

00001

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING DRAFT EIS
PUBLIC HEARING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2008

RED LION HOTEL
VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON



P-1051-001

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 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.

00098

1 Clark County.
 2 HAL DINGERINK: Apparently there
 3 are three additional folks who have signed
 4 up. I don't know, I am having more
 5 trouble as the not goes on reading. A.L.
 6 Kansanback. Everett? Is there an Everett
 7 here? Jonathan Schlueter.
 8 SPEAKER: I thought I had
 9 signed up to speak. You haven't called my
 10 name.
 11 HAL DINGERINK: I called everybody
 12 who signed up. All right.
 13 SPEAKER: If I can get up
 14 and say something --
 15 HAL DINGERINK: Okay. And I've
 16 got one more. Okay.
 17 A.L. KANSANBACK: Good evening.
 18 Thank you gentlemen for coming. I am here
 19 tonight because I got a little panicked.
 20 When somebody pushes me to spend four
 21 billion dollars as a taxpayer and I've got
 22 to do it by tomorrow, I get real nervous.
 23 I don't think that anybody has looked at
 24 this thing with all eyes open.
 25 We are talking, what, 50 percent or

P-1051-001

00099

P-1051-001 | 1 40 percent of the cost of the big dig here
2 in Boston. We all know about that baby.

P-1051-002 | 3 This thing is getting out of hand.
4 This bridge is way overdone. It hasn't
5 looked at the alternatives. And you know,
6 if it costs to keep more dollars a year
7 down the road or two years down the road,
8 then let it happen. At least it will be
9 right.

P-1051-003 | 10 We are not looking to the future with
11 the way we are doing it right now. Light
12 rail is not the answer. I am totally
13 opposed to light rail. It makes no sense.

P-1051-004 | 14 Now with that said, if we've got to
15 look at something heavy, like people are
16 talking to the west side and to get rid of
17 the freight -- the day is coming we are
18 going to have 100 mile an hour trains
19 coming through here, so let's maybe look
20 at the future.

P-1051-005 | 21 Light rail is not future. Light rail
22 is a glorified cable car and that happened
23 in the 1900s.

P-1051-006 | 24 That's my opinion. Let's not build
25 anything. If they take the money away, so

P-1051-002

Thank you for your comment. 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.

Regarding alternatives, evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) explains how the project's Sponsoring Agencies solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, tribes and other experts for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, such as new transportation corridors across the Columbia River, various transit modes, tolling, other demand management measures, 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. Components that increased capacity or helped reduce travel demand without increasing capacity were advanced for further evaluation. See Appendix C of the DEIS for an explanation and the results from early screening processes. The DEIS analyzed the full range of reasonable alternatives, which included the four build alternatives, and variations on each based on their individual components and various options. The range varied from No-Build, to alternatives that provided varying levels of highway improvements, different high capacity transit modes, different transit alignments and termini, and different tolling options. Many other components and

00100
P-1051-006 | 1 be it.
P-1051-007 | 2 My god, Bin Laden's family can put a
 3 bridge over the top of the Black Sea -- or
 4 the Red Sea for ten billion dollars and we
 5 are talking four billion to get just about
 6 where I could throw a rock at a few years
 7 ago? This is ridiculous.
 8 Thank you.
 9 HAL DINGERINK: Thank you. John.
 10 JONATHAN SCHLUETER: Thank you.
 11 For the record, my name is Jonathan
 12 Schlueter. I'm the Executive Director of
 13 West Side Economic Alliance based in
 14 Tigard.
 15 I thought until I heard one of your
 16 previous witnesses say that he was from
 17 Chehalis that I might claim the title for
 18 the longest distance commute to testify at
 19 tonight's meeting. So I thought it
 20 appropriate to explain why somebody from
 21 the west side of the Portland Metro Region
 22 would want to appear here today.
 23 It is because 105 companies in
 24 Washington County ship containerized
 25 freights over the Port of Portland and

combinations were evaluated prior to beginning the DEIS, but were dropped when analyses and input indicated that they would not adequately meet the Purpose and Need.

P-1051-003

Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected light rail to Clark College as the project's preferred transit mode. These sponsor agencies, which include the Vancouver City Council, Portland City Council, C-TRAN Board, TriMet Board, RTC Board and Metro Council considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force (a broad group of stakeholders representative of the range of interests affected by the project - see the DEIS Public Involvement Appendix for more information regarding the CRC Task Force) before voting on the LPA.

As illustrated in the DEIS, and summarized in Exhibit 29 (page S-33) of the Executive Summary, light rail would better serve transit riders than bus rapid transit (BRT) within the CRC project area. Light rail would carry more passengers across the river during the PM peak, result in more people choosing to take transit, faster travel times through the project area, fewer potential noise impacts, and lower costs per incremental rider than BRT. Additionally, light rail is more likely to attract desirable development on Hayden Island and in downtown Vancouver, which is consistent with local land use plans.

P-1051-004

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River,

00115

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2
3 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
4 County of Clark)
5
6 I, Cathy S. Taylor, a notary public
7 for the State of Washington do hereby
8 certify that I transcribed to the best of
9 my ability said proceedings written by me
10 in machine shorthand and thereafter
11 reduced to typewriting; and that the
12 foregoing transcript constitutes a full,
13 true and accurate record of said
14 proceedings and of the whole thereof.
15
16
17
18
19 Witness my hand and notarial seal
20 this 16th day of June, 2008.
21
22 _____
23 Cathy S. Taylor, RPR, CSR
24 Notary Public for the State of Washington
25 My Commission expires April 15, 2009

and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why a third corridor, arterial crossing of the Columbia River, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need. For a general description of the screening process see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS. It should be noted that every proposal received from the public was considered, and many of the proposals that were dropped from further consideration included elements that helped shape the alternatives in the DEIS.

P-1051-005

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-1051-006

See discussion regarding light rail selection, above.

P-1051-007

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 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.