above

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

General purpose lanes
 Automobile if other than General purpose lanes
 Truck if other than General purpose lanes
 Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes
 Pedestrian
 Bike
 Transit bus
 Transit rail
 Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?

A copy of the latest seismic evaluation of the I-5 bridges and any other bridges that you have similar data for.

Hopefully you will have most of these items already in a single document or spreadsheet, as they are all fundamental to the decision making process.

I understand that most of the costs will be preliminary estimates, not firm costs - so please give me what you have with the appropriate qualifiers/disclaimers.

(Please reply to all so that I will get redundant copies)

Thanks

Karlock Information Request History Page 1 of 15

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-0817-032

As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the project's Purpose and Need reflects "previous planning studies, solicitation of public input, and coordination with stakeholder groups." This outreach, and prior planning studies, identified improving transit service along the I-5 corridor as an important element of this project. This need is included in the project's Purpose and Need. As such, any alternative (except No-Build) evaluated in the DEIS must address this need to improve transit service.

P-0817-033

See discussion above regarding the project's Purpose and Need.

P-0817-040

Jk

Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2007 17:06:00 -0800
 From: "Cogan, Danielle" <cogand@columbiarivercrossing.com>
 To: "jim karlock" <jkarlock@ipns.com>

Mr. Karlock,

We are working on the answers to your questions and should have responses by Friday. Thank you for your patience. As you know, we spent a lot of time and energy working on the staff recommendation, and now we are dedicating our efforts to answering questions and providing staff support to the 4 Alternative Task Force Subcommittee.

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** RE: info request & more
 Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2007 08:33:28 -0700
 From: "Cogan, Danielle" <cogand@columbiarivercrossing.com>
 To: "Jim Karlock" <jkarlock@earthlink.net>
 Cc: "document.control" <document.control@columbiarivercrossing.org>, "Columbia River Crossing" <feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org>

Dear Mr. Karlock,

Thank you for contacting the Columbia River Crossing project about the number of current and projected vehicle trips for the year 2030 on I-5, the cost of each of the project elements under consideration, and the cost of a lid over I-5 in Vancouver.

You also requested the sign-in sheets for CRC Task Force meetings, open houses and the March 12 CRC Fourth Alternative Task Force Subcommittee meeting. Please direct your request for the sign-in sheets to the document control department of the Columbia River Crossing project by emailing your request to document.control@columbiarivercrossing.org.

The seismic evaluation of the I-5 bridges is available on the Project Documents page of the CRC website under the heading General Documents on this web page:

<http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/materials/projDocs.aspx>

The existing daily volume data for vehicle trips across the Columbia River is for the year 2005. These traffic volumes are estimated at 40- pedestrians, 160- bicycles, 122, 800-cars, 11,000- cars and trucks; and 200- transit vehicles for a total of 134,000 vehicles.

The vehicle traffic data for the year 2030 is an estimate based on forecasted data and may change. The year 2030 forecasted data describes vehicle trips during Peak 4- Hour Volumes for northbound PM traffic and southbound AM traffic.

Southbound AM 4-Hr
2005 Existing Conditions
 Cars- 19,025
 Trucks- 900
 Transit- 75
 Total Vehicles- 20,000

P-0817-034

Please see response to comment P-0817-023.

P-0817-035

Thank you for your comment.

P-0817-036

Please see response to P-0817-027.

P-0817-037

Please see the response above to comment P-0817-029.

P-0817-038

Please refer to our other responses regarding the costs of light rail.

P-0817-039

Please see response to comment P-0817-023.

P-0817-040

Please see response to P-0817-027.

P-0817-0402030 No-Build Forecasts

Cars- 21, 800
Trucks- 1,025
Transit- 100
Total Vehicles- 22,925

2030 Build Forecasts

Cars- 26, 650
Trucks- 1,275
Transit- 150
Total Vehicles- 28,075

Northbound PM 4-Hr2005 Existing Conditions

Cars- 20,400
Trucks- 700
Transit- 100
Total Vehicles- 21,200

2030 No-Build Forecasts

Cars- 20,975
Trucks- 725
Transit- 125
Total Vehicles- 21,825

2030 Build Forecasts

Cars- 31,875
Trucks- 1,100
Transit- 225
Total Vehicles- 33,200

We will study the cost of the alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative we will estimate its cost during this period as well.

Thank you for contacting the Columbia River Crossing with your questions about the project. Please contact me if you have any further questions about the project development process.

Sincerely,

Danielle Cogan
Communications Manager

Subject: Your Request for CRC Records
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 09:03:06 -0700
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

P-0817-040

Dear Mr. Karlock-
Please find the attached letter of acknowledgment concerning your request for CRC records. Please forward your address so that we can mail you the original.
Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Public Disclosure Coordinator
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188

Karlock03-26-07Letter.pdf

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 11:58 AM
To: Gleason, Tonja
Subject: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

When can I expect these copies to be mailed?
What will the total cost be?
Can I come to you office and pick them up.
Can I bring a copy machine?

Thanks
JK

jim karlock
3311 n.e. 35th ave
portland or 97212

At 08:03 AM 3/26/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:

Dear Mr. Karlock-
Please find the attached letter of acknowledgment concerning your request for CRC records. Please forward your address so that we can mail you the original.
Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Public Disclosure Coordinator
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 12:47 PM
To: Gleason, Tonja

Karlock Information Request History Page 4 of 15

P-0817-040 Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

At 10:08 AM 3/26/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:

When can I expect these copies to be mailed?

You will hear from us within 30 days to either provide you with the information you requested assuming that it is available or to give you an estimate of the time needed to fulfill your request.

What will the total cost be?

Until we identify and locate all the requested information we do not know what the total cost will be. The cost per state law of copies is as follows:

.15 cents per page for 8.5" x 11" black and white
 .20 cents per page for 8.5" x 14" black and white
 .25 cents per page for 11" x 17" black and white
 .72 cents per page for 8.5" x 11" color
 .77 cents per page for 8.5" x 14" color
 \$1.44 per page for 11" x 17" color

Can I come in your office and pick them up.

Absolutely

Can I bring a copy machine?

I will check with the State of Washington to determine if this is acceptable.

I thought you were operating under BOTH Washington and Oregon rules. Oregon specifically requires you to allow a citizen to bring in a copy machine.

Can I bring my copy machine in to copy those sheets this afternoon? (Or pickup copies that you made if under \$15)

Thanks
 JK

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 11:57:41 -0700

From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>

To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Jim-

You are correct that this project falls under the jurisdiction of BOTH states. This is precisely the reason I will need to check with Washington to see if you will be able to bring a copy machine in. Even if the answer is yes, we have 30 days to compile the information that you requested and to examine it for redactable information. This information is not readily available this afternoon, so you will be unable to do this today. We will however get this to you as soon as we are able.
 Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
 Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660

360.816.2188

P-0817-040

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 1:31 PM**To:** Gleason, Tonja**Subject:** RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Please note that the 30 period stated on March 14, the data that I emailed your "communications and public outreach" person.

I might add that it has been almost two weeks for this simple request.

Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

~~Automobile (and how many person per vehicle)~~
~~Truck~~
~~Other motor vehicle~~
Pedestrian
Bike
~~Transit~~
~~Other than above~~

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

General purpose lanes
 Automobile if other than General purpose lanes
 Truck if other than General purpose lanes
 Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes
 Pedestrian
 Bike
 Transit bus
 Transit rail
 Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?

Thanks
 JK

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records
 Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 14:15:20 -0700

Karlock Information Request History Page 6 of 15

P-0817-040

From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Hello Jim-
 I have logged your additional request and have attached a letter of acknowledgment to this email.
 Regards-

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 3:54 PM
To: Gleason, Tonja
Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks. However your attached letter left out these requested items:

How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge **currently** and **projected for 2030** in each of these categories:

Pedestrian
Bike
 Other than above

Also please note that this request was made on Feb 21, 2007 to your Communications and Public Outreach" person, Danielle Cogan, not March 26 as indicated on your letter.

Thanks
 JK

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records
 Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2007 15:41:05 -0700
 From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
 To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Thanks Jim-
 We have revised your request to reflect the three additional items.
 Regards

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188

P-0817-040

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 5:15 PM
To: Gleason, Tonja
Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records

Thanks.

I note that your letter still shows a request date of March 26, 2007 while the request was originally made on February 21, 2007 to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person.

Please make the appropriate correction.

Thanks
 JK

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Request for CRC Records
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2007 08:00:31 -0700
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Jim-

The letters that you sent to me on the 23rd and the other on the 26th do not officially qualify as public records request. The request that I received on the 23rd was asking how to do something ie request records. I am giving you the benefit of the doubt and treating it as a request. The request that you believe was sent to Danielle Cogan on February 21st and was received by me on March 26th was already answered by Danielle. We will answer your request again, however it likely won't change. There are no corrections to make on the letters.

Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
 Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188

Subject: Your Requests for Information
Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 09:45:57 -0700
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock-

In response to your request for records dated March 23,2007, we have the records requested:

"(Danielle was apparently unable to simply forward my request form several weeks ago, so I am sending it directly to this address.)"

How do I get copies of all sign in sheets from all open house type events of the CRC, plus the task force meetings.

*Thanks
 JK."*

P-0817-040 Please provide an address that we can send them to or provide a time that you would like to pick them up.

With respect to your request dated March 26, 2007:

"How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge currently and projected for 2030 in each of these categories:

Pedestrian

Bike

Other Than Above

Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

General purpose lanes

Automobile if other than General purpose lanes

Truck if other than General purpose lanes

Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes

Pedestrian

Bike

Transit bus

Transit rail

Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?"

As stated in Danielle's previous response to you dated March 23, 2007, we will study the cost of the alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative, we will estimate its cost during this period as well. There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide.

Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
 Columbia River Crossing Project
 700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
 Vancouver, Washington 98660
 360.816.2188
www.columbiarivercrossing.org

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2007 10:27 AM

P-0817-040 To: Gleason, Tonja
 Cc: jimredde@portlandtribune.com; jimmayer@news.oregonian.com; john.laird@columbian.com
 Subject: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Requests for Information

At 09:45 AM 4/19/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:

Dear Mr. Karlock-

In response to your request for records dated March 23,2007, we have the records requested:

"(Danielle was apparently unable to simply forward my request form several weeks ago, so I am sending it directly to this address.)"

How do I get copies of all sign in sheets from all open house type events of the CRC, plus the task force meetings.

*Thanks
 JK."*

Please provide an address that we can send them to or provide a time that you would like to pick them up.

I would like to pick them up this afternoon.

With respect to your request dated March 26, 2007:

"How many daily trips are there across the I-5 bridge currently and projected for 2030 in each of these categories:

Pedestrian

Bike

Other Than Above

Would you also be kind enough to finish my request of 2/21/07 (made to Danielle Cogan, your "communications and public outreach" person as follows. I will repeat my request, with the filled items crossed out, and mention that I was told that the remaining information did not exist. That is simply not credible, or an indication of gross dereliction of duty by the engineering staff:

For each of the current alternatives, what is the cost (in dollars) for each of these elements, broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches:

General purpose lanes

Automobile if other than General purpose lanes

Truck if other than General purpose lanes

Other motor vehicle if other than General purpose lanes

Pedestrian

Bike

Transit bus

Transit rail

Other than above

What would covering-burying I-5 in Vancouver per Mayor Pollard's recent comments cost?

Where do the various options attain ground level at each end of the bridges and related ramps?"

As stated in Danielle's previous response to you dated March 23, 2007, we will study the cost of the

P-0817-040

alternatives and their elements as the project moves forward in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. The DEIS is an intense and thorough process of analysis that will examine the benefits and impacts of the proposed alternatives including cost. If a lid is part of an alternative, we will estimate its cost during this period as well. There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide.

That was not a request for official studies. That was, and is, a request for any documents containing any estimates, of any kind, preliminary or not, or guesses of any kind, in any way stating possible costs.

To state that no document in your possession contains any cost estimate of any kind, is simply not believable. I hereby demand that you produce the requested documents ASAP.

As to your claim that "There are currently no Pedestrian or Bike projections for 2030 to provide." Again, this is not a request for official documents prepared "to provide". It is a request for ANY documents in your possession that contain projections about 2030 Pedestrian or Bike projected volume, OFFICIAL OR NOT.

To state that no document, in your possession contains, any projection of any kind, is simply not believable. I hereby demand that you produce the requested documents ASAP.

If such documents do not exist, does this constitute your denial of published cost estimates such as these:

"Although the cost of the so-called Columbia River Crossing currently is estimated at between \$2 billion and \$6 billion" *The Portland Tribune, Feb 23, 2007*

"\$2 billion - State officials say a six-lane span is needed..." *The Oregonian, Wednesday, November 22, 2006*

"When it comes to planning a \$2 billion, once-a-century bridge," *The Columbian, Sunday, January 07, 2007*

I want you to produce the basis for those published estimates.

Thanks
JK

Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Requests for Information
Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2007 11:18:49 -0700
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Thank you Jim-
Your documents will be ready for pick up at the front desk this afternoon. I will pass your comments regarding the validity of our response on to the appropriate project individuals.
Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,

P-0817-040 Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188
www.columbiarivercrossing.org

From: Jim Karlock [mailto:Jkarlock@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2007 3:45 AM
To: Gleason, Tonja
Subject: RE: *** Detected as Spam *** Re: Your Requests for Information

I would like to thank you for providing copies of the sign in sheets.

As you will recall we discussed my unfilled requests and you stated that "works in process" and "data" were exempt from disclosure.

I checked ORS 192 (<http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/192.html>) and could find no mention of data being exempt, except under narrow circumstances, primarily confidentiality.

Likewise, I find no mention of "work in process" being exempt.

Please cite an ORS **and** Washington statute provision for your claim of exemption from disclosure laws, or supply the information that I requested on February 23, 2007.

Thanks
JK

Subject: Your Requests for Information
Date: Mon, 30 Apr 2007 14:39:24 -0700
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock-

I have passed this matter on to appropriate staff for clarification. I will get back with you as soon as we are provided with direction.

Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Ave. STE 300.
Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188
www.columbiarivercrossing.org

01:39 pm 5/4/07
To: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
Re: Your Requests for Information

I has now been another week and my request from February 23 2007 is still not fully filled.

P-0817-040 When can I expect his information?

Thanks
JK

At 02:39 PM 4/30/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:
Dear Mr. Karlock-

I have passed this matter on to appropriate staff for clarification. I will get back with you as soon as we are provided with direction.

Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188

01:33 pm 5/10/07

To: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
Subject: Re: Your Requests for Information

I has now been almost another week and my request from February 23 2007 is still not fully filled.
When can I expect his information?

Thanks
JK

At 02:39 PM 4/30/07, Gleason, Tonja wrote:
Dear Mr. Karlock-

I have passed this matter on to appropriate staff for clarification. I will get back with you as soon as we are provided with direction.

Sincerely,

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188
www.columbiarivercrossing.org

P-0817-040

Subject: Columbia River Crossing Cost Estimates
Date: Mon, 2 Jul 2007 07:12:34 -0700
From: "Gleason, Tonja" <GleasonT@columbiarivercrossing.org>
To: "Jim Karlock" <Jkarlock@earthlink.net>

Dear Mr. Karlock,

This email is in response to your recent request for the estimates prepared for the Columbia River Crossing project.

At this time, we do not have any completed or confirmed cost estimates for the project. We anticipate having completed estimates in September.

Please keep in mind that with all of our estimates for the project, we must first verify the estimate and then apply a risk assessment in order to ensure that the estimates are accurate and complete. That process is lengthy, but necessary given the limited amount of engineering that is typically completed by this phase of the project.

In your request dated March 26, 2007, you asked for projections and estimates for the project. We did not have estimates at that time, nor do we have completed estimates at this time. On April 19, 2007, we provided you with the information that we had and closed out your request.

Since that time, you have asked for a citation regarding exemption from public disclosure laws. Although that doesn't apply to your original request because we don't have completed estimates, we offer the following:

RCW – 42.56.280 Preliminary Drafts

Preliminary drafts, notes, recommendations, and intra-agency memorandums in which opinions are expressed or policies formulated or recommended are exempt under this chapter.

Estimates under preparation fall under this RCW.

Once again, we intend to have completed estimates prepared and available in September of this year.

We appreciate your interest in the project and look forward to providing you with the cost estimates once they are completed.

Tonja L. Gleason C.P.A.
Project Controls Manager
Columbia River Crossing Project
700 Washington Ave. STE 300,
Vancouver, Washington 98660
360.816.2188
www.columbiarivercrossing.org

- P-0817-041** The DEIS did not consider adding enough road capacity to ensure free flow and running frequent buses in the general purpose lanes.
The DEIS did not consider running frequent buses in HOV/HOT lanes.
The DEIS did not consider a simple bus system upgrade in service, such as increasing bus routes and frequency, instead of fancy stations and exclusive lanes.
The DEIS did not consider eliminating park and ride by increasing bus routes and frequency.
- P-0817-042** Did the DEIS specify the East and West boundaries of the "bridge influence area" in a clear and consistent manner?
- P-0817-043** The DEIS did not consider highway only.
The DEIS did not consider transit only.
The DEIS did not individually consider improving the on/off ramps that cause the most congestion.
- P-0817-044** The DEIS did not provide separable costs for the various components in a clear manner (if at all).
- P-0817-045** The DEIS did not consider the death rate of light rail which is over twice that of buses.
- P-0817-046** It appears that only live load on bridge foundations was assigned to rail (the rest presumably being allocated to the highway component):
the foundation cost was allocated to transit based on transit's proportionate share of the "live load" on the foundation (3)
- P-0817-047** The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to become much more energy efficient in the future due to Federal mandates.
- P-0817-048** The DEIS did not consider that cars are likely to emit much less CO2 in the future due to Federal energy mandates.
- P-0817-049** The DEIS failed to give costs in common units like cost per passenger-mile. This makes comparisons difficult.
The DEIS failed to give have supporting data readily locateable. Many times a number would appear in the report with no obvious source in the technical documents.
- P-0817-050** The funding sources listed in the DEIS may overstate the available Federal funding for the transit portion.
The funding sources listed in the DEIS may understate the available Federal funding for the road portion.
- P-0817-051** Some alleged data in the DEIS, appears to be unsupported assertions.
- P-0817-052** This phase of the project is apparently managed by a company that has given money, in the past, to support one of outcomes under consideration.⁽⁴⁾
- P-0817-053** Some task force members own land in the affected areas and may profit from their decisions.
- P-0817-054** The task force did not consider the cost and benefit of each of the various options (and their components) before they were eliminated for consideration in the DEIS. This could have caused combinations of options (or parts thereof) that might have met the selection criteria to be rejected.

P-0817-041

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.

P-0817-055 Task Force was not representative. It had only two automobile users representatives (of the 39 members), although automobile users are the majority of the transportation system users.

Task Force was not representative. A number of groups with an anti-automobile agenda were given memberships on the 39 member task force, although such radical views are only shared by a tiny minority of the general population. Several such groups were formed by one individual (Burkholder) who is also a task force member himself. He effectively had three (or more) votes.

P-0817-056 The project management has refused numerous requests for information, relying on dubious legal distinctions or hiding behind the differences between Oregon and Washington public records laws.

For instance, although this is a joint project of both Oregon and Washington, they claimed that they did not have to give out copies of drafts because Washington law does not require them to, while Oregon law does require the release of drafts. Regardless of applicable law, this indicates a clear desire to hide information in what is claimed to be an open process. Some of the requests were never filled, including the projected bike and pedestrian volumes, costs (broken down by the bridge component itself and other related items such as approaches) of the general purpose lanes; Pedestrian; Bike and Transit rail. See Exhibit 2. (Attachment 2 has the complete history.)

The project has failed to fill a request for information, sent on 6/3/2008, in time to complete this comment document by the deadline. The only response received was the email auto responder and an email a few days ago claiming that they had found my request in their spam filter. This fails to "ring true" as many of their replies, in the past, have had a subject header (from the original email request) with the line "flagged as spam" added. For an example see the email exchange in Attachment 1. This strongly suggests that most of their incoming email goes into the spam filter and, by implication, they check the spam filter on a regular basis. (Exhibit 2)

P-0817-057 The proposed project will actually cause more CO2 emissions than "no-build". Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to emit more CO2 than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 11 tons of CO2 per day at a construction cost of about 600,000 tons. It will take 150 years of savings to make up for the construction emissions. This is a longer payback time than the likely life of the project. (Exhibit 3)

P-0817-058 The proposed project will actually use more energy than "no-build". Alternatives 4 & 5 are projected to use more energy than no build. Alternatives 2 & 3 are projected to save about 140 million BTU per day at a construction cost of 7,000,000 million BTU. It will take about 137 years to make up for the construction energy consumption. (Exhibit 4)

P-0817-059 The cost of the rail portion is excessive, especially when compared to the cost of driving. The cost of the rail component is estimated at \$1.1 Billion, about \$35 million per year when annualized at 5%. The projected 6 million annual trips will cost \$9 each. This is for just the 4.2 mile project area, so the cost is \$2.04 per passenger-mile. (See Exhibit 5) For comparison, the average American pays 50.324 per mile. (AAA gives a higher number because they assume the upscale usage patterns of its members, mostly their 2.5 year old car age, while the national average is 9 years. AAA reports cost per vehicle-mile, while we use passenger-mile to match transit data.) Gasoline would have to get to \$43 /gal. to cost as much per mile as just the construction cost of this project with today's cars. With current hybrid cars, gas would have to cost over \$100 / gal. (Exhibit 6)

P-0817-060 Conclusion: reject the project with a recommendation that they propose a modest road

P-0817-061 only project solution to serve the actual needs of the near future. If rail turns out to be needed in 20 years, then build it in 15 years. To build it earlier is merely to shove billions of dollars to construction companies and to satisfy Portland's numerous profession prophets of impending doom.

*** eSafe scanned this email for malicious content ***

P-0817-042

See discussion of the project boundaries above.

P-0817-043

See response to this same comment above, in P-0817-014.

P-0817-044

Please see response to same comment, above.

P-0817-045

Please see response to comment P-0817-016.

P-0817-046

The project has sought to accurately estimate costs for this complex project. The costs have been separated between modes and between geographic areas. However, the integrated nature of the project makes it difficult to have full and completely differentiated costs for transit and highway components.

The loading on the bridge is driven by the mass of the bridge itself. This is one reason why the stacked option was selected; as it is a very efficient way of providing the bike and pedestrian, and transit river crossings. The bridge would not be built any smaller if transit were not part of it. The difference is almost entirely in the less costly options such as decking, railing, and electric catenary wires.

The costs attributed to transit have been calculated by taking the cost of the proposed design and comparing it to the cost of a typical segmental bridge without transit.

P-0817-047

Please see response above to comment P-0817-018.

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

P-0817-048

Please see response above to comment P-0817-019.

P-0817-049

See response to same comment, above.

P-0817-050

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-0817-051

See response to same comment, above.

P-0817-052

See response to same comment, above.

P-0817-053

See response to same comment, above.

P-0817-054

See response to this same comment, in P-0817-025, above.

P-0817-055

See response to same comment, above.

P-0817-056

Please see response to P-0817-027.

P-0817-057

Please see response above to comment P-0817-029.

P-0817-058

Please see response above to comment P-0817-030.

P-0817-059

Please refer to our other responses regarding the costs of light rail.

P-0817-060

See response to this same comment above, in P-0817-032.

P-0817-061

See discussion of project's Purpose and Need above.