

Hines, Maurice

From: Tweet [tweetfamily@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2011 11:32 PM
To: Columbia River Crossing
Subject: CRC feedback. please confirm receipt.

CRC- feedback

P-100-001

1)The proposed replacement bridge adds no thru lanes, only merging lanes. An earlier phase of the project did include an added thru lane in each direction, and no reasonable justification is given for cutting that out. To rebuild the bridge without any added thru capacity will not help traffic flow.

P-100-002

2)"[According to the Regional Transportation Council, the bridge carries about 3,300 transit trips per day. That means only 2.4 percent of all trips that cross the bridge are on public transit. Adding light rail to the bridge would increase costs by about \\$1.17 billion. This means local officials want to spend 40 percent more in order to serve 2.4 percent of total bridge crossings.](#)" [click link](#)

3) Local officials have noted that light rail in Clark County is a want, not a need. Supposedly, it may become more practical in 20-30 years. Yet the CRC insists on building it ASAP. [Population and traffic projections used by the CRC are now considered highly inflated and cost estimates are understated based upon outside expert review.](#) When or if population and job density will be high enough to support light rail remains to be seen. Today, job losses and foreclosures dominate the outlook, and growth remains uncertain. Meanwhile, CRC racks up \$MILLIONS in charges with insufficient explanation of how public \$\$are spent. A forensic accountant has analyzed the financial documents.

"*She found that the CRC was unable to adequately account for how it spent \$108 million in public funds between July 2005 and February 2011. Oddities included invoices totaling \$15 million lacking vendor names and invoices worth \$38 million that lacked codes to identify services rendered*" The general contractor has since filed in court to keep financial records from public scrutiny. [Follow the \\$\\$\\$link](#)

4)What will transportation technology be like in 20 years? Why spend \$\$we don't have today for something we may not need in 20 years? With rapidly changing technology, closer timing to reaching true need insures the best options available are selected. What is higher priority? Roads that serve all, or light rail that serves only passengers travelling to limited destinations? Roads carry freight that stocks stores, medical centers and businesses, specialized service vehicles and trucks, and emergency vehicles. Roads provide flexible routes to more destinations for buses, vanpools, or carpools that serve public transit needs. Light rail is limited to fixed routes and still requires time consuming transfers to bus for many destinations. On the Oregon side, light rail doesn't come near enough to the businesses to make it practical. Transfer to a bus is needed, so that starting out on a bus is less time consuming in the long run.

5)What is more cost effective? Light Rail costs of \$237 million/ mile in Seattle and \$204 million/ mile in Portland far exceed the cost of building and maintaining roadways. Why light rail? Mass transit options like light rail and bus rapid transit have been eligible for federal pots of gold, creating incentives to build regardless of the cost. Those connected to the light rail business are some of the strongest proponents for it.

P-100-003

5)Locally Preferred Alternative?
The following cities have a representative on the Ctran board. Battleground, Ridgefield/Yacolt, and Camas/Washougal. The same is true for the Regional Transportation Council, RTC.
The representatives for the RTC and Ctran voted on the "locally preferred alternative" of light rail and a replacement I-5 bridge in some cases without the city council members knowing about the vote beforehand. Citizens were not informed of the upcoming vote through a local public hearing on a preferred alternative in any of these cities. Neither did any of these city councils vote to give their C-tran or RTC representative direction in how to vote on the "locally preferred alternative". Some C-tran representatives explained that they spoke with some of the council about the decision, and it's unclear how much if any of this discussion took place in an open public meeting.

1

P-100-001

Following the selection of the LPA in July of 2008, the CRC Project Sponsors Council (PSC) was developed to provide recommendations to the project on a variety of issues, including the number of add/drop lanes over the river crossing. Over the course of several months, PSC was provided with operational characteristics and potential environmental impacts of 8-, 10-, and 12-lane options. These technical evaluation criteria included, but were not limited to, traffic safety, congestion, traffic diversion onto local streets and I-205, regional vehicle miles travelled, transit ridership, regional economic impact, effects to neighborhoods, and protected species and habitats. In addition to the technical information, PSC received input from CRC advisory groups and reviewed public comment submitted to the project and obtained during two public Q&A sessions in January 2009 regarding the number of lanes decision, as well as hearings conducted by Portland City Council and by Metro Council. In August 2010, the PSC voted unanimously to recommend that the replacement bridges be constructed with 10 lanes and full shoulders, see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS.

The proposed new lanes are add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges), which are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area, and accommodate the 68% to 75% of traffic that enters and/or exits I-5 within two miles of the Columbia River.

P-100-002

As described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the DEIS and FEIS, and in the Indirect Effects Technical Report, highway capacity improvements and access improvements can induce development in suburban and rural areas that were not previously served, or were greatly underserved, by highway access. The DEIS outlines a comprehensive analysis of the potential induced growth effects that could be expected from the CRC project. A review of national research on induced growth indicates that

P-100-003

In contrast, other cities in Washington openly discuss transportation at meetings and adopt formal motions to give their transit representative direction on how to vote for the city. When I asked about the lack of local public hearings for the approximately \$4-8.7 Billion CRC "Locally Preferred Alternative", the response from Camas City Councilor Dietzman and Washougal Mayor Guard was that the law does not require a public hearing. Councilor Dietzman further explained at a Ward meeting that other boards, such as the mosquito board, rarely hold public hearings as a justification for not holding a local public hearing on the CRC "Locally Preferred Alternative". Nevertheless, it is good practice and open government to hold a local public hearing and take a council vote in each city on such a large regional transportation project. It will impact I-205 bridge traffic from I-5 traffic diverting to avoid the toll. (Which could lead to tolling the I-205 bridge to even out traffic, make it fair, etc). Careful scrutiny is necessary prior to such a building project to insure it best meets our local needs in the most cost effective and efficient manner possible. The best means to find out what the locals prefer is to hold the planned light rail vote, which has been delayed. The vote should be held PRIOR to a final decision to bring light rail in to Clark County.

Will the C-tran board allow Camas and Washougal citizens to vote on light rail and bus rapid transit in 2012? There is no guarantee. If the light rail vote had been held this November as planned, Camas and Washougal voters would have automatically had a vote. However, our C-Tran representative and the CTRAN board voted to delay the promised light rail vote. A law was put in place to allow for a subdistrict vote starting in July 2012, that could cut out Camas and Washougal, and north county voters at the will of the C-Tran board. I believe the C-tran light rail/high capacity transit vote should be district-wide to include all cities in the district since all are taxed for public transportation and all will be impacted if costly light rail is introduced. Regardless of where one lives in the county, all End up paying the C-tran sales tax when they shop in the larger urban areas where most of the stores are located.

P-100-004

What happened to the 3rd bridge port to port connection that would better handle more traffic?
This option was eliminated without the same serious study the light rail and I-5 bridge replacement was give.
This makes more sense because it connects 2 industrial areas and freight traffic, and alleviates traffic with a new corridor.
From the fairs I attended this summer near the 3rd bridge now booth, it seems it is the "locally Preferred Alternative"
of many as it opens up 2-3 new lanes in each direction for traffic AND freight.

The process is broken. Only one bid from one contractor for one bridge, no local public hearings or votes in the cities supposedly "represented" on the C-Tran or RTC boards, no accounting for \$ Millions.

A new crossing should be considered before wasting our transportation \$ and consuming the potential for other transportation improvements in our area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Margaret Tweet
2715 NW 34th Circle
Camas, WA 98607

there are six factors that tend to be associated with highway projects that induce sprawl. These are discussed in the Indirect Effects Technical Report. Based on the CRC project team's comparison of those national research findings to CRC's travel demand modeling, Metro's 2001 land use / transportation modeling, and a review of Clark County, City of Vancouver, City of Portland and Metro land use planning and growth management regulations, the DEIS and the FEIS conclude that the likelihood of substantial induced sprawl from the CRC project is very low. In fact, the CRC project will likely support the region's goals of concentrating development in regional centers, reinforcing existing corridors, and promoting transit and pedestrian friendly development and development patterns. The region's goals are reinforced by the project's location in an already urbanized area, the inclusion of new tolls that manage demand, the inclusion of new light rail, and the active regulation of growth management in the region.

In October, 2008, the project convened a panel of national experts to review the travel demand model methodology and conclusions, including a land use evaluation. The panel unanimously concluded that CRC's methods and the conclusions were valid and reasonable. Specifically, the panel noted that CRC would "have a low impact to induce growth... because the project is located in a mature urban area," and that it would "contribute to a better jobs housing balance in Clark County... a positive outcome of the project". These results are summarized in the "Columbia River Crossing Travel Demand Model Review Report" (November 25, 2008). In 2010, Metro ran the MetroScope model (an integrated land use and transportation model) to forecast growth associated with transportation improvements of a 12-lane river crossing and light rail to Clark College. Even with a 12-lane river crossing, the model showed only minimal changes in employment location and housing demand compared to the No-Build Alternative. For a more detailed discussion regarding potential indirect land use changes as a result of the CRC project, including the likely land use changes associated with the

introduction of light rail, please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the FEIS.

By 2030, the region's population is expected to increase by one million people. This increase will result in more people needing to travel between home, work, school, recreation, etc. In 2005, 135,000 vehicles crossed the Columbia River on the Interstate Bridge, which led to 4-6 hours of congestion each weekday. By 2030, 184,000 are predicted to cross the river, which would lead to 15 hours of daily congestion if no action is taken. Congestion occurs when vehicle demand is greater than a transportation system's capacity. It results in slower speeds and increased travel times. CRC defines congestion as vehicles traveling less than 30 mph. The Columbia River Crossing project uses information gathered from Metro's nationally-recognized travel demand models to determine the project's effect on congestion. These models predict trip frequency, types or modes of transportation, destination, and time of day. Transportation planners use these models to analyze the effects of such factors as increased population and employment, transportation improvements, and new developments on the transportation system.

Traffic volumes fluctuate and did decrease during some years. Traffic volumes obtained from the Oregon Department of Transportation's automatic traffic recorder (ATR) monitoring sites show that traffic volumes have, in fact, been increasing in the last few years. Whether the traffic volumes forecast for year 2030 will actually be achieved in that year should not be the only consideration. In its July 27, 2010 report, the Independent Review Panel (IRP) expressed concerns about a longer horizon. The IRP commented "The desirability of living in the Portland/Vancouver region is not going to diminish, so populations will continue to grow.... [T]he IRP believes the greatest risk in the decision-making process is not over-sizing the bridges but not building enough capacity for the next 100 years." [1]

Past financial performance is an important issue but is not relevant to the

NEPA review process. The Record of Decision concludes the NEPA analysis. It indicates which alternative has been selected by the federal government, and allows for the continued design, eligibility for federal funding and permitting, and eventual construction of that alternative. The Locally Preferred Alternative is supported by local, regional, state, and federal agencies and has been selected following exhaustive analysis and public involvement program.

The project takes the issues of financial management very seriously. The project is currently developing new financial reporting mechanisms and has started providing monthly reports on the internet. The project will continue to work with the public to improve transparency and an understanding of the resources required for an undertaking of this scale.

Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected light rail to Clark College as the project's preferred transit mode. These sponsor agencies, which include the Vancouver City Council, Portland City Council, C-TRAN Board, TriMet Board, RTC Board and Metro Council considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force (a broad group of stakeholders representative of the range of interests affected by the project - see the DEIS Public Involvement Appendix for more information regarding the CRC Task Force) before voting on the LPA.

As illustrated in the DEIS, and summarized in Exhibit 29 (page S-33) of the Executive Summary, light rail would better serve transit riders than bus rapid transit (BRT) within the CRC project area. Light rail would carry more passengers across the river during the PM peak, result in more people choosing to take transit, faster travel times through the project area, fewer potential noise impacts, and lower costs per incremental rider than BRT. Additionally, light rail is more likely to attract desirable development on Hayden Island and in downtown Vancouver, which is

consistent with local land use plans.

[1] Warne, Thomas (2010). I-5 Columbia River Crossing Project, Independent Review Panel, Final Report. Independent Review Panel, Olympia, July 27, 2010.

P-100-003

Over the course of the CRC project, a public involvement program has been used to educate and involve stakeholders and the public in order for them to become active participants in shaping the CRC project. At the time of DEIS publication, the project team had participated in over 350 public events, giving over 10,000 people a face-to-face opportunity to learn about the project and provide meaningful input. In order to encourage the highest levels of attendance as possible, most meetings scheduled by the project team were on weekday evenings or weekends during the day. Meetings have been held primarily within the project area to ensure proximity to those potentially most affected by the project. In addition to public events, the program also enabled significant involvement for those who are unable to attend meetings through the project's website and project update notifications.

Prior to publication of the DEIS, property owners potentially affected by project alternatives were notified directly via mail, and six meetings specifically focused on potential right-of-way needs were held in September of 2007. Extensive outreach has been conducted through distribution of written information in hard copy and electronic form, including comment forms, the creation of a project website, and outreach to local and regional media.

When the DEIS was published, the project's database had grown to over 3,000 e-mail addresses and over 10,000 postal mailing addresses. The database was used to encourage participation in public events and involve the broader community. Through implementation of the public

involvement program, over 3,000 public comments were received before publication of the DEIS and over 1,600 comments were received during the 60-day DEIS comment period. In addition, since the DEIS comment period there have been numerous community meetings, open houses, and public hearings by project sponsors, providing more opportunities for public input and comment.

Please see Appendix B of the FEIS for a broader discussion of the public involvement program, including a list of public involvement events that have occurred related to this project. There will not be a public vote on construction of the various CRC project elements. However, as a public project, it must be approved and funded by the decisions of elected officials who are themselves directly elected by voters. Long-term operation and maintenance of the new light rail line will be funded through C-TRAN and TriMet. For its share of the operations and maintenance funding, C-TRAN plans on pursuing a public vote.

P-100-004

The 3rd bridge port to port crossing idea was evaluated and removed from consideration, as discussed in Chapter 2 of the FEIS. No additional analysis was required to know that it did not address the identified needs for the CRC project. Other locations for a new crossing were also considered and removed from consideration because they could not adequately meet the purpose and need.

The C-TRAN board and Regional Transportation Council both voted on and approved the locally preferred alternative.