

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

00072

1 I also am a member of Minority  
 2 Contractors and I am a national  
 3 representative for that organization. And  
 4 I have been asking them continuously for  
 5 opportunities and they said that because  
 6 Washington is taking the lead on it and  
 7 not Oregon -- the other thing is that they  
 8 say they are giving moneys, but it's not  
 9 to be the technical piece, but the local  
 10 public involvement.

11 So it's just sad for me as a minority  
 12 woman that there is no representation in  
 13 this especially when I -- most of my  
 14 employees are 50 percent African-Americans  
 15 and Hispanics.

16 Thank you.

17 HAL DENERINK: Thank you. At  
 18 this time, we are ready to change out.  
 19 John Waller, Daniel Swink and Anne  
 20 McEnery-Ogle. And we are ready to move  
 21 on to Bob Wachter.

22 BOB WACHTER: Good evening. My  
 23 name is Bob Wachter. I reside at 2813  
 24 Northeast 153rd Circle. I am a retired  
 25 engineer, having first seen the light of

P-1069-001

**P-1069-001**

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.

Regarding I-5 congestion, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) began construction on the I-5 Delta Park widening project in April 2008. Phase I of the project involves widening I-5 and lengthening the entrance and exit ramps at Victory Boulevard and Columbia Boulevard. When complete, the Delta Park project will have widened the current 2-lane segment of southbound I-5 to 3 lanes. There are currently no immediate plans to widen I-5 south of Delta Park. The southbound traffic congestion that currently exists near the I-5/I-405 split will not be improved by either the CRC project or the Delta Park project. However, traffic analyses show the congestion will not be worse because of the Columbia River Crossing project. The main reason is that fewer cars are expected to cross the river with a project in 2030 than without a project. This is due to the provision of improved transit service and tolling.

Beyond the CRC and Delta Park projects, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan recommended a comprehensive list of modal actions relating to: additional transit capacity and service; additional rail capacity; land use and land use accord; transportation demand/system management; environmental justice; additional elements and strategies (such as new river crossings); and financing. RTC and Metro are tasked with initiating recommendations as part of their regional

P-1069-001

00073

1 day here in the Portland Vancouver area.  
 2 While the Columbia River Crossing  
 3 Draft Development Statement seems to  
 4 demonstrate that a terrific amount of  
 5 effort has been employed in studying a  
 6 two-mile wide segment between the I-5 Main  
 7 Street interchange and the Columbia River,  
 8 I feel that the scope of this study has  
 9 been limited by political considerations.  
 10 Had the scope been extended to look  
 11 at all reasonable Columbia River Crossing  
 12 points, the public would have had a much  
 13 better opportunity to evaluate the  
 14 long-range advantages or disadvantages of  
 15 each of these costly CRC Bridge proposals.  
 16 In short, I believe other Columbia  
 17 River Crossing schemes should have been  
 18 considered before presenting this limited  
 19 offering to the public.  
 20 In my opinion, the proposal that is  
 21 now being reviewed, it primarily focussed  
 22 on connecting the Delta Park light rail  
 23 system to Clark County rather than  
 24 addressing the long-range congestion  
 25 problems facing I-5 traffic.

transportation planning role. Examples of current efforts include RTC's evaluation of future high-capacity transit in Clark County, and evaluation of needs for future river crossings. Regional planners have investigated solutions to existing bottlenecks at the I-5 connections with I-405 and I-84. ODOT is responsible for conducting ongoing studies to identify other congestion problems on I-5 in Oregon that may need to be addressed in the future.

P-1069-001 00074

1 If the public was too accept any one  
2 of these present CRC Bridge proposals,  
3 those who follow us will be cussing us out  
4 because of our shortsightedness. Just  
5 pushing the traffic bottleneck further  
6 south into Portland is asinine.

7 When it comes to making roadway  
8 investments in the four billion dollar  
9 range, we need to be thinking in terms of  
10 usefulness in time periods of at least 40  
11 or 50 years.

12 Take it from one who remembers  
13 crossing the original interstate bridge on  
14 a street car and then witnessing the  
15 regions terrific population growth  
16 followed by the evolution of all the  
17 additional Columbia River bridges.

18 Some of us think there is a better  
19 location for the new Columbia River Bridge  
20 which will offer greater long-range  
21 advantages for handling both roadway and  
22 light rail traffic in this rapidly growing  
23 Portland Vancouver area.

24 Unfortunately, the CRC Task Force has  
25 not been receptive to these ideas. What

P-1069-001 | 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 Dengerink: 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

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