

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



P-1049-001

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.

Based on the Metro model's past ability to predict transportation effects, the CRC project is confident in the data received from Metro and uses it to determine what impact the project will have on congestion. The improvements proposed by the project to the highway and seven interchanges will help better accommodate increased future vehicle traffic. New auxiliary lanes and longer on/off ramps will allow safer and more efficient merging and weaving to enter or exit the freeway. Narrow lanes and shoulders will be widened to current standards. Shoulders will be added where they are currently missing. All of these changes will improve the flow of traffic in the bottleneck area of the Interstate Bridge.

00058

1 take those six trees and my neighbors
 2 asked me to say that tonight. Thank you
 3 very much.
 4 HAL Dengerink: Okay. Tadd.
 5 TADD HESS: Yes, my name is Tadd
 6 Hess. Thank you very much for having
 7 this. My home address is 2317 Northwest
 8 101st Street.
 9 I strongly agree with the idea of
 10 building the biggest bridge we can build
 11 with light rail. My own experience is
 12 that of a carpenter. I do -- I do
 13 structural concrete. I built a few
 14 bridges in my life. I worked on a project
 15 on the east coast that took 26 years to
 16 get done. And the day they opened it, it
 17 was already packed. And that's because
 18 when you take too long to make decisions,
 19 the plans that you have, have to be
 20 re-upped so that it can deal with the
 21 amount of people that you are adding on
 22 every day that you are sitting around
 23 deciding.
 24 Now, a bridge isn't a Bic lighter.
 25 You have to, like, make a decision to

P-1049-001

00059

P-1049-001 | 1 build something that is either enlargeable
2 (sic) or large enough to deal with the
3 future.

P-1049-002 | 4 As far as the light rail goes, if I
5 have a choice between sitting in a car in
6 traffic or sitting in a bus in traffic,
7 I'll sit in my car, you know. In the
8 wintertime, I am halfway hypothermic, you
9 know. The last thing in the world I want
10 to do is slog onto a bus. But if I can
11 hop on a train and run across quick, that
12 would probably change it.

P-1049-003 | 13 It's already -- you know, I'm already
14 paying for parking in Portland that's out
15 of this world, so the idea of paying for a
16 toll is -- I'm totally against it.

P-1049-004 | 17 I think that we should consider
18 pulling out the 150 million dollars a year
19 that Washington residents pay to Oregon in
20 income tax and I think that we should tax
21 Oregon residents who buy products on this
22 side of the river. That way, we can
23 probably come up with a little bit of
24 money to pay for it besides the Fed.
25 And in conclusion, I just have to say

P-1049-002

Preferences for specific alternatives or options, as expressed in comments received before and after the issuance of the DEIS, were shared with local sponsor agencies to inform decision making. Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected a replacement I-5 bridge with light rail to Clark College as the project's Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). These sponsor agencies, which include the Portland City Council, Vancouver City Council, TriMet Board, C-TRAN Board, Metro Council, RTC Board, considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force when voting on the LPA.

With the LPA, new bridges will replace 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.

For a more detailed description of highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements associated with the LPA, see Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

P-1049-003

Tolling was evaluated in the DEIS and FEIS, and included in the LPA for two important reasons. First, a toll may be necessary to pay for the construction of this project, as discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. Second, a toll provides a valuable travel demand management tool that encourages travelers to take alternative modes (including light rail provided by this project), travel at off-peak periods, or reduce their auto trips. This demand management reduces congestion and extends the effective service life of the facility. When the existing I-5 northbound

00060
P-1049-005

1 that the other thing that I am sort of
 2 bothered by is not only sort of just the
 3 general, like, busting on you guys that's
 4 been happening, but also I think that we
 5 cannot let Pierce Airfield make a decision
 6 of how tall a bridge should be. I think
 7 it's matter of national security and also
 8 an economic matter for this whole -- for
 9 the whole northwest.
 10 With that, thank you, Gentlemen.
 11 HAL DINGERINK: Thank you, Tadd.
 12 Joe.
 13 JOE CORTRIGHT: Joe Cortright,
 14 Portland.
 15 On reading the Draft Environmental
 16 Impact Statement, I was struck that as a
 17 work of literature it reminds me of Marcel
 18 Proust's Remembrance of Things Past --
 19 extraordinarily long turgid work written
 20 in a foreign language obsessed with the
 21 time gone by -- and one other thing, a
 22 work of fiction.
 23 I think there are 15 flaws in the
 24 draft environmental impact statement and
 25 I'll go through them quickly.

bridge was built in 1917, it was paid for with a toll. The southbound I-5 bridge, built in 1958, was also funded partially by tolls. In 2008, the Washington legislature passed enabling language for tolling on I-5, provided that each facility is later authorized under specific legislation. Once authorized by the legislature, the Washington Transportation Commission has the authority to set the toll rates. In Oregon, and the Oregon Transportation Commission has the authority to toll a facility and to set the toll rates.

P-1049-004

Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA. This discussion provides an updated assessment of likely funding sources for this project, though it is not common practice to receive funding commitments prior to completion of the alternative selection process. As described in the FEIS, project funding is expected to come from a variety of local, state, and federal sources, with federal funding and tolls providing substantial revenue for the construction. As Oregon and Washington businesses and residents will benefit from the project's multi-modal improvements, both states have been identified as contributors to the project. As jurisdictions on both sides of the river seek to encourage non-auto travel, tolls are not anticipated for bikes, pedestrians, and transit users. Lastly, CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects and purposes would remain dedicated to those projects and purposes.

P-1049-005

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

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

constraints imposed by the location and alignment of the river crossing all constrain the ultimate design of the bridge. The upstream river crossing alignment was dropped for further consideration in October 2007. The downstream option has a curved alignment primarily for construction staging purposes, and connecting into existing I-5. The curved alignment limits the feasibility of several different structure types.

Since the publication of the DEIS, the Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) met multiple times to discuss the design of the bridges and 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, in April 2011, announced selection of the composite deck truss as the preferred bridge type. 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.