

1 really was kind of scary. After a while, it wasn't
 2 a problem at all. So I certainly, as a cyclist,
 3 don't want to spend 4.2 billion to get a bicycle
 4 bridge and -- However, if it is going to happen, I
 5 would like to see better cycling and pedestrian
 6 facilities and light rail. Thank you.

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

8 Now, to this table (indicated), I'd like
 9 to invite Joe Morrison, Jim Howell, Randy Salisbury.
 10 And the next speaker is Doug Klotz.

11 **MR. KLOTZ:** Hi. I'm Doug Klotz; K-L-O-T-
 12 Z, 2630 Southeast 43rd Avenue, Portland 97206.

13 Many in Portland would know me as a long-
 14 time pedestrian advocate and, certainly, all the
 15 build options to include improved pedestrian and
 16 bicycle facilities, which is great.

17 However, as some of the previous speakers,
 18 I am concerned about the modeling that is used to
 19 determine traffic volumes and how that is -- would
 20 be accepted by the current reduction in auto travel
 21 that is occurring. And, certainly, most
 22 commentators on the -- on the world scene would --
 23 would -- would agree that oil prices are not going
 24 down. Auto travel is going to be more expensive.
 25 And to answer one of the previous speakers, yes,

P-0968-001

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

P-0968-002

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

P-0968-003

Significant increases in oil prices can have both short term and long term effects on travel behavior. In the short term, the options for responding to rising gas prices are more limited, and include driving less and/or changing from driving to walking, biking or transit for at least some trips. During recent increases in gasoline prices transit use increased and off-peak highway travel decreased. Peak period highway travel changed little.

Over the long term, there are more options for adjusting to changes in gasoline prices, besides changing driving behavior. Technological advances and legislative mandates can increase fuel efficiency standards in the long term. In turn, as older vehicles wear out, more consumers can replace them with more fuel efficient vehicles. Automobile manufacturers are developing and will continue to develop new vehicle and engine technologies that require much less, or even no, petroleum-based fuels. This trend is already happening as evidenced by the growing popularity of gasoline-electric hybrid and small electric vehicles.

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-0968-003 1 there are other ways to power automobiles, but they
2 are not as cheap and not as convenient. And there
3 will be a reduction in traffic, regardless. So I
4 think we need to relook at that with the -- we look
5 at the congestion issue with a -- with a view to
6 what the likely congestion might be in the future.

P-0968-004 7 I also want to note that congestion --
8 there's a definition of "congestion" in this report.
9 And I -- I don't know the exact figure, but it's
10 something like, you know, any speed below 40 miles
11 an hour, or so, is considered "congestion." And I --
12 - Having lived in Los Angeles for a while, that's
13 not congestion. Congestion is when you're stopped.

P-0968-005 14 Anyway, so -- and they -- as the other
15 fellow said, the NEPA standards would point to
16 reconsidering under new circumstances that weren't
17 there ten -- ten years ago when the project was
18 started.

P-0968-006 19 And I also note that freight capacity is a
20 lot of the concern for this corridor, and certainly,
21 that's -- that's an important issue. I have heard,
22 though, in talking to Portland's -- the coordinator
23 of Portland's freight master plan, that there is
24 actually desire for rail freight service. But
25 because of the way the rail industry is going with

P-0968-004

The project has sought a solution to congestion problems, including long queues at ramps, long delays at signals, and slow speeds on the highway. Typically speeds below 30mph are considered to represent congested conditions on the Interstate system.

P-0968-005

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

P-0968-006

According to the Feasibility of Diverting Truck Freight to Rail in the Columbia River Corridor Technical Memorandum produced by CRC project staff in April 2006, trains cannot move smaller loads as cost-effectively as trucks and may even be more costly for shipping distances under 500 miles. This is a key point, as the average trip distance by truck in the Portland/Vancouver region is 199 miles. While there are certainly some commodities that could shift from truck to rail in the region, it is probably a very minimal amount, probably not part of a consistent and regular shipment schedule, and would not significantly ease congestion along I-5 in the project area.

Additionally, the Vancouver-Portland region is the "last mile" for 85 percent of the freight traveling in the region. That is, goods are produced, assembled, and/or delivered within the region, and the overwhelming majority of the local shippers and customers are not located on a rail spur or within a rail/intermodal terminal. Even if there was a targeted effort to use railroads more frequently, the goods would need to travel by truck on regional roads and freeways to arrive at rail terminals. In fact, most of the goods produced or received from the rail system must drive those goods by truck to or from the rail lines; and, increased rail service would likely lead to greater use of trucks for this very reason.

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-0968-006 1 major railroads only concerned with, you know,
 2 shipping large -- moving large trains of similar
 3 units from city to city, they don't have much
 4 interest in moving freight -- goods around in a
 5 metropolitan area. And, matter of fact, there is an
 6 industry down on U.S. 30 -- I can't tell you what
 7 industry at this point -- that couldn't get
 8 reasonable service to move stuff to Vancouver.

P-0968-007 9 So, at this point, I would say no-build is
 10 the option I support, because all the rest of the
 11 options add auto capacity, even if it's in the form
 12 of auxiliary lanes that clear out the main lanes.
 13 They add auto capacity, when I don't think it's

P-0968-008 14 needed. We need to move the freight by rail with a
 15 new rail bridge parallel to the current rail bridge
 16 that that would open at the same time, or other
 17 means. But I don't think that we need the excess
 18 auto capacity.

MR. HEWITT: Thank you.

J.R. Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: My name's J.R. Robinson.

Current address is 4503 Northeast 38th Street in
 Vancouver.

I've worked for the last ten years in
 Hillsboro, so I commute that quite a bit. And there

P-0968-007

Following the selection of the LPA in July of 2008, the CRC Project Sponsors Council (PSC) was developed to provide recommendations to the project on a variety of issues, including the number of add/drop lanes over the river crossing. Over the course of several months, PSC was provided with operational characteristics and potential environmental impacts of 8-, 10-, and 12-lane options. These technical evaluation criteria included, but were not limited to, traffic safety, congestion, traffic diversion onto local streets and I-205, regional vehicle miles travelled, transit ridership, regional economic impact, effects to neighborhoods, and protected species and habitats. In addition to the technical information, PSC received input from CRC advisory groups and reviewed public comment submitted to the project and obtained during two public Q&A sessions in January 2009 regarding the number of lanes decision, as well as hearings conducted by Portland City Council and by Metro Council. In August 2010, the PSC voted unanimously to recommend that the replacement bridges be constructed with 10 lanes and full shoulders. For more information regarding the number of lanes decision making process, see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS.

The proposed new lanes are add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges), which are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area, and accommodate the 68 to 75% of traffic that enters and/or exits I-5 within two miles of the Columbia River.

P-0968-008

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

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

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. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and 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 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. 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). This analysis found that a more balanced investment in highway and transit, as represented by Alternatives 2 and 3, performed best.

Regarding a new rail bridge, the Vancouver-Portland region is the "last mile" for 85 percent of the freight traveling in the region. That is, goods are produced, assembled, and/or delivered within the region, and the overwhelming majority of the local shippers and customers are not located on a rail spur or within a rail/intermodal terminal. Even if there was a targeted effort to use railroads more frequently, the goods would need to travel by truck on regional roads and freeways to arrive at rail terminals. In fact, most of the goods produced or received from the rail system must drive those goods by truck to or from the rail lines; and, increased rail service would likely lead to greater use of trucks for this very reason. Additionally, according to the Feasibility of Diverting Truck Freight to Rail in the Columbia River Corridor Technical Memorandum produced by CRC project staff in April 2006, trains cannot move smaller loads as cost-effectively as trucks and may even be more costly for shipping distances under 500 miles. This is a key point, as the average

trip distance by truck in the Portland/Vancouver region is 199 miles. While there are certainly some commodities that could shift from truck to rail in the region, it is probably a very minimal amount, probably not part of a consistent and regular shipment schedule, and would not significantly ease congestion along I-5 in the project area.