

00001

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING DRAFT EIS  
PUBLIC HEARING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2008

RED LION HOTEL  
VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON



00075

1 is needed now are three discretely  
 2 separated Columbia River Crossings into  
 3 Oregon. Let the CRC start thinking  
 4 outside the box.

5 Thank you.

6 HAL DINGERINK: Thank you, Bob.

7 Okay.

8 SPEAKER: I did participate  
 9 early in this process and early in this  
 10 process I did urge the consideration of a  
 11 heavy rail or a rail alternative that  
 12 would be truly between communities and not  
 13 a street car as we are being left with.

14 The prospect of a 45-minute-plus  
 15 commute just getting -- once you get over  
 16 the bridge on the existing street car is  
 17 not very -- it is not a positive thing.  
 18 We really needed another alternative with  
 19 this type of light rail. It's not very  
 20 attractive.

21 But from the same point of view, if  
 22 we were to look at our overall commitment  
 23 as a community to transportation and if we  
 24 were to look at it in the bigger picture  
 25 of things, I really believe that the

P-1036-001

P-1036-002

**P-1036-001**

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River, and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why a third corridor, arterial crossing, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need.

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 effected 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. Not only would light rail carry more passengers across the river during the PM peak, it would also result in more people choosing to take transit, faster travel times through the project area, and fewer potential noise impacts 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.

00076

**P-1036-002** 1 Portland and the Urban Planners really do  
2 have the right thing in mind.  
3 We may think that the people from  
4 Metro were crazy and everything, coming in  
5 late and we may not like their opinions,  
6 but some of the things said really did  
7 make sense.  
8 The idea of the flexible tolling, if  
9 we really look at modifying our behaviors,  
10 really does make sense. We are not going  
11 to, through this, alleviate the stress  
**P-1036-003** 12 that is already been put upon  
13 neighborhoods that are directly adjacent  
14 to the I-5 corridor.  
15 Those neighborhoods, from all the  
16 alternatives that I could see, will  
17 continue to be poisoned with the effluent  
18 of a transportation corridor. I do not  
19 see substantial mitigation being rendered  
20 to them, and I think that's wrong. You  
21 know, it is has been mentioned again and  
22 again that we need to do that, but it's  
23 wrong.  
**P-1036-004** 24 Anthropologists -- if you look at our  
25 terrific marriage with the car -- over

The CRC Task Force, a broad group of stakeholders representative of the range of interests effected by the project (see the DEIS Public Involvement Appendix for more information regarding the CRC Task Force) recommended that light rail be selected as the preferred transit mode.

#### **P-1036-002**

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-1036-003**

The air quality evaluation presented in the DEIS assessed how emissions would be expected to change by 2030 and how the project would affect emissions of pollutants regulated by state and federal standards as well as vehicle emissions that are not regulated. Oregon and Washington, as well as the federal government, have established ambient air quality standards for criteria pollutants. These standards are based on human health risks. The DEIS evaluation included an analysis demonstrating that the CRC project would allow the region to retain conformity with state and federal air quality standards for relevant criteria pollutants. See the Air Quality Technical Report for a detailed explanation of the state and federal regulations concerning air quality and the evaluation of how the project complies with relevant air quality regulations. See Section 3.10 of the FEIS for an updated explanation of the pollutants regulated by state and federal law.

The DEIS also evaluated how the project alternatives would affect emissions of mobile source air toxins (MSATs) from I-5 traffic. MSAT emissions from vehicles are not currently regulated. The evaluation in

00077  
**P-1036-004**

1 here it seems that we are even more  
 2 married to the car than the Portland area.  
 3 We are throwbacks. I don't know what's  
 4 wrong with us here. We are provincial.  
 5 We do not get it, and the people in  
 6 Portland seem to have got it. And we've  
 7 got to realize that we are going to have  
 8 to have some sort of dependance upon  
 9 communal transportation.  
 10 Thank you.  
 11 HAL DINGERINK: Thank you. Karen.  
 12 KAREN AXELL: My name is Karen  
 13 Axell. I live on East 29th Street in  
 14 Vancouver. I am against any form of light  
 15 rail and I did testify to that also six to  
 16 seven years ago at the I-5 transportation  
 17 project and 13 years ago when we all in  
 18 Clark County voted against light rail.  
 19 It is too expensive. There are no  
 20 clear funding options projected. It does  
 21 not reduce congestion. Figures show that  
 22 less than one percent shift from cars to  
 23 light rail the per rider cost is too  
 24 high.  
 25 They show that -- it seems to be

the DEIS found "that future (no-build or build) emissions of all pollutants would be substantially lower than existing emissions for the region and the subareas" (page 3-277). These reductions in emissions are largely the result of on-going reductions in vehicle emissions that will occur with or without the project, and are based on standard assumptions regarding future vehicles and fuel. The anticipated vehicle emission reductions are based largely on regulation-driven improvements in fleet fuel efficiency standards and cleaner gasoline and diesel fuels. Any extraordinary improvements in fleet fuel efficiency or fuels would result in even greater emission reductions.

Projected reductions in vehicle fleet emissions would result in a 25% to 90% reduction in I-5 related criteria pollutant emissions over existing conditions, even with the anticipated growth in population, employment and VMT. In addition, the build alternatives would provide small further reductions in vehicle emissions at the regional level and for most pollutants in each of the subareas along I-5. CO and NOx emissions would be slightly higher with the project than with No-Build (but still lower than existing conditions) in the I-5 subarea between the SR 14 and SR 500 interchanges, as discussed in DEIS Chapter 3 (Section 3.10) and FEIS Chapter 3 (Section 3.10). The updated analysis conducted for the FEIS resulted in very similar findings to those in the DEIS.

#### **P-1036-004**

With the LPA, new bridges will the existing Interstate Bridges to carry I-5 traffic, light rail, pedestrians and bicyclists across the Columbia River. Light rail will extend from the Expo Center MAX Station in Portland to a station and park and ride at Clark College in Vancouver. Pedestrians and bicyclists would travel along a wider and safer path than exists today.

00115

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
County of Clark)

I, Cathy S. Taylor, a notary public  
for the State of Washington do hereby  
certify that I transcribed to the best of  
my ability said proceedings written by me  
in machine shorthand and thereafter  
reduced to typewriting; and that the  
foregoing transcript constitutes a full,  
true and accurate record of said  
proceedings and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and notarial seal  
this 16th day of June, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cathy S. Taylor, RPR, CSR  
Notary Public for the State of Washington  
My Commission expires April 15, 2009