



1 and write articles giving facts and figures. We  
 2 need -- If light rail is going to be a part of this,  
 3 we need to convince the people who -- who have not  
 4 had the advantage of living in a place where right  
 5 light rail really works, to see what that's going to  
 6 be like. That's it.

7 **MR. HEWITT:** Thank you.

8 So, now, I'd like to call up to this table  
 9 Connie Wallace, Christian Steinbrecher, and Dan  
 10 Kaufman. And the next speaker here will be Terry  
 11 Parker.

**P-0963-001** 12 **MR. PARKER:** My name's Terry Parker. My  
 13 mailing address is Post Office Box 13503, Portland  
 14 97213.

**P-0963-002** 15 Alternative one, the no-build, does not  
 16 have enough capacity for either motor vehicles or  
 17 transit, in addition to lacking some safety  
 18 requirements of a modern freeway.

**P-0963-003** 19 The replacement crossing is too massive,  
 20 has too massive a footprint, and both are too

**P-0963-004** 21 expensive to construct. Under no circumstances  
 22 should there be a separate structure constructed for  
 23 the chosen transit option; bicycles and/or

**P-0963-005** 24 pedestrians. The supplemental crossing as proposed  
 25 are nothing more than a sham; a pointless folly that

### **P-0963-001**

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

### **P-0963-002**

Preferences for specific alternatives or options, as expressed in comments received before and after the issuance of the DEIS, were shared with local sponsor agencies to inform decision making. Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected a replacement I-5 bridge with light rail to Clark College as the project's Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). These sponsor agencies, which include the Portland City Council, Vancouver City Council, TriMet Board, C-TRAN Board, Metro Council, RTC Board, considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force when voting on the LPA.

With the LPA, new bridges will replace the existing Interstate Bridges to carry I-5 traffic, light rail, pedestrians and bicyclists across the Columbia River. Light rail will extend from the Expo Center MAX Station in Portland to a station and park and ride at Clark College in Vancouver. Pedestrians and bicyclists would travel along a wider and safer path than exists today.

For a more detailed description of highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements associated with the LPA, see Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

### **P-0963-003**

The Columbia River Crossing project includes the replacement of the existing I-5 bridge over the Columbia River, improvements at seven interchanges over 5 miles of I-5, and the extension of light rail from Portland to Vancouver. The projected cost to construct this large and

# Naegeli Reporting

**800.528.3335**  
**www.NaegeliReporting.com**

503.227.7123 FAX

Portland, OR (503) 227-1544 Seattle, WA (206) 622-3376 Spokane, WA (509) 838-6000 Coeur d'Alene, ID (208) 667-1163

**P-0963-005** 1 appears to be specifically designed for the politic  
2 -- for the purpose of politically eliminating any  
3 less-costly options that would reuse the existing  
4 historical bridges. Therefore, none of the above  
5 are acceptable.

6 It's time to take the politics and the  
7 special interests out of this project and come up  
8 with a reasonably-priced, cost-effective, reality-  
9 check option that meets everybody's needs, while not

**P-0963-006** 10 just -- while recycling -- not just recycling, but  
11 reusing the existing historical bridges. Clearly, a

**P-0963-007** 12 new I-5 crossing is needed for highway mobility  
13 purposes to meet modern safety needs of an  
14 interstate freeway.

15 However, a new freeway bridge only needs  
16 to be -- have six full-width lanes -- full-service  
17 lanes; three in each direction, and the current  
18 bridge can be saved.

**P-0963-008** 19 I propose a different -- a couple of  
20 different alternatives. Alternative A places the  
21 chosen transit option on the ground level using one  
22 lane in each direction for the historical bridges,  
23 while alternative B puts the transit option under  
24 the -- under a new highway -- six-lane highway

**P-0963-009** 25 bridge. The transit authoritarians, Oregonians, and

complex project are presented in Chapter 4 of the FEIS, and are estimated in year of expenditure dollars to account for inflation. Multiple sources will help fund construction of the project – the federal government, State of Oregon, State of Washington, and tolling the I-5 Bridge.

#### **P-0963-004**

The Stacked/Transit Highway Bridge (STHB) option, which would allow transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians to travel beneath the highway bridge deck, was included as part of the LPA. The DEIS indicated that the two bridges required for this bridge option would put less bridge sub-structure in the Columbia River, likely resulting in less environmental impact. After publication of the DEIS, additional engineering studies were conducted that confirmed the feasibility of the STHB design.

The STHB is described in greater detail in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2) of the FEIS. Impacts associated with a STHB are discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

#### **P-0963-005**

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

#### **P-0963-006**

Thank you for your comment. Preferences for specific alternatives or options, as expressed in comments received before and after the issuance of the DEIS, were shared with local sponsor agencies to inform decision making.

#### **P-0963-007**

The CRC Task Force - composed of 39 leaders from a broad cross section of Washington and Oregon communities – was tasked with

**Naegeli**  
**REPORTING**

**800.528.3335**  
**www.NaegeliReporting.com**  
**503.227.7123 FAX**  
Portland, OR (503) 227-1544 Seattle, WA (206) 622-3376 Spokane, WA (509) 838-6000 Coeur d'Alene, ID (208) 667-1163

**P-0963-009** 1 even Oregon politicians have no business deciding  
2 for Washingtonians if light rail should be running  
3 through their communities. It's their choice.

**P-0963-010** 4 The benefits of reusing the exist --  
5 existing bridges, along with a new freeway bridge,  
6 include the amount of disruption and energy used for  
7 construction is less, as compared to any total  
8 replacement option. Due to interchange  
9 modifications and relocations, the size of the  
10 footprint is the smallest of any build-up option,  
11 and historical structure is preserved. All of which  
12 equate to saving the taxpayers' money while  
13 constructing a workable project. These alternatives  
14 must be considered.

**P-0963-011** 15 As for tolling, once again, take the  
16 politics out and establish a reality check. Do not  
17 kill the economy, and do not further separate the  
18 two sides of the river.

**P-0963-012** 19 Therefore, I say if tolling is implemented  
20 for any motor vehicles, then the users of all modes  
21 of vehicular traffic, including transit passengers  
22 and free-loading bicyclists, must be required to pay  
23 a toll or a user charge. Anything less is  
24 socialistic policymaking that has no place in a  
25 democratic society and smacks of discrimination.

advising the CRC project team, including federal sponsors, and providing guidance and recommendations at key decision points over the course of nearly 3 ½ years. Public agencies, businesses, civic organizations, neighborhoods and freight, commuter and environmental groups were all represented on the Task Force. The Task Force voted to develop a supplemental bridge alternative, in an attempt to find an alternative to total bridge replacement that would still meet the project's purpose and need but at lower cost and with greater reliance on managing demand with higher tolls and more transit service. The two most promising supplemental alternatives were considered in the DEIS. Based on the detailed analysis that followed, the Task Force recommended, and all project sponsors agreed, that the replacement bridge with light rail was the locally preferred alternative.

**P-0963-008**

Please refer to response to comment P-0963-004.

**P-0963-009**

Light rail has been endorsed by every local Sponsoring Agency (Vancouver City Council, C-TRAN, RTC, Portland City Council, TriMet, and Metro), whose boards are comprised of the elected leadership of the region.

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

The CRC project planning for light rail incorporates and supports the principles of the Vancouver's City Center Vision Plan. Downtown

**Naegeli  
REPORTING**

**800.528.3335**  
**www.NaegeliReporting.com**

503.227.7123 FAX  
Portland, OR (503) 227-1544 Seattle, WA (206) 622-3376 Spokane, WA (509) 838-6000 Coeur d'Alene, ID (208) 667-1163

**P-0963-013** 1           Moreover, there should be no consideration  
2 of what is commonly called "congestion pricing."  
3 This, too, is discrimination, in that, most people  
4 cannot choose the hours that they work.

**P-0963-014** 5 Additionally, the HR -- the HOV lanes don't work.

**P-0963-015** 6           I have submitted a six-page written  
7 testimony. Please review it. Thank you.

8           **MR. HEWITT:** Thank you.

9           **MR. KODAMA:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 It's Jim Kodama, for the record; K-O-D-A-M-A.

11           **MR. HEWITT:** Thank you. I couldn't tell  
12 that.

13           **MR. KODAMA:** I'm with the Pacific  
14 Northwest Regional Council. My mailing address is  
15 1015 Allen Street, Space Number 1, in Kelso,  
16 Washington.

17           I have spoke at several EIS meetings in  
18 favor of developments. Because of our loss to our  
19 lumber industries, our areas have been devastated,  
20 employment-wise. Our communities are downgrading,  
21 drugs seem to be rancid (sic). The construction of  
22 this bridge will help pass over the Columbia.  
23 Which, thank goodness we have. The Columbia is a  
24 vital source of economic jobs to this community that  
25 will bring good paying jobs, manufacturing jobs.

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

Long-term operation and maintenance of the new light rail line will be funded through C-TRAN and TriMet. For its share of the operations and maintenance funding, C-TRAN plans on having a public vote.

#### **P-0963-010**

A supplemental bridge has been considered. The alternative actually required more right of way than a replacement option. This was required in order to maintain the existing ramps and interchanges, and adding to them with facilities to serve a new bridge alongside the old. The Replacement options provide the greatest opportunity for efficiently stacking and weaving the ramps within a tight footprint.

#### **P-0963-011**

This issue was addressed as part of the economics analysis and is described in detail in the Economics Technical Report. This report, and Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the DEIS, note that the increased costs incurred because of tolls would generally be offset by the improved travel options and travel times. Under existing and No Build Alternative conditions, congestion delays and high crash rates have significant costs for local businesses and travelers; 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 and Airport Way. However, the variable-rate toll structure that was evaluated in the DEIS

**Naegeli**  
**REPORTING**

**800.528.3335**  
**www.NaegeliReporting.com**

503.227.7123 FAX  
Portland, OR (503) 227-1544    Seattle, WA (206) 622-3376    Spokane, WA (509) 838-6000    Coeur d'Alene, ID (208) 667-1163

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 a toll-free alternative for reaching destinations across the river.

**P-0963-012**

Details of the tolling system are still being refined as the project development enters the final design stage. It is currently not anticipated that transit users, bicyclists or pedestrians will pay a toll. Additionally, certain toll discounts or waivers for other groups have been and will continue to be considered. The ultimate decision on any tolling options will be made by both the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions.

**P-0963-013**

The CRC project proposes to include a variable rate toll. The goal of variable-rate tolling is to reduce congestion and maximize the flow of traffic through this corridor. With a variable rate toll, a lower toll is charged when traffic demand is lower and a higher toll is charged when the corridor is at its highest demand. Because a toll is charged by time of day, variable-rate tolling gives travelers an incentive to change travel times, reduce optional trips, take an alternate route, or choose transit as an alternative to driving alone. Experiences in other cities in the U.S. and around the world have shown that these fees can help reduce congestion and improve the performance of the roadway.

**P-0963-014**

The CRC project does not include HOV lanes inside its five-mile project area. The CRC project team looked at HOV lanes and freight lanes,

which are typically located on the inside freeway lane next to the barrier, as part of its technical analysis. Because about 70 percent of the vehicles enter and/or exit I-5 within the five-mile study area, access to and from a HOV lane or freight lane could create traffic operational problems by increasing lane changes (for example, HOVs entering the freeway and needing to merge all the way to the inside lane). The results of this analysis is described in more detail in section 3.1 of the DEIS. Regarding the existing HOV lanes located outside the project area, the CRC project does not propose any changes. These HOV lanes might effectively link to HOV lanes in the CRC area in the future, if employed as part of a larger regional plan. Should the region adopt and develop a larger HOV system, lanes within the bridge influence area could potentially be striped as part of that network.

**P-0963-015**

These comments were included as formal comments on the DEIS and were responded to.