traffic, and so one. Some of it is the interchanges.

There's, in Vancouver, three stops in approximately 15 blocks, as I recall. And that's quite a few. And, again, it won't move people. But I think we should have a system and using our C-TRAN and try that to bring people into a hub and move. I'll stop. I see the light's on. Thank you.

MR. HEWITT: Thank you.

Jim Howell. Welcome.

P-0972-001 **MR. HOWELL:** May name is Jim Howell. 3325 Northeast 45th Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

P-0972-002 If, one, we're required to make a choice among the alternatives, the only responsible choice would be the no-build. This does not mean that nothing should be done. Clearly, there are severe congestion. There's severe congestion on the freeway, especially southbound at the a.m. and northbound in the p.m. The current proposal to build more lanes will not solve the problem, because in the long run, it will only attract more traffic.

P-0972-003 There are many ways to relieve the bottleneck without throwing over $4 billion to rebuild five miles of freeway and seven interchanges, construct a 12-lane mega structure

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-0972-001

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

P-0972-002

Thank you for your comment. The facility will actually "attract" or "induce" fewer trips than if nothing were built. This is achieved by the thoughtful integration of tolling, light rail transit, congestion pricing, etc. We have substantiated our findings with the use of regional models, independent review panels, and through numerous, critical agency reviews. Please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of this FEIS and and the Indirect Effects Technical Report.

P-0972-003

Significant work has gone into developing the CRC project, including an ongoing public involvement effort. The public involvement program includes numerous advisory groups to ensure the values and interests of the community are reflected in project decisions. These groups include representatives of public agencies, businesses, civic organizations, neighborhoods and freight, commuter and environmental groups. Feedback from the general public and advisory groups has been generally supportive of the project, including support for the transit, bicycle, pedestrian, highway, interchange, and financing elements of the project. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the process used to develop project alternatives and select a Locally Preferred Alternative.

P-0972-003
over the Columbia River and Hayden Island, and spend over $150 million to demolish three structurally

P-0972-004
sound bridges. This project grew out of an earlier study by many jurisdictions called the "Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership" that recommended an inclusive multilevel approach to solving the transportation problems in the corridor.

About three years ago this process was taken over -- some would say "hijacked" -- by the Washington and Oregon DOTs and turned into a huge freeway project with a condescending nod toward transit, bikes, and pedestrians. It seems that

P-0972-005
everyone has failed to acknowledge the elephant in the room. Located about one mile downstream is the BNSF Railroad. The railroad -- railroad bridge built in 1908 serves the only real corridor on the West Coast between Mexico and Canada and is a more critical link in case of natural disaster than I-5. Another freeway bridge, I-205, is just five miles east, but the next rail crossing is a single-track bridge 90 miles up river east of The Dalles.

As the cost of diesel fuel continues to rise, more freight will move from trucks to rail. The 70 percent increase in truck traffic projected

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-0972-004

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) and Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS explain how the project's Sponsoring Agencies solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, and tribes for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, such as a possible third transportation corridor across the Columbia River, alternative transit modes, and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and found that alternatives that do not include improvements to the existing I-5 facility generally do not address the seismic vulnerability of the existing I-5 bridges, traffic congestion on I-5, or the existing safety problems caused by sub-standard design of I-5. Traffic modeling showed that even significant investment in improving transit options in the corridor or building a third corridor was not enough to alleviate future traffic demand and existing safety hazards on I-5. It is important to note that transit and river crossing components were not eliminated simply because they could not accommodate future vehicular trips. For example, both light rail and tolling help to decrease vehicular demand. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the screening process used to develop project alternatives.

P-0972-005

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 form truck to rail in the region, it is

P-0972-005

by the CRC staff and used to justify this freeway project will not materialize. Trains are far more energy-efficient than trucks and can be barred on electricity as well as diesel. Capacity for freight and passengers on the railroad will have to be greatly increased to meet future demand, and government will have to help pay for it.

P-0972-006

An I-5 rail capacity study was completed in 2003 that indicated that, I quote, "Train delay ratios in this quarter already approach levels experienced in much larger denser corridors such as those with -- within the Chicago area." The study recommended ten projects costing about $170 million that should be done immediately and would greatly relieve some of the congestion. Very little has been done to date. It also identified other improvements such as adding another main line across the river, replacing antiquated swing span of the lift span, grade -- grade separating the north Portland junction and other improvements that would greatly facilitate freight and passenger service.

P-0972-007

I see the red light is on. I have some more information for you.

MR. HEWITT: Could you submit the paper that you brought? Thank you.

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

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.

P-0972-006

Eliminating bridge lifts would provide a safety improvement. Relocating the BNSF railroad bridge swing span could reduce the number of times the I-5 bridge would need to lift, but it would not eliminate the need for bridge lifts. The I-5 bridge would still need to lift for regular monitoring and maintenance and for occasional taller vessels such as construction barges and high-mast recreational vessels. More importantly, simply moving the BNSF swing span, which is private property, would address only a small portion of the identified traffic safety issues, and almost none of the other stated Purpose and Need for the proposed action as described in Chapter 1 (Section 1.3) of the DEIS and FEIS.

P-0972-007

The information submitted was included, and responded to, in comment P-0792-004.