

Hines, Maurice

From: David Madore [David.M@usdigital.com]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2011 9:58 PM
To: Columbia River Crossing; David Madore
Subject: CRC Light Rail Crossing Project – problem 7

24 Oct, 2011

Re: CRC Light Rail Crossing Project – problem 7

To: feedback@columbiarivercrossing.org

The NEPA Process was not followed by conducting design and studies to run concurrently

P-066-001

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

The NEPA process is a clear simple concise process defined by law to ensure that major projects are practical and logically proceed in a sequence that best meets the needs of citizens by evaluating all viable options before resources are consumed on design and construction plans before the vetting process selects a clear choice.

The CRC project violated the NEPA process in an unprecedented way. Except in emergency situations such as the Minneapolis bridge collapse to build the I-35W, no other project in the US has proceeded with the vetting process in parallel with the design process as the CRC project has. The reason is that it violates the intent of the NEPA process which is intended to vet all the choices first to determine which one is the best fit for function. The CRC project proceeded for 4 years consuming over \$100 million with a bridge design before the alternatives were properly vetted. As a result of the haste and incompetence, the bridge design was scrapped within 4 weeks after it was made public. The violation of the NEPA process resulted in substantial loss and waste. The project should have been stopped and investigation conducted and corrective measures should have been taken to bring the project into compliance. That never happened. The project has continued to flounder as a result of improper sequences that continue to comply with the NEPA process.

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-066-001

The approach was consistent with NEPA requirements. Developing some level of design for the alternatives is necessary to complete the NEPA review. The DEIS did not propose a particular bridge type. It defined the bridge in terms of vertical and horizontal parameters, capacity, and pier configuration. Some potential bridge types were conceptualized early and those were shown to the public. Well after the DEIS was issued, one bridge type (open web box) emerged as the likely preferred approach. The Bridge Expert Review Panel recommended that the project instead select one of three other bridge types, which the project did (selecting a composite deck truss). The composite deck truss bridge type fits within the parameters of the design and impacts evaluated in the DEIS, and was one of the bridge types that had been considered earlier in the process. The bridge type evaluation process is described in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.