

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



00094

1 of the other people who are going to go
 2 ahead and complain about the houses being
 3 moved.
 4 But you know what? We need to do it.
 5 It's the best thing to do for the economy.
 6 It's the best thing to do for the region.
 7 Thank you very much.
 8 HAL DINGERINK: Okay. My
 9 information that what we have left are two
 10 remaining folks. Can I make certain of
 11 that? Ginger.
 12 GINGER METCALF: Thank you.
 13 Freight mobility, delivery of services,
 14 navigation, safety and jobs -- smart
 15 planning calls for building a replacement
 16 bridge now. It would be irresponsible of
 17 us as citizens not to consider the
 18 immediate future and the future of those
 19 who follow us.
 20 HAL DINGERINK: Thank you.
 21 Debbie.
 22 DEBBIE PETERSON: Thank you. My
 23 name is Debbie Peterson. My address is
 24 P.O. Box 82, Vancouver. I'm a 30-year
 25 resident of this area and I am not either

P-1062-001

P-1062-001

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.

Light rail has been endorsed by every 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.

P-1062-001

00095

1 a yea-sayer nor am I a naysayer. I look
 2 at the data. And I think the data is
 3 overwhelmingly sobering in terms of light
 4 rail and its deficiencies and its promises
 5 versus the actual outcome.
 6 I would like to go ahead and explain
 7 that if I may. First of all, I would like
 8 to say that light rail will have
 9 negligible impact on traffic congestion
 10 based -- because of the traffic, few
 11 automobile drivers from their cars -- the
 12 demographics of Clark County trends will
 13 make light rail much less effective than
 14 predicted by the CRC.
 15 Light rail is expensive. The most
 16 cost effective federally funded systems
 17 have required subsidies of 5000 dollars
 18 and more per new rider. New riders are
 19 those riders that get out of their cars
 20 and into transit systems, not those who
 21 were originally taking bus transit and now
 22 going to light rail transit.
 23 Light rail cost and ridership
 24 forecasts are erroneous and they are based
 25 in favor of light rail. We experienced

The CRC project planning for light rail incorporates and supports the principles of the Vancouver's City Center Vision Plan. Downtown 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, which is expected no earlier than fall 2010.

The LPA includes light rail across the river as an option for people who do not want to drive. Light rail, a variable toll on vehicles crossing the river, a bicycle and pedestrian pathway, and transportation demand management and transportation system management are all characteristics of the LPA which will give people options other than drive across the bridge.

P-1062-001

00096

1 that at the last neighborhood association
2 meetings that were held at the Rider
3 Resource Center by disinterested third
4 parties from Seattle.
5 Light rail will not spur development.
6 Development along light rail corridors is
7 spurred by tax subsidies, not light rail.
8 Portland itself is a poster child for
9 light rail. And as we know, light rail
10 has not produced urban development.
11 Actually what has produced urban
12 development along light rail are tax
13 subsidies via ten years. Light rail will
14 not improve commuter travel time, energy
15 conservation and safety.
16 My recommendations are to the CRC. I
17 would like to see the CRC Directors
18 continue to be made aware of the national
19 experience in light rail over the past
20 20 years and light rail's documented
21 inability to solve urban transit problems
22 such as traffic congestion and pollution.
23 These are via -- I'm sorry. These are
24 verifiable data that you can look up
25 yourselves.

00097

P-1062-001 1 Along those lines, we further suggest
2 that disinterested experts from academia
3 be invited to provide a historical
4 perspective to the directors. Input
5 should come from a variety of sources,
6 especially experts in economics, transit
7 and light rail who do not have a vested
8 interest in the promotion of light rail
9 for our county.

P-1062-002 10 Second recommendation, I would like
11 to see that they have a build/no build
12 criteria. I would like to see parameters
13 that are instituted that say, "If we do
14 not meet this, we will have a no build
15 decision."

P-1062-003 16 I think that Clark County residents
17 of this area deserve that. They have put
18 up three years of incompetence. And based
19 on that gentleman whose first name is Joe
20 showed the inconsistencies that were made.
21 And you do deserve being publicly --
22 I believe -- humiliated because of the
23 lack -- with the money that you've had,
24 the lack of discretion and the lack of
25 information you have given the people of

P-1062-002

It is important that a project, such as CRC, provide ample opportunity for input from a diverse constituency of stakeholders and jurisdictions, and that it follow a process that complies with all federal, state and local legal requirements. The project sponsors' intent is to progress at a deliberate pace to ensure that we meet public interests, meet the transportation needs, address the quality of local communities and the environment, and be financially and fiscally responsible. Following publication of the FEIS, there will be a record of decision. If that decision is to move forward with one of the build alternatives, then the sponsors will progress into final engineering, finance plan implementation, and then construction. Without the record of decision, there will be no progress made, construction can not begin, and property would not be acquired. Though this would constitute a no-build scenario, the project could be reconsidered in the future.

P-1062-003

Over the course of the CRC project, a public involvement program has been used to educate and involve stakeholders and the public in order for them to become active participants in shaping the CRC project. At the time of DEIS publication, the project team had participated in over 350 public events, giving over 10,000 people a face-to-face opportunity to learn about the project and provide meaningful input. In order to encourage the highest levels of attendance as possible, most meetings scheduled by the project team were on weekday evenings or weekends during the day. Meetings have been held primarily within the project area to ensure proximity to those potentially most affected by the project. In addition to public events, the program also enabled significant involvement for those who are unable to attend meetings through an extensive website and project update notifications. Prior to publication of the DEIS, property owners potentially affected by project alternatives were notified directly via mail, and six meetings specifically focused on potential right-of-way needs were held in September of 2007.

P-1062-003 |

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

Extensive outreach has been conducted through distribution of written information in hard copy and electronic form, including comment forms, the creation of a project web site, and outreach to local and regional media. When the DEIS was published, the project's database, used to encourage participation in public events and involve the broader community, had grown to over 3,000 e-mail addresses and over 10,000 postal mailing addresses. Through implementation of the public involvement program, over 3,000 public comments were received before publication of the DEIS and over 1,600 comments were received during the 60-day DEIS comment period. In addition, since the DEIS comment period there have been numerous community meetings, open houses, and public hearings by project sponsors, providing more opportunities for public input and comment. See Appendix B of the FEIS for a broader discussion of the public involvement program, including a list of public involvement events that have occurred related to this project.

00115

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
County of Clark)

I, Cathy S. Taylor, a notary public
for the State of Washington do hereby
certify that I transcribed to the best of
my ability said proceedings written by me
in machine shorthand and thereafter
reduced to typewriting; and that the
foregoing transcript constitutes a full,
true and accurate record of said
proceedings and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and notarial seal
this 16th day of June, 2008.

Cathy S. Taylor, RPR, CSR
Notary Public for the State of Washington
My Commission expires April 15, 2009