

Hines, Maurice

From: David Madore [David.M@usdigital.com]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2011 9:35 PM
To: Columbia River Crossing; David Madore
Subject: CRC Light Rail Crossing Project – problem 5

24 Oct, 2011

Re: CRC Light Rail Crossing Project – problem 5

To: feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org

The NEPA Process was not followed by failing to in a very low cost BNSF lift span

Please do not approve this project. Here are fundamental reasons why it should be rejected:

P-064-001

The existing I-5 Bridge has a lift span and a light span. The bridge operator keeps a manual log that records the date, time of each lift and the type of vessel that requested the lift. The CRC neglected to disclose that the majority of bridge typical lifts is for personal recreational sailboats with very tall masts. The NEPA process requires that all practical alternatives that can solve the major problem. This NEPA process was not followed for this project because a simple low cost program could provide sailboat owners the means to equip their sailboats with masts that can be lowered in order to clear the bridge without a lift.

Most of the time, commercial vessels can safely pass under the high span of the bridge and not require a lift. Exceptions occur sometimes when the river flow is fast. When that happens, even though those commercial vessels can fit through the high span, the fast river flow does not allow them to safely make the sharp S-curve to navigate to the BNSF railroad turnstile at the north bank of the river. A low cost solution would be to add a lift span to the BNSF railroad bridge near the center of the river. Adding that lift span (costing less than \$60 million) would allow those commercial vessels to navigate a near straight line through the high span without requiring a lift. That would eliminate most lifts for commercial vessels during those fast river flow periods.

That low cost system level alternative was not included as a viable alternative as the NEPA process required.

It would be irresponsible to move forward with this project with such glaring red flags.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter to:

David Madore
david.m@usdigital.com
1400 NE 136 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98684
cell: 360-601-3056

P-064-001

Eliminating bridge lifts would provide a safety improvement. Relocating the BNSF railroad bridge swing span could reduce the number of times the I-5 bridge would need to lift, but it would not eliminate the need for bridge lifts. The I-5 bridge would still need to lift for regular monitoring and maintenance and for occasional taller vessels such as construction barges and high-mast recreational vessels. More importantly, simply moving the BNSF swing span, which is private property, would address only a small portion of the identified traffic safety issues, and almost none of the other stated Purpose and Need for the proposed action as described in Chapter 1 (Section 1.3) of the DEIS and FEIS.