

Hines, Maurice

From: Natalie Baker [natalie.x.baker@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2011 4:04 PM
To: Columbia River Crossing
Subject: Feedback on CRC

Categories: Red Category

P-039-001

You want my feedback on the CRC as a citizen of Portland? My feedback is that I understand how excited you must be about this project--indeed, that bridge would be gigantic and to some people that is the basis for considering something to be impressive--but you need to look around you: this project's legitimacy is nonexistent these days. Important non-profits, news organizations, and citizens groups have all joined to form an overwhelmingly loud voice that unitedly asks you to stop moving forward. Why continue the farce of soliciting feedback when it is blatantly obvious that you won't actually take it into consideration? What exactly do you want feedback on this far in the process? Are you just asking for feedback so that when you plunge this city into debt and a further decrease in infrastructure we actually want, you can point to the fact that you solicited feedback and claim that the CRC was built through an inclusive process? You still have a chance to take the difficult but undeniably ethical path and admit fault, slowing the process down and revisiting the legitimate concerns that have ALREADY been voiced. Don't go through with something because you've already come so far--the real costs are yet to be felt by this city, and only you have the ability to prevent them. You asked for my feedback, and I took the time to give you my thoughts. Please show me that same level of respect by legitimately considering what I (and, I anticipate, many others) have said to you, either by slowing down the process to include important stakeholders and their concerns, or by replying to my feedback with why you will not do so.

Sincerely,
Natalie Baker

P.S. Every city planner in the world knows that if you want to cut down on auto use, you have to stop accommodating it through high-speed multi-lane infrastructure. How this city can simultaneously market itself as a leader in the bicycle movement while funding a megahighway is completely beyond me.

P-039-001

Input and feedback have been carefully considered during the project's NEPA process to date. Many changes have been made based on input from citizens and other interested parties who care about the impacts as well as the benefits of the proposed project (some of the changes made are discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS). The process was extended to allow the Independent Review Panel and then the Bridge Expert Review Panel time to evaluate and make recommendations on many aspects of the project. These recommendations also led to project changes (summarized in Chapter 2 of the FEIS). Although Ms. Baker has suggested that we slow the process down and rethink the direction, others comment that the process has gone too slow and we should advance it much faster to construction. All input is considered. At this point, the project is advancing the selected alternative into the final design process. The speed at which it advances through design and to construction will depend on decisions by agency leadership, which are subject to citizen input.