


**From:** [Dufus Del Dia](#) 

**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)

**CC:** [Tom Potter](#); [Commissioner Sam Adams](#); [Dan Saltzman](#); [Randy Leonard](#); [Gary Blackmer](#); [Letters@News.Oregonian.com](#);

**Subject:** Columbia River Crossing

**Date:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 12:16:09 PM

**Attachments:**

---

**P-0952-001** Build it and they will come. In droves.

The best way to increase traffic, congestion and pollution in the I-5 Corridor between Portland and Vancouver is to double the number of lanes crossing the river. We would also get the added "benefits" of destroyed neighborhoods to accommodate the expansion, increased pollution for the remaining neighborhoods adjacent to the freeway, and one Whopper of a bill to pay the developers to build it.

**P-0952-002** On the other hand, a much more sustainable, common sense approach would be to take the advice of Robert Liberty, Carlotta Collette and Carl Hosticka: leave the current bridge in place, and charge a toll to cross it while we sit back and study the impact of doubling the number of cars and trucks crossing the river every day. I mean \*really\* study it, not pay the developers and their buddies to

**P-0952-003** give us a distorted report that says increasing capacity would result in decreased usage. Hah! SO Silly!

**P-0952-004** The rising price of oil and the detrimental effects of burning it will reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled between Portland and Vancouver on it's own.

**P-0952-005** Adding a toll would not only help reduce the traffic, but give us some money to put towards a solution that actually makes some sense, like mass transit options, bicycle and pedestrian options, and (most important) some sustainable thinking.

Thanks  
Steve Nassar  
S.E. Portland  
503.777.9555

### **P-0952-001**

As Chapter 3 (Sections 3.10 and 3.11) of the DEIS described, and as Chapter 3 (Sections 3.10 and 3.11) of the FEIS further elaborated, noise and air emission levels will improve for communities and most households along I-5. Air quality will be improved in large part by measures unassociated with the CRC project, such as regulated improvements in vehicle fuel emissions and in cleaner gasoline and diesel. Highway noise mitigation proposed for the CRC project would result in fewer noise impacts in the future with the project than there are today. There will be some locations where noise impacts cannot be mitigated. It is also true that with the introduction of light rail, better bicycle facilities, and a toll, the Average Daily Trips over the bridge will be reduced from the levels expected under the No-Build Alternative. The livability of residents along I-5 will also be improved as a result of greater personal mobility, an improved transit network, an improved network for walking and biking, less traffic cutting through neighborhoods, and the subsequent job creation that is expected to occur as a result of this major investment.

### **P-0952-002**

Modeling has indicated that tolling I-5 without making the improvements that are part of the CRC project would not meet the project's Purpose and Need. This does not mean that some form of tolling prior to constructing CRC couldn't be implemented. The ultimate decision on any tolling options will be made by both the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions.

### **P-0952-003**

Extensive technical and public review and input has been included in all phases of the CRC project, from developing a purpose and need statement, screening a wide variety of alternatives, and developing a Draft and Final EIS. A supplemental draft is required if changes to alternatives after the draft are substantial and/ or if there are new

significant impacts not previously discussed in the draft and/or there are changes in laws or regulations after the draft. The DEIS identified potential mitigation measures for all potentially significant as well as many non-significant impacts, and the FEIS further analyzes and develops mitigation measures and plans to a higher level of detail and refinement. CEQ NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1502.9(c)) do not require agencies to prepare a supplemental draft EIS just because an FEIS includes refined alternatives and additional information. Such changes are typical and expected in the planning process, and are consistent with CEQ and FHWA NEPA regulations. Between publication of the DEIS and FEIS, FTA and FHWA prepared three NEPA re-evaluations and a documented categorical exclusion (DCE) to complete changes in the project since the DEIS. The NEPA re-evaluations addressed the change in the project from: 1) the 17th Street transit alignment, 2) the composite deck truss bridge type, and 3) all other changes in design between the DEIS and the FEIS. The DCE addressed the impacts from the track work on the steel bridge.

Both agencies concluded from these evaluations that these changes and new information would not result in any significant environmental impacts that were not previously considered in the DEIS. For more information, see Appendix O of the FEIS.

#### **P-0952-004**

Traffic forecasts reported in the DEIS and used to inform decisions on a locally preferred alternative were derived from adopted regional employment and population forecasts and state-of-the-art modeling and evaluation conducted by Metro, RTC and the project team, and reviewed by all project sponsor agencies as well as FTA and FHWA. In addition, an independent panel of traffic modeling experts was convened in October 2008 to review the modeling methods and findings. These experts concluded that the project's approach to estimating future travel demand was reasonable and that it relied on accepted practices

employed in metropolitan regions throughout the country. These findings are summarized in the “Columbia River Crossing Travel Demand Model Review Report” (November 25, 2008). This independent review confirmed the approach CRC modeling used to address multiple variables that can affect travel demand, including gasoline prices, tolling, travel demand measures and induced development.

#### **P-0952-005**

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an extensive evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) explains how the project's Sponsoring Agencies generated ideas and solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, and tribes for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, many of which were non-auto oriented options such as various transit modes and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently without any capital investment. These options were evaluated for whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and the findings were reviewed by project sponsors, the public, agencies, and other stakeholders. Alternatives that included only TDM/TSM strategies, or provided only transit improvements, would provide benefits, but could only address a very limited portion of the project's purpose and need. This extensive analysis found that in order for an alternative to meet the six "needs" included in the Purpose and Need (described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS), it had to provide at least some measure of capital improvements to I-5 in the project area. Alternatives that did not include such improvements did not adequately address the seismic vulnerability of the existing I-5 bridges, traffic congestion on I-5, or the existing safety problems caused by sub-standard design of the highway in this corridor. The DEIS evaluated alternatives with more demand management (higher toll) and increased transit service with less investment in highway infrastructure improvements (Alternatives 4 and 5) compared to the toll

and transit service levels included in Alternatives 2 and 3. The additional service and higher toll provided only marginal reductions in I-5 vehicle volumes, and they came primarily at the cost of greater traffic diversion to I-205. This analysis found that a more balanced investment in highway and transit, as represented by Alternatives 2 and 3, performed considerably better on a broad set of criteria.