

Hines, Maurice

From: Sharonnasset [sharonnasset@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2011 10:03 PM
To: Columbia River Crossing
Subject: Public Comments Environmental Impact Statement concerning the Columbia River Crossing project. -4
Attachments: non-compliance -4.doc

P-078-001 Add this to the formal Public Comments Environmental Impact Statement concerning the Columbia River Crossing project.

CRC are seeking non-compliance waves when other project stay in-compliance

The reasons that CRC staff continues to tell committees, citizens, and elected official including members of Congress that the Third Bridge was studied, areIt was brought in during NEPA Scoping and CRC documents state all reasonable alternative brought in during scoping must be thoroughly studied this is one of the reasons opponents state the NEPA process has not been followed, and a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement must be started immediately. AND the CRC is seeking wavers from Federal Agencies for non-compliance on issue of Marine Navigation, Aviation, and Historic 4(f) problems that require looking for alternative that stay in compliance.

1. A range of alternatives thoroughly studied though construction is required in the NEPA process, no range of alternatives, equal to the current Locally Preferred Alternatives was studied.

P-078-002 2. The CRC Locally Preferred Alternative removes up to 20 Historical Resources and 11/2 to 2 acres of the Historic Fort Vancouver Reserve, and challenges Pearson Airport airspace. If it is Feasible or Prudent to avoid 4(f) Historic Resource it is required for Federal funding. CRC does not qualify for federal funding.

P-078-003 3. The Replacement bridge, the current Locally Preferred Alternative, does not meet current marine needs of 110' clearance for water traffic business. The Replacement bridge at 95' is less than the current bridge clearance. The I-205 is 130' and the current I-5 bridges are higher than 130'. The CRC's own original data states that a new bridge should not be less than 110' to keep from having adverse impacts on marine traffic. The Third Bridge approximately 1 mile west of the current bridges can be constructed high enough to handle current and future marine needs.

4. The Replacement bridge (depending on design) will need a waiver from the Federal Aviation Administration because it will enter Portland Airport and

P-078-001

Please see the responses to Ms. Nasset's comments made on the DEIS (P-0781, P-0797, P-0936, P-0977, P-1058, and P-1168), which were published with the Final EIS. Impacts (adverse as well as beneficial) to navigation, aviation and Section 4(f) resources are described in the FEIS. This includes a discussion and disclosure of the project's ability to comply with related regulations, and any regulatory permits and approvals that will be required. Also see responses to Ms. Nasset's other comment letters on the FEIS, P-075 to P-083.

P-078-002

The project has worked hard to avoid historic impacts and minimize the impacts that are unavoidable. The avoidance activities and Section 4(f) impacts are detailed in the FEIS. The project does not "remove up to 40 historical resources." The State Historic Preservation Offices of both states have concurred that the project will have adverse effects to only three historic (National Register eligible) properties. Additionally, the Lucky Lager Warehouse is currently shown as displaced in the FEIS. Though it is on the Clark County Heritage Register, it has not been deemed National Register eligible. As the designs are refined, the project will continue to seek ways to avoid and minimize impacts to historic properties. The project will also have an effect on numerous archaeological sites, as documented in Section 3.8 of the FEIS.

P-078-003

The project conducted a series of studies and stakeholder outreach to determine the appropriate navigation clearance for the proposed bridges. Many factors were considered to determine the navigation clearance for the proposed bridges across the Columbia River. In addition to vessel height, the safe and efficient operation of aviation (Pearson Field), highway, light rail, and the multi-use path (bicycle and pedestrian) were considered.

P-078-003 Pearson Airport airspace. The Third Bridge approximately 1 mile west of the current bridges can be constructed without entering into the airports' airspace.

P-078-004 5. CRC Need and Purpose Statement requires the state to avoid impacts on private property, business, and communities. CRC is removing or impacting up to 280 piece of property full or partice on Jantzen Beach - up to 29 homes, 39 businesses and added congestion on I-5 Freeway. Third Bridge alignment on Jantzen Beach is bare vacant and publicly owned land and without interruption on the existing transportation system. Several of the properties are values at millions of dollars.

Molly Coston, the former Chair of RTC, signed the letter understanding you will be calling to verify the letter. Council Member Coston phone number is 360.608.0462.

The former Chair of the Clark County Board of Commissioner Steve Stuart signed the letter understands you will be calling to verify. 360.397.2232

P-078-005 Please ask the CRC representative to provide data of a thorough study of a 6-lane freeway with 2 managed lanes, and high speed rail alignment, with the freeway attaching to I-5 at Mill Plain, going into the Port of Vancouver and connecting to HWY-30 near Linnton OR. The data is to be credible and verifiable, with on and off ramps at each arterial crossing.

Sharon Nasset
503.283.9585
Thirdbridgenow.com

Sharon Nasset
CEO Third Bridge Now
503.283.9585
Sharonnasset@aol.com

*** eSafe scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

CRC conducted studies of current river usage and validated these studies through stakeholder outreach to determine what clearances are required by current river users. These efforts included a Boat Survey to identify the types of vessels that use the Columbia River at the project location, their frequency of usage and required navigation clearance. Additionally, a series of telephone and/or face-to-face interviews were conducted with river users to validate and update the information contained in the Boat Survey. Along with these efforts, the United States Coast Guard (USCG) held a preliminary hearing on the Columbia River Crossing to solicit comments from river users.

The information gathered from the above mentioned studies and stakeholder outreach was considered in conjunction with the operational statutes for nearby Pearson Field and with requirements for safe and efficient operation of the proposed highway, light rail, and multi-use path facilities. Taking all of these considerations into account, it was determined that a 95-foot vertical clearance will allow all but a couple of infrequent river users to navigate beneath the bridge at all times of year. These infrequent river users include marine contractors and a few sailboats. However, it is possible for contractors to partially disassemble equipment so they could pass beneath a 95-foot vertical clearance.

The protection of Pearson Field, although important from the perspective of historic resource protection, the local economy, the provision of public services, and preferences stated by the City of Vancouver, is not the only factor influencing bridge heights over the Columbia River. Possible intrusions into Portland International Airport airspace, maintenance of marine navigation, construction staging, maintaining I-5 traffic, and constraints imposed by the location and alignment of the river crossing all constrain the ultimate design of the bridge.

Since the publication of the DEIS, the Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) met multiple times to discuss the design of the bridges and

Add this to the formal Public Comments Environmental Impact Statement concerning the Columbia River Crossing project.

CRC are seeking non-compliance waves when other project stay in-compliance

P-078-006

The reasons that CRC staff continues to tell committees, citizens, and elected official including members of Congress that the Third Bridge was studied, areIt was brought in during NEPA Scoping and CRC documents state all reasonable alternative brought in during scoping must be thoroughly studied this is one of the reasons opponents state the NEPA process has not been followed, and a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement must be started immediately. AND the CRC is seeking waivers from Federal Agencies for non-compliance on issue of Marine Navigation, Aviation, and Historic 4(f) problems that require looking for alternative that stay in compliance.

1. A range of alternatives thoroughly studied though construction is required in the NEPA process, no range of alternatives, equal to the current Locally Preferred Alternatives was studied.
2. The CRC Locally Preferred Alternative removes up to 20 Historical Resources and 11/2 to 2 acres of the Historic Fort Vancouver Reserve, and challenges Pearson Airport airspace. If it is Feasible or Prudent to avoid 4(f) Historic Resource it is required for Federal funding. CRC does not qualify for federal funding.
3. The Replacement bridge, the current Locally Preferred Alternative, does not meet current marine needs of 110' clearance for water traffic business. The Replacement bridge at 95' is less than the current bridge clearance. The I-205 is 130' and the current I-5 bridges are higher than 130'. The CRC's own original data states that a new bridge should not be less than 110' to keep from having adverse impacts on marine traffic. The Third Bridge approximately 1 mile west of the current bridges can be constructed high enough to handle current and future marine needs.
4. The Replacement bridge (depending on design) will need a waiver from the Federal Aviation Administration because it will enter Portland Airport and Pearson Airport airspace. The Third Bridge approximately 1 mile west of the current bridges can be constructed without entering into the airports' airspace.
5. CRC Need and Purpose Statement requires the state to avoid impacts on private property, business, and communities. CRC is removing or impacting up to 280 piece of property full or part on Jantzen Beach - up to 29 homes, 39 businesses and added congestion on I-5 Freeway. Third Bridge alignment on Jantzen Beach is bare vacant and publicly owned land and without interruption on the existing transportation system. Several of the properties are values at millions of dollars.

Molly Coston, the former Chair of RTC, signed the letter understanding you will be calling to verify the letter. Council Member Coston phone number is 360.608.0462.

The former Chair of the Clark County Board of Commissioner Steve Stuart signed the letter understands you will be calling to verify. 360.397.2232

Please ask the CRC representative to provide data of a thorough study of a 6-lane freeway with 2 managed lanes, and high speed rail alignment, with the freeway attaching to I-5 at Mill Plain, going into the Port of Vancouver and connecting to HWY-30 near Linnton OR. The data is to be credible and verifiable, with on and off ramps at each arterial crossing.

Sharon Nasset

ultimately endorsed the two-bridge concept in January 2009 and also endorsed the open-web concept in September of 2009. The Project Sponsors Council endorsed a two-bridge option in June of 2009, and also endorsed the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee recommendations for a covered pathway with the conditions of the maintenance and security plan in September of 2009. Then in February 2011, the CRC Bridge Review Panel recommended that the project discontinue work on the open-web concept and instead select either a composite deck truss, tied arch or cable-stayed bridge type. Following additional analysis and outreach, the governors announced the selection of the composite deck truss as the preferred bridge type in April 2011.

For a more detailed description of the limitations and opportunities that influenced the bridge type selection process, please see Technical Screening Study Final Report December 2008, Aesthetic Screening Study Final Report March 2009, Final Type Study Report October 2009, CRC Project Bridge Review Panel Report, February 2011, CRC: Key Findings and Recommendation Related to Bridge Type, February 2011 and the memo from the governors offices – Moving Forward; CRC Background, Bridge-type Major Factors, Next Steps, April 2011. Much of this information is also summarized in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

P-078-004

The vision and values of the CRC are used to help guide how the CRC address the Purpose and Need (found in Section 1.5 of the FEIS). The values related to property acquisitions include:

- Supporting a healthy and vibrant land use mix of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, cultural, and historic areas.
- Recognizing the history of the community surrounding the I-5 BIA, supporting improved community cohesion, and avoiding neighborhood disruption.
- Ensuring the fair distribution of benefits and adverse effects of the project for the region, communities, and neighborhoods adjacent to

503.283.9585
Thirdbridgenow.com

Sharon Nasset
CEO Third Bridge Now
503.283.9585
Sharonnasset@aol.com

the project area.

Since the publication of the DEIS in May of 2008, and the selection of the LPA by project partners in July 2008, the CRC project team has been working to minimize the potential property impacts associated with the project's improvements. Though the project team has been working to stay within the existing right-of-way, some property right acquisitions will be unavoidable. Property owners will receive just compensation for the estimated value of land and improvements acquired and for other impacts that result in a measurable loss of value to the remaining property. Following the publication of the FEIS, property owners will be notified of impacts to their property and acquisition negotiations will begin. The acquisition and relocation process will follow The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act of 1970 (as amended).

Alignments associated with a new river crossing were analyzed and dismissed in the screening process, as described in Section 2.7 of the FEIS.

The CRC project team has worked with RTC and project partners throughout the NEPA process.

P-078-005

Please see the response to Ms. Nasset's other FEIS comment letters, P-075 to P-083.

P-078-006

This is a repeat of comments P-078-001 through P-078-005, to which responses have been provided.