

Hines, Maurice

From: Doug Mabry [doug@mabry.org]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2011 9:48 PM
To: Columbia River Crossing
Subject: feedback

P-059-001 | How will businesses be re-imbursed for lost revenue during the building project?

P-059-001

Businesses will not be reimbursed for lost revenues, but any business that would be directly displaced would be provided with financial and other relocation assistance. The project will also work with businesses located near construction to support their continued viability. This is discussed in the FEIS, Section 3.4.

Hines, Maurice

From: Doug Mabry [doug@mabry.org]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2011 9:50 PM
To: Columbia River Crossing
Subject: feedback

P-059-002

What is the impact of repairing the existing structure so it will last for another 50 years?

P-059-002

As documented in the Panel Assessment of Interstate Bridges Seismic Vulnerabilities Technical Report (2006), it was determined necessary for any CRC project alternatives that reused the existing I-5 bridges to also seismically retrofit those bridges. The DEIS analyzed a Supplemental River Crossing as a component of two out of the five alternatives studied.

A Supplemental River Crossing, which would retain and seismically retrofit the existing bridges for northbound traffic and add one new bridge to the west for southbound traffic, was not chosen as a part of the Locally Preferred Alternative by the local sponsor agencies. This decision was informed by the DEIS, which found, among other things, that the Supplemental River Crossing would not substantially improve congestion over No-Build, would maintain some substandard and unsafe design features, and would not be substantially cheaper to construct than a replacement river crossing, as originally believed. In addition, the Supplemental crossing could worsen marine navigation by retaining the existing piers, and adding a new set of structures in the water with the new bridge. The US Coast Guard informed the project in a letter dated January 26, 2006, that "retention of one of the existing bridges for travel off Interstate 5 would at best maintain the same degree of difficulty to vessels, especially downbound tows. For that reason I would also not recommend such a plan..."

Although the Supplemental River Crossing would improve the seismic safety of the existing bridges, these findings indicate that it did not meet the project's Purpose and Need as effectively as the Replacement River Crossing. A supplemental bridge that only includes improvements for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians also does not meet the CRC project's Purpose and Need. As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the project's Purpose and Need "was developed by relying on previous

planning studies, solicitation of public input, and coordination with stakeholder groups."