

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-0513-001**

In the summer of 2007, every potentially affected property owner received a letter informing them that their property could be affected by the project and invited them to attend one of several meetings to learn more or to set up an individual meeting. Also during summer 2007, door-to-door outreach was conducted to focus on downtown Vancouver businesses. This effort resulted in reaching 184 businesses to provide them with general information about light rail and the project. CRC staff also gathered public feedback on the project and light rail alignment. The following blocks were reached during this effort:

- 100 block of W 13th St., W 9th St., E 8th St.
- 200 block of Columbia, W McLoughlin, E McLoughlin, W Evergreen, W 6th, W 13th, W 12th, E 17th
- 300 block of E 17th, W Mill Plain, W 11th, W 6th, E 15th, E Mill Plain, W 12th, W Evergreen, E McLoughlin
- 400 block of E 13th, W 8th, E 15th, E Mill Plain
- 500 block of Main, W 8th
- 600 block of Broadway, Main
- 700 block of Broadway, Main, Washington
- 800 block of C St., Broadway, Columbia, Main, Washington
- 900 block of Daniels, Main, Washington
- 1100 block of Broadway, Main, Washington
- 1200 block of Broadway, Main
- 1300 block of Main, Columbia, Washington, Franklin
- 1400 block of Broadway, Columbia, C St.
- 1500 block of Broadway, Columbia, D St.
- 1600 block of Columbia, C St., Main, Washington
- 1700 block of Broadway
- 1800 block of Broadway, Columbia
- 1900 block of Main
- 2600 block of Kauffman Ave.
- 5000 block of SW Macadam Ave.

00084

1 I either can't get there at all via the  
 2 system that is in place or I can't get  
 3 there because -- sorry, I just lost my  
 4 train of thought -- because of the  
 5 inflexibility of it.  
 6 I don't -- it doesn't seem a  
 7 practical system. Whereas, if you were  
 8 relying on a bus system, it's very  
 9 versatile. It can change in size to  
 10 accommodate the ridership that is  
 11 involved. You can travel along with the  
 12 cars immediately or you can create, you  
 13 know, a designated lanes for it, for rapid  
 14 bus transit like they were mentioning.  
 15 So I think that this whole project  
 16 just needs to be given more public input.  
 17 I see the public is kind of being shut out  
 18 and the whole Environmental Impact  
 19 Statement, as has been mentioned, needs to  
 20 be allotted plenty of time for that review  
 21 process. There is a lot of material to  
 22 cover there.  
 23 HAL DENERINK: Thank you. Anne.  
 24 ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE: Good evening,  
 25 Anne McEnery-Ogle, 3501 F Street.

**P-0513-001**

00085  
**P-0513-001**

1           There are two issues that need to be  
 2 addressed prior to that July deadline.  
 3 The draft EIS states that the Staff has  
 4 gone door to door in the impact area to  
 5 discuss the impacts to businesses, and we  
 6 have found that not to be true  
 7 unfortunately.  
 8           Businesses at 29th, 31st, 33rd, 37th,  
 9 39th and Main Street did not know about  
 10 this and had not been informed. Three of  
 11 the businesses at the corner of Fourth  
 12 Plain and Broadway including the  
 13 Walgreen's, the Vancouver Education  
 14 Association and the church had not been  
 15 notified about this project.  
 16           Five businesses along McLoughlin did  
 17 not know about it. And the Clark County  
 18 Historic Museum had not been told, even  
 19 though the document clearly states the  
 20 Staff has gone door to door and engaged in  
 21 conversation with the businesses.  
 22           The businesses were not aware of  
 23 their loss of parking along the transit  
 24 lines. Some had already renewed their  
 25 leases without the knowledge of the impact

- 7000 block of NE Greenwood
- 12000 block of SW Tualatin Rd.

During the Draft EIS public comment period post cards to notify residents and businesses about the document, open houses, and public comment period were mailed to every address in the project area. The same post cards were distributed door-to-door to a variety of locations in Vancouver. The list of the locations can be found on the project Web site (see page 61):

[http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/PublicInvolvementReports/DraftEIS\\_CommentReport\\_May2toJuly1\\_2008.pdf](http://www.columbiarivercrossing.org/FileLibrary/PublicInvolvementReports/DraftEIS_CommentReport_May2toJuly1_2008.pdf)

In addition, fliers were developed for distribution to Vancouver neighborhoods during the Draft EIS public comment period. The flier highlighted the Draft EIS alternatives, document availability, public comment period, and open houses. Six Vancouver neighborhood associations in the project area chose to distribute the fliers.

00086

**P-0513-002** 1 from the Columbia River Crossing. And in  
2 fact, some have been told that they could  
3 get insulation and new windows to mitigate  
4 for noise, air and vibration impacts.  
5 Unfortunately, that is not true for  
6 businesses, and so the door so door  
**P-0513-003** 7 campaigning needs to be completed as soon  
8 as possible.

**P-0513-004** 9 In addition, the City of Vancouver  
10 and the C-Tran Board of Directors and the  
11 citizen have been told that Vancouver has  
12 the 750 million dollars from the Federal  
13 Government to pay for light rail. And  
14 again, unfortunately, it's come to light  
15 that that is not true.  
16 So it's important that the CRC  
17 provide the actual information, especially  
18 the upfront noting and the competitive  
19 grant process to our decision-makers  
20 before that July deadline.  
21 Thank you very much.  
22 HAL DENGERINK: Thank you, Anne.  
23 Okay. At this point, I am going to do a  
24 change out by adding Ginger Metcalf and  
25 Debbie Peterson, and we'll go to Jerry

**P-0513-002**

Potential noise and vibration impacts that would result from the CRC project were disclosed in the Chapter 3 (Section 3.11) of the DEIS, and have been updated in Chapter 3 (Section 3.11) of the FEIS.

The FHWA with input from the DOT's set the traffic noise abatement criteria for highway noise, which are implemented by the state DOT's. Noise walls, to the extent that they are effective at reducing noise and can be constructed at a reasonable cost, are the most common type of mitigation for highway noise when project related noise levels exceed the abatement criteria. The DEIS proposed potential locations for new or replacement noise walls that are preliminarily considered reasonable and feasible by state criteria. Information on the noise walls used to mitigate project related highway noise impacts can be found in the DEIS (pages 3-301 through 3-305). The analysis performed for the FEIS is based on more refined designs and updated traffic modeling (Chapter 3 Section 3.11).

The criteria in the FTA Guidance Manual for Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment are based on documented research on community reaction to noise. The amount that the transit project is allowed to change the overall noise environment is reduced with increasing levels of existing noise. There are two levels of impact included in the FTA criteria; moderate impact and severe impact. The criterion for moderate impact varies according to the existing noise level, the predicted project noise level, and the percentage of people highly annoyed by the project noise. The severe impact also varies according to the existing and projected noise levels, but is set at levels where a higher percentage of people would be highly annoyed by the project noise. Project noise in the no impact range is not likely to be annoying to most people. While the FTA recommends mitigation be considered for all impacts, impacts in the severe category should be avoided or, if no other alternative exists, then mitigation should be implemented. Based on the analysis performed for

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

the DEIS and updated in the FEIS, light rail operations are predicted to result in several moderate noise impacts, depending on the alternative, however no severe noise impacts were identified under the Clark College terminus (page 3-294). As identified in FEIS Chapter 3 (Section 3.11) these impacts could be mitigated by providing interior sound insulation to residences along the transit alignments and/or sound walls in some locations.

As described in the DEIS and FEIS, the FTA has also developed impact criteria for acceptable levels of ground-borne vibration. Light rail operations could result in some vibration impacts along 17th Street and Washington Street, all of which could be mitigated by installing vibration isolation between the rails and ground. This too has been updated for the FEIS in Chapter 3 (Section 3.11).

Mitigation would occur during project construction.

#### **P-0513-003**

Door-to-door outreach has occurred since the publication of the Draft EIS and selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative, specific to the transit alignment. Prior to adoption of the transit alignment in 2010, all property owners and tenants received mailings, door-to-door information, and were invited to attend one of two open houses to learn more about the light rail alignment. In addition, C-TRAN staff met with many property owners individually to discuss expected changes on the street and any property impacts.

#### **P-0513-004**

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.