

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

00081

1 tracks. I don't think it brings the city
 2 together.
 3 The cost -- I mean, people wonder why
 4 this thing is being pushed forward. This
 5 is all about money. This is money for
 6 developers. This is money for
 7 construction workers. This is money for
 8 everybody but the people that actually
 9 have to use it.
 10 The subsidies that have to actually
 11 operate the system are so large that -- I
 12 mean, I would be surprised if one percent
 13 of the cost was actually carried by the
 14 rider on a light rail system. It just
 15 doesn't make sense.
 16 Thank you.
 17 HAL DINGERINK: Thank you, John.
 18 Daniel.
 19 DANIEL SWINK: My name is Daniel
 20 Swink, mailing address P.O. Box 61884,
 21 Vancouver, Washington.
 22 I'm also an income taxpayer of Oregon
 23 as well as a resident of Vancouver and I
 24 grew up around seeing a lot of -- well,
 25 Washington transportation projects

P-1066-001

P-1066-001

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an 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 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, such as a possible third transportation corridor across the Columbia River, alternative transit modes, and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and found that alternatives that do not include improvements to the existing I-5 facility generally do not 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 I-5. Traffic modeling showed that even significant investment in improving transit options in the corridor or building a third corridor was not enough to alleviate future traffic demand and existing safety hazards on I-5. It is important to note that transit and river crossing components were not eliminated simply because they could not accommodate future vehicular trips. For example, both light rail and tolling help to decrease vehicular demand. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the DEIS for more discussion on the screening process used to develop project alternatives and 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.

00082

P-1066-001 1 developed right in my front yard in the
 2 past, including Interstate 90.
 3 And I have attended many of these
 4 meetings with the River Crossing Project
 5 and has been observing what's going on
 6 with the media regarding this project and
 7 the outreach to the public. And from my
 8 observations and my experience with the
 9 meetings is that -- as many other people
 10 have mentioned here, it seems to be -- the
 11 lines seem to be pretty made up in terms
 12 of what options we are going to look at
 13 with this project, how it's going to be
 14 put forth, and there seems to be a lot of
 15 vague information about where -- how this
 16 project is going to get paid for.

P-1066-002 17 It seems to be tending to gravitate
 18 towards grabbing the money that is
 19 available from the Federal Government.
 20 Well, you have to remember the Federal
 21 Government is still us, the tax payers.
 22 So money that is coming from the Federal
 23 Government is money that is being diverted
 24 from other needed infrastructure projects
 25 as well. So any money that is being spent

P-1066-002

As the only continuous north-south Interstate on the West Coast connecting the Canadian and Mexican borders, I-5 is vital to the local, regional, and national economy. The I-5 crossing also provides the primary transportation link between Vancouver and Portland, and the only direct connection between the downtown areas of these cities. As described in the DEIS, serious problems face this important crossing, including growing congestion, impaired freight movement, limited public transit options, high auto accident rates, substandard bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and vulnerability to failure in an earthquake. The fact that other important issues face our communities does not diminish the importance of addressing the problems plaguing the I-5 crossing.

CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects would remain dedicated to those projects, and anticipates needing to find new funds to finance the project. Funding for the project will come from a variety of sources including federal grants that would not be available to other transportation projects in the region, State of Oregon, State of Washington, regional and local sources. In addition, it is assumed that the replacement bridge will be tolled. Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA.

00083

P-1066-002 | 1 should be spent wisely because -- just
 2 because money is available does not mean
 3 we should rush to be spending it if we are
 4 not spending it appropriately for the
 5 needs that it's being set for.

P-1066-003 | 6 So I am also against light rail
 7 because -- for many of the -- as many
 8 other people have mentioned here this
 9 evening, I can see where it would create
 10 an increase in crime trend in the area.
P-1066-004 | 11 And the cost of paying for this project
 12 just doesn't -- like previously here was
 13 just mentioned, it doesn't seem fathomable
 14 how it's going to be cost effective to put
 15 in such an expensive system that is so
 16 inflexible because the rails are in fixed
 17 position.
 18 There are so many commuters and so
 19 many service people out there on the
 20 freeway. I have worked many jobs
 21 traveling that freeway, that commuters --
 22 even with the job I have now -- that rail
 23 system -- even the bus -- is not effective
 24 for me to commute using the rail system
 25 because I can't get to where I need to go.

P-1066-003

Safety and security are high priorities for C-Tran and TriMet. CRC, C-TRAN and TriMet are partnering with local jurisdictions, police and neighborhoods to design, implement and operate a safe and secure transit system. A Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP) was created, in part, to address public concerns about safety, and is a requirement for funding from the Federal Transit Administration. Nationally, studies show that crime rates at the stations directly correlated to the amount of crime in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Between 2008 and 2009 TriMet has aggressively enhanced safety and security on its MAX and bus systems. During that time frame, the number of police officers working in the Transit Police Division doubled to 58 officers who spend up to 70 percent of their time patrolling the system. Additionally, TriMet added 15 new fare inspectors and granted authority for all 46 TriMet Road Supervisors to enforce fares.

Please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the FEIS for more information regarding potential impact on crime and plans for ensuring the safety and security of passengers using the light rail system.

P-1066-004

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.

00084

P-1066-004 | 1 I either can't get there at all via the
 2 system that is in place or I can't get
 3 there because -- sorry, I just lost my
 4 train of thought -- because of the
 5 inflexibility of it.
 6 I don't -- it doesn't seem a
 7 practical system. Whereas, if you were
 8 relying on a bus system, it's very
 9 versatile. It can change in size to
 10 accommodate the ridership that is
 11 involved. You can travel along with the
 12 cars immediately or you can create, you
 13 know, a designated lanes for it, for rapid
 14 bus transit like they were mentioning.

P-1066-005 | 15 So I think that this whole project
 16 just needs to be given more public input.
 17 I see the public is kind of being shut out
 18 and the whole Environmental Impact
 19 Statement, as has been mentioned, needs to
 20 be allotted plenty of time for that review
 21 process. There is a lot of material to
 22 cover there.
 23 HAL DINGERINK: Thank you. Anne.
 24 ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE: Good evening,
 25 Anne McEnery-Ogle, 3501 F Street.

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.

P-1066-005

Multiple methods have been used to engage the public so as to address the needs of a wide variety of people and the project decision-making process. Public feedback has helped guide the outreach effort. Examples include workshops with facilitated small-group discussions, open houses where participants can talk one-on-one with staff, public hearings, presentations and discussion at community and neighborhood-sponsored meetings, often at the group's request, and advisory group meetings where CRC seeks recommendations from a citizen committee. These events and meetings have taken place at a variety of locations, days of the week and times of the day to meet the needs of the entire community. For more information on the project's public outreach, please see Appendix B of the FEIS.

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