



Appendix J. Original Comments on the DEIS

Table J-1 provides the text from the comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) (in the light-blue rows) within the comment period (between November 7 and December 22, 2008). Above each comment, the table lists the identifier for each comment, the name of the commenter, and information about how the comment was received. If a copy of the original document is available (file names indicated in parentheses in the white row of the “How Comment was Received” column), it is provided in a separate file (Sellwood_FEIS_AppJ-2.pdf).

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
48	Blair Kramer	Received via Web Site
	<p>I received a document asking about the Sellwood Br. alternative that I would prefer. As far as I can see the only alternative that makes any sense, as far as being able to handle traffic smoothly, is alternative C. I am familiar with roundabouts as I've traveled thru Astoria on Hwy. 101 where there is a roundabout at the north end of the bridge (Youngs Bay Br.) located between Warrenton and Astoria. It is very confusing to people who are not familiar with it and especially the elderly, even those who are familiar with it. I also have run into problems with large semi-trucks being able to round the turn and staying in their lanes. Many times I have had to run up onto the island in the middle when a truck cuts it too close around the curve. Fortunately the State gave room to do so. But it is dangerous all the same.</p> <p>Also, as we all know, traffic signals are a necessity for safety reasons but they do impede the flow of all traffic. If they can be avoided they should. Also having to stop, idle, and then go wastes precious gasoline. Having only one alternative to choose from, that does not involve a roundabout or traffic signal, if a new bridge is to be constructed, I think alternative C is the only option that makes sense.</p>	
49	John Shurts	Received via Web Site
	<p>DEIS was well done. Thank you. I also took the survey. But just to echo my survey answers, I strongly favor the Alternatives that keep the bridge on its current alignment, whether rehabilitation or replacement. The Alternatives to north interfere too much with one of the jewels of the area -- Sellwood Park along the river.</p>	
50	John Tipton	Received via Web Site
	<p>do the right thing and move it to the north. and away from our homes. these condos were not built to withstand the high level of sound that comes with high numbers of trucks and cars that will come that close to are home. people can already see that im having dinner, i just dont want them to see What im having for dinner.</p>	
51	Chelsea Bianchi	Received via Web Site
	<p>I feel that there are four main issues, all regarding livability of all local residents, to consider when choosing between the alternatives listed for bridge design: closure periods, impact on recreation or parks, and preparation for the future thus keeping property values attainable for middle class families and not undervaluing their homes. In my opinion these issues trump other livability issues for the long term impact they will have on Sellwood, Lake Oswego, Johns Landing, and other neighborhoods. I feel that the option that best addresses these issues is Alternative D. There is no closure issue, 3.9 acres of park are lost compared to the 3.8 of Alternative E but only 5 facilities. The construction phasing/cost/future reconfigure will destroy less housing and workplaces than Alternative E, cost less</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	then Alternatives A and B, and allow for future adaptations thus keeping all neighborhoods viable parts of Portlands infostructure and not disconnected segments that have a hard time connecting. Please consider Alternative D as the best answer to the Sellwood Bridge Issue.	
52	John Russell	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>If the bridge needs to have at least 3' shoulders, why not double their functionality and make them functional bike lanes, at least 6' or 6.5' wide?</p> <p>If shoulders weren't needed, I would, as a cyclists prefer a Hawthorne-bridge-style sidewalk with enough room for cyclists and pedestrians. With the expected number of pedestrians, it might even be acceptable to make the sidewalks somewhere in the range of 12' to 18' wide, but only to reduce the overall size and cost of the bridge, not to add vehicle lanes.</p> <p>As it appears that shoulders are in fact required, why not make them double as large-enough bike lanes?</p> <p>The vehicle congestion problem would not be solved in any way by adding more lanes, as the bottle neck would simply be moved to either side of the bridge. The real solution to that specific problem would be to look at a bridge in the vicinity of Lake Oswego.</p> <p>In the aforementioned aspects, along with the second lowest average cost, along with the absence of a closure, D is clearly the best option.</p>	
53	Derek Holmgren	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	Because the alternatives have different bridge designs, it is assumed the different bridge designs would have different lighting schemes. Chapter 3.11 (Visual Resources) does not analyze how the alternatives would affect the visual landscape at night. Please provide a description of the Sellwood Bridge's sources of nighttime light (such as bridge lighting, safety/roadway lighting, and lighting for pedestrians) in the affected environment. Then, please identify impacts on the visual landscape at night for each alternative. For example, would one alternative have more sources of light than another? Or, would one alternative have more visible sources of light than another? The visibility of light could be influenced by the color of the light, whether the light is flashing or steady, and the elevation of the light). Also, please identify mitigation to minimize nighttime light and its spread. For example, would shrouds be affixed to the bridge's light fixtures to prevent light from straying off-site? Would any of the light fixtures make use of solar panels for electricity?	
54	Chris Pheil	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I have already completed the last survey regarding the preferred bridge/interchange designs but then had another thought.</p> <p>My preferred design has always been a double deck design in order to lessen the impact that bridge width has on the adjacent bridges and residences.</p> <p>On the East end, has anyone considered moving the bridge on ramp back to 7th or 8th Avenue in order to allow the bridge height to soar over the businesses and residences in order to allow them to remain?</p> <p>Just a thought.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Chris Pheil</p>	
55	Doug Prentice	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	Being a Sellwood resident I favor the no build alternative. With the economy in such turmoil it makes	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		no sense to build a 300 million dollar bridge. Rebuild the existing bridge and save our neighborhood. I do not think the estimates have anticipated the potential legal litigation and lawsuits brought to the county if they try to condemn and move residents and businesses. This will even delay the process further and could even stop it. A new brige needs to be built in another area that takes the commuter traffic out of the Sellwood community.
56	Diane Howieson	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		I am concerned about the safety of the west side interchange for bicyclists who are cycling from Lake Oswego to Portland, or Portland to Lake Oswego. The current road arrangement is unsafe. Which plan is best to protect these bicyclists?
57	Diane Howieson	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		If one of the alternatives is selected that closes the bridge, the Tacoma St Ferry should be reinstated for pedestrians and cyclists.
58	Dan Pence	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		Please hurry up and get this done. Everybody has known that this bridge has needed to be updated or replaced for 30 years. It's time for action, enough with getting everybody to share their every opinion. My daughter drives to Lake Oswego using the Sellwood bridge every day. It's not safe for her or the other 40,000 people she shares it with. BTW when this crossing is closed her trip to school will be at least 15 miles longer each way and I can't imagine how long it will take her. My neighbor rides her bike across this bridge every day commuting to Lewis and Clark, it sucks for her. We are ready for this nightmare to end.
59	Clifford Colvin	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		I use the Sellwood Bridge everyday to go to work. I prefer the double decker option. Cars & trucks on top and bicycles & pedestrians on the bottom. Thank you. Clifford Colvin
60	Daniel Kaufman	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		I received your mailer today and it seems you left off one significant and cost-effective alternative. This would be to eliminate the bridge. Why is that not one of the alternatives? This is a serious question and since I live in the Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood. I also don't see any information in the flier about how we will fund construction. That would certainly effect the alternative I choose. Best regards, Dan Kaufman 5611 SE 15th Avenue Portland, OR 97202
61	Sharon Marcus	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		In the 34 years I have lived in Portland, my two neighborhoods have been Sellwood and Corbett/Lair Hill/Terwilliger (now South Waterfront). My husband and I frequently cross the Sellwood Bridge to shop and frequent restaurants, and I am therefore aware of the close proximity of buildings to the bridge as well as the crowded and dangerous nature of the bridge as it is currently configured. I prefer Alternative D primarily for the following two reasons: (1) There would be NO closure period which is important for the health and success of the businesses in Sellwood; (2) The cross-section of the design allows for future reconfiguration – very important for our rapidly growing area. The displacement of 5 condo units and 9 businesses with a total of 30 employees, as well as the 3.9 acres of park/rec. impact and 5 park facilities is not excessive when compared to the other options. It is unfortunate that condos and business were allowed to be built so close to the bridge in the first

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		place, but since they are there it seems there is no way of avoiding some displacement.
62	Jim Larpenteur, Sellwood Harbor	<i>Received via Open House (062_JimLarpenteur.pdf)</i>
	<p>1. The survey is flawed because it doesn't lend itself to voting on the hybrid alternatives that are supposed to be available.</p> <p>2. The EIS is flawed because it doesn't address hybrid alternatives.</p> <p>We, you (CTF), and the PAG were promised to have the ability to mix and match within the 5 alternatives. There is no mix and match cost information. The Count in it's zeal to promote alternative D, designates 2 span of 64 ft. for Alt. D and saddles Alternative E, the preferred alternative for many of us, with a span of 75 ft. What would Alt E with a span of 64 ft cost? Does a "no" vote for Alt E mean the voter doesn't like the route or is it rejection of a 75 ft span for our neighborhood bridge?</p>	
63	John Lattig, Sellwood Harbor Condo Association	<i>Received via Open House (063_johnLattig.pdf)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft EIS is inadequate as a decision-making tool. Although it's been said that a “hybrid” solution may be the final recommendation, there is insufficient information in the EIS to allow for cost comparisons of alignment/cross section/bridge type combinations. For example, there needs to be a cost matrix that allows one to identify the cost savings of pairing a narrower cross section with alignment F. • The EIS lacks any documentation that would support the assumption only 4 residential units at Sellwood Harbor will be destroyed by Alternative D. Three of those units would be stripped off the northern end of a 3-story building with below grade parking, and one unit stripped of the end of a 3 unit townhouse structure. The EIS should include certification by a structural engineer that what remains will be structurally sound. • In Section 3, it's acknowledged that the loss of one condo unit at River Park may result in financial harm to the condo association as a whole because of diminished dues revenue. No such acknowledgement is made for the potentially greater harm of destroying 4 of 38 units at Sellwood Harbor (Alternative D.). This is a serious omission. • More explicit detail regarding right-of-way costs should be included so that decision makers can verify the adequacy of the cost projections. <p>Some of the statements in Section 4, Key Differentiators, are misleading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's implied as a negative factor that Alternative E will require the most right-of-way acquisition (11.7 acres vs. 10.5 acres.). This is mitigated by information presented in other sections of the EIS: Alternative E takes less parkland space than other alternatives, and it reclaims land on the east side that can be used for other constructive public use such as Sellwood Riverfront Park expansion and transit facilities. • It's stated that Alternative E will adversely impact Oaks Pioneer Church, but the section 106 process concluded with a finding of “no adverse impact” and it's also stated there will be no 4(f) impact to the church. • With respect to Alternative E noise impact on the church, the projected change is only 2db at 2035 traffic levels and the overall db level is below the Oregon State criterion of 65db. 	
64	Thomas Walsh	<i>Received via Open House (064_ThomasWalsh.pdf)</i>
	I ask that the CTh review and discuss the adequacy of the Seliwood Bridge DEIS before undertaking the process of selecting an alternative. If the DEIS has unnoticed	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>deficiencies, then the chances of making a proper choice become very small. The CTF should take the lead in critiquing the document. I offer an example of what I consider a serious fault in the DEIS. Section 3.19 treats noise. It gives levels for the existing condition and predicts them for the future conditions for the differing alternatives. They are much too low. They are said to be in units of dBA. Stated values range up to 72 cIBA. A casual walk along Tacoma St. will show that this value is constantly exceeded. A low-priced sound meter indicated that the emissions of most vehicles exceeded 72 cIBA and many approached 83 , 84 and even 85 CIBA. There is even a contradiction in the noise section. Large trucks will be traveling Tacoma St. under the build alternatives. Table 3.19-1 gives the noise of a large truck at a distance of 50 feet as 90 CIBA, not 72 dBA. On Tacoma Street, one cannot get 50 feet from passing traffic. The problem with the data in the main volume of the DEIS perhaps arises because the analysis and measurements to obtain levels, as described in the supporting document, “Noise, Seliwood Bridge Final Technical Report”, gave its results in Leq(h), not dBA. These were then erroneously incorporated into the DEIS as cIBA. Leq(h) is the hourly energy average of sound levels in dBA. I consider these averages very misleading. They make the noise appear to be much less severe than it really is.</p> <p>They are very much favored by groups and organizations which do not want limits placed on it, e.g., the aircraft owners, off-roaders, the FAA, the Forest Service, FHWA, etc.</p> <p>Noise levels should be given in environmental documents as it would be measured by rapid response meter settings as a function of time. If averages are given for some reason, they certainly should not be mislabeled. Even if the Oregon exterior Noise Abatement Criterion of 65 dBLeq(h) for a residence is met, noise there is still very intrusive and objectionable. Speech interference occurs at 58 CIBA when people are more than 3 feet apart. [Daniel R. Raichel, The Science and Applications of Acoustics, Springer Science+Media, Inc., 2006].</p> <p>The CTh may all ready be doing what I am requesting. I hope so. At the last CTF meeting I mentioned two letters to officials of the Columbia River Crossing Project. commenting on it. One is from the Multnomah County Health Department, dated June 9, 2008 and the second is from the National Marine Fisheries Service, dated August 6, 2008. The first one is very applicable to this project. The second one contains some useful information. I suggest that at least some members of the CTh obtain copies and read them.</p>
65	Clarke Balcom	<p><i>Received via Web Site</i></p> <p>Prefer dedicated transit lanes in Alternative E, which should be designed to allow for streetcar to Sellwood that could also connect to future Milwaukie lightrail.</p> <p>Best long-term value for the money.</p> <p>Also, Grand Place mostly still unoccupied, so minimal displacement. Can alignment be designed to go over or around River Park offices?</p> <p>Bike/ped trail alignment underneath roadway design (as in Alternative C) is clever, but presents danger of assault/rape out of sight of traffic.</p>
66	Jim Rech	<p><i>Received via Web Site</i></p> <p>Go with Alternative E.</p> <p>The disruption, cost (please do the girder option), and future flexibility are too compelling. It's a horrible economy out there and the community needs to focus on practical priorities.</p> <p>Businesses can be moved. There is a great amount of vacant space. They can live with it. They probably will end up be better off.</p> <p>In contrast, the impact on people (dislocations)and neighborhoods needs to be addressed as a high priority. Don't force them to ask, beg or sue.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
67	Don Henderson	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Do this fast. The construction industry is hungry for business and the cost should be dramatically lower than quoted in the EIS.</p> <p>All the alignments will have an impact in some way, but alignment D is clearly a terrible choice. I remain amazed that it could even be an option.</p> <p>The displacement of so many long time residents is unconsciable. Further the gutting of a substantial portion of Sellwood Harbor will utterly destroy the value and livability of the remaining units.</p> <p>The best approach is to repair and maintain the existing bridge. This will eliminate the loss of any property and the displacement of any residents as well as any businesses.</p> <p>It, I suspect, would cost the least of all the other alternatives which is a good thing,too.</p>	
68	Roland Haertl, Haertl Development / Consulting	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I am aware of the interchange issues and problems at both east and west side.</p> <p>My comments:</p> <p>In 1966 I was invited by the Portland Arts commission to comment on the then submitted 8 or 9 designs for the Fremont Bridge. A review of the criteria by me resulted in a preliminary design (drawn up by David Soderstrom), submitted to the Arts Commission by me (at that time employed by Storch Consulting Engineers), then recommended for implementation and then implemented. The Fremont tied-arch / through-arch concept does not appear to be the best solution in this case.</p> <p>A single eastside pylon, cable-stay bridge would address the problematic geology of the west side terminus and provide a visual counterpoint of the high topography westside bank, resulting in an aesthetically exciting bridge.</p>	
69	Wayne Skall	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Please do not build the temporary detour bridge on Spokane St. This would create an unliveable situation for the residents of this area. Riverpark Condominiums would be placed in a virtual "construction sandwich". I understand that this temporary detour bridge can be added to several of the alternatives. The DEIS is not addressing the impact of this temporary bridge on the area residents. It also does not address the fact that the parking along Spokane St. would be displaced as well as the parking spaces under the Sellwood Bridge. If this temporary detour bridge is built, our condos would be totally devalued, without any compensation. I have been to a task force meeting, as well as several public information meetings and I have seen the committee members talk about mixing and matching by adding this temporary bridge alternative to some of the other options. This is discussed very impersonally with no neighborhood input and no regard for the residents. If the task force insists on going ahead with the detour bridge, I believe that our only option will be to initiate legal action. I have seen first hand the lack of true feeling and the lack of compassion that the task force has for the people that actually live in the vicinity of the bridge. Please visit and look at the situation first hand, and put yourself in the position of someone that lives near the bridge and please take the temporary detour bridge off the table.</p>	
70	Zephyr Moore, One Earth Society	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>December 1, 2008</p> <p>Dear Bridge Repair,</p> <p>The Fire Dept on a recent ballot begged for \$0.25/\$1,000 tax on PROPERTY to pay for new truck. A one-pound car dealer advertising rectangle on 3,000 pound car is \$0.33/\$1,000 tax on EVERYTHING</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>paid by EVERYONE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both gas taxes subsidize car dealers • Gas tax and business' Weight mile tax attempt to keep up with the cost of pavement repair. Weight on tire read wears road. Businesses use common avenues to deliver raw materials and finished goods for purpose of profit, thus—equitably—pay tax on that weight. Slip, skid and sliding extra weight in or on a vehicle wears road proportionate to its increase. Less weight on road = less tax. • Car dealers profit by screwing advertising rectangles—TATTOOS--over State on license plate. LOOK! Metal rectangles weigh a pound (454 grams) and are punted [football 404 g] everywhere! Consider: 1,000 miles/month average 33 miles or 970, 60-yard punts/day-- completed in about an hour. The mental, chemical and physical forces applied with straining effort to propel one-pound ad rectangle/3,000 lb. car consume man-made [\$0.33/\$1,000] and Earthly capital otherwise used or capable of being used to produce more wealth. Dealers pay no weight mile tax on the perpetually profitable-pound used and useful only on roads! • Think! Postal tax = \$4.05/pound of advertising; one-way. RUBNUZD? • Cities, counties and State legislatures will have money to fill pits, cracks, ruts and holes after taxing car dealers for millions of pound-advertising rectangles that will thanklessly; daily, rub our roads raw. Or simply unscrew advertising from your car and beg your neighbors to do the same. Recycle metal rectangles with tin cans. <p>Very Sincerely, Zephyr Thoreau Moore</p>	
71	Philip Haynes	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>In order to pay for the Sellwood Bridge (& Columbia River Bridge too), why not set up a toll? The new Tacoma Narrows Bridge has a toll on it. The Maple Street Bridge in Spokane had a toll on it, but now removed.</p>	
72	Austin Pratt, US Coast Guard	<i>Received via Mail In (072_US_Coast_Guard.pdf)</i>
	<p>The Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Statement for the Sellwood Bridge Project has been reviewed in our role as a cooperating agency. This document is generally adequate for the purposes of our permit authority. Specifically referenced are Table S-4 on page S-22 and page 3-7 where river navigation is discussed. We will supplement this information as needed in our independent evaluation following an application for a bridge permit.</p>	
73	Robert E and Lucy Wiegand, Sellwood Harbor	<i>Received via Mail In (73_Robert_and_Lucy_Wiegand.pdf)</i>
	<p>As owners of a townhouse at Sellwood Harbor, we are very concerned about the proposed alignments for the Sellwood Bridge. We strongly recommend that Multnomah County proceed with Alternative E for the proposed new bridge. We believe it is the alignment that will least adversely impact all of the residents of the Sellwood Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the only alternative that does not destroy existing homes; • It is the only alignment that accomodates transit; • It has the flexibility to accommodate future needs; • It is less costly; 	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will have less impact on aquatic and water resources than Alt. D; and • There will be less adverse impact on the conversion of park land. <p>We strongly believe any of the other options would be very damaging to Sellwood Harbor; it would result in the destruction of four residences here. This would adversely impact the owners of those properties as well as the remaining home owners as it would diminish the value of all the homes in Sellwood Harbor.</p> <p>We strongly urge the County to adopt Alternative E as the most fair and practical solution of the Sellwood Bridge reconstruction options.</p>	
74	Peter Sweet	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I am flabbergasted that the best designs are all band aid solutions to a serious, regional traffic bottleneck. Why aren't planners thinking out 25-35 years and providing a real solution to getting Eastside commuters back and forth to their jobs via four-lane roads?</p> <p>I believe a new bridge should start at the foot of Taylor's Ferry and Macadam on the Westside and connect to McLoughlin Ave. near the Milwaukie Ave. overpass on the Eastside.</p> <p>Keep the present Sellwood Bridge, but limit it to pedestrian and bicycle traffic.</p>	
75	Ed Murphy, Sellwood Harbor	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Alt D:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>When are you going to provide a Structural Engineer's and an Architect's Certification that you can cost effectively remove 3 homes from a 9 home 4 Story multifamily building? When are you going to provide accurate right-of-way cost estimates to purchase the land and 21 parking spaces, destroy and reconstruct the buildings, compensate remaining home owners for their loss of homes values and the loss of HOA revenues caused by Alt D at Sellwood Harbor? The county staff made a special Power Point Presentation to have Alt D included, however, there has not been any factual evidence that the effects on Sellwood Harbor can be accomplish as proposed. Before Alt D moves forward, you need to provide factual evidence of the costs and loss in home values imposed on Sellwood Harbor in your loosely fabricated right-of-way cost projections. How can you in good conscious propose the bridge to land on unstable soils, the major contributing cause of the current bridge problems, on the West side of the River?</p> <p>Alt E:</p> <p>When will there be a cross section with related costs that is similar to Alt D be presented for Alt E? According the Draft EIS, Alt E can be less expensive than D, it lands on what appears to be stable soil on the West, does not harm the Oaks Pioneer Church, purchased right-of-way land that can have future park uses, does not harm Sellwood Waterfront Park, and does not destroy any existing homes. Why are you afraid to demonstrate these facts as positives? So far, the staff verbal reports have implied the above points as negatives. Alt E will not as implied, cause the loss of 216 jobs. People will need to relocate in SE and SW Portland that has nearly 2 millions square feet of vacant office space, however, the E Alternative will not cause the loss of jobs as implied by staff presentations.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for replying to my concerns.</p>	
76	Renee Moog	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I am sorry I don't have the time to read the whole report nor have I been involved extensively in the planning meetings however I have scanned the options and discussions and here are my comment/questions.</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>I appreciate the need to safely carry various kinds of traffic across the Sellwood Bridge but I don't see any discussion of what happens to Eastbound traffic after it goes through Sellwood. I live on Johnson Creek Boulevard and from my perspective the traffic going through our RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD (speed limit 25) is already TOO MUCH and TOO FAST. If more traffic and specifically more cut through traffic (going to 205 via a neighborhood instead of 224) is planned for Johnson Creek Blvd. will be backed up even more (already there are times I wait 20 minutes to go from 99E to my house at 42nd and Johnson Creek Blvd- about 1/2 mile). I don't like the idea of more traffic going through Sellwood (it's already backed up to get onto the bridge at busy times) but if that is going to happen, what is being done to channel traffic onto 99E and down to 224 instead of through a RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD (speed limit 25)?</p> <p>Was there any discussion of making a new Bridge further South thus avoiding taking traffic that is southbound across the river in a less residential area? That would leave the current Sellwood bridge as a pedestrian/bike bridge.</p> <p>Thank you, Renee Moog</p> <p>PS. Over a year and a half ago I submitted questions to your site and never received a reply- I certainly would appreciate a reply.</p>
77	Bob and Kristin Howell	<i>Received via Mail In (077_Bob_and_Kristin_Howell.pdf)</i>
		<p>As property owners who would be effected by the location of the new bridge, we want to mkae our preferences know. We feel that Alternative E would have the most advantages for all concerned for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would effect less parkland 2. Becuase more acreage is involved, the remaining land could be used for other projects that would benefit all 3. The proposed brige could be narrowed to keep costs down and widened at a later date when economics improve without disturbing businesses or residents. 4. The River Park Center is willing to be comdemned as they are having a hard time getting tenants due to the uncertain future of the bridge. If the City purchased the building now they would have ample time to relocate without jeopardizing jobs. 5. The bridge would be built on stable ground. 6. The noise factor would not disturb anyone. 7. It would allow for mass transit – now or at a later time. 8. It would release tenants of Sellwood Harbor and others from the "hostage" position we find ourselves in, waiting for a definite decision to be made. 9. There would be no property tax loss from Sellwood Harbor and those reaminging. 10. There would be no need for the closure of the existing bridge. <p>Please consider the above when making your final decision.</p> <p>Thank you, Bob and Kris Howell</p>
78	Sue Conachan	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>On the survey, you asked us where we lived and what we used the bridge for, e.g. commuting to work. I think it would have been very interesting, not necessarily helpful to the overall survey information, but especially for commuting to work if it had asked what area we were commuting to, e.g. Hillsboro, Aloha, Tigard, Beaverton, etc. Then you could see if like people from the east of I-205</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	who could just jump on the freeway systems were cutting through Sellwood just because instead of using the freeway. It wouldn't change anything but would see patterns of the traffic to and from. For example, I come from Oak Grove and I only travel 8 miles to go to Barbur Boulevard/Multnomah Boulevard area. No other option to travel over the Sellwood Bridge. Just a thought!	
79	Charles Tindall, Blue Line Transportation	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>We do not support this project because it does not relieve congestion and it is not going to provide a freight route to move commerce.</p> <p>The alternative really seem strange. Ped goes from 20' to 37' and vehicle travel goes from 22' to 48'. The West-side Interchange should be interchangeable with the bridge designs. It is also important to know the cost of each interchange and how each effects traffic flow.</p> <p>Thank you, Charlie</p>	
80	Mark Scherzinger	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Replacement of the Sellwood Bridge is a monumental effort in pleasing as many of the parties involved as possible. As I have no particular stake in the results except as a taxpayer, I am inclined to ponder other solutions and, at best, to treat the draft EIS as a shopping list. In addition, by controlling the project cost, it should be that much easier to fund.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I am not convinced that a replacement bridge must connect to Tacoma Street. Though submitted too late to sway the consideration of alignment alternatives, I have suggested a bridge alignment to the south that would use the old railroad right-of-way in the vicinity of Ochoco Street to connect to 17th and create a traffic corridor to Highway 224. 2) Otherwise, escalation of right-of-way costs leads to the conclusion that the replacement bridge should then have the same alignment as the existing bridge. 'No' for Alternatives D and E. 3) But a two-lane replacement bridge seems short-sighted for a projected 75-year lifespan. This appears to be driven by the planned future improvements to Tacoma Street which serve to strictly limit it's traffic capacity in favor of neighborhood livability. I have no problem with this priority and, in fact, I see this as adding weight to my first point. 4) It would take some convincing that a separate pedestrian/bicycle bridge (\$52-58 million) should be considered at all. 'No' for Alternative A. 5) 'No' to Alternative B because of the detour bridge cost. Unless you can show a \$30 million benefit from it's use. Would it have a higher weight limitation than the existing bridge? In addition, I fear the effect on the active landslide of the wider round-about interchange at the west end, not to mention increased right-of-way costs. 6) So it's 'Yes' for Alternate C. But why not make this a double-deck continuous truss bridge? This would maintain the narrow footprint and provide visual continuity with the existing bridge elevation. Consider a design with a two-lane bridge deck on both levels. One deck could be designated not just for pedestrian/bicycle but for transit, or even for future completion. While there is the added complexity of the connections at each end, it makes some allowance for future capacity expansion. It is unclear how much the more visually pleasing thru-arch would add to the overall cost; substantial if Alternative E is any indication. The right-turn-loop-under-bridge option at the east end is another attractive feature of this alternative. However, once again the size of the west-end interchange, though most attractive, incurs additional right-of-way costs and may be an issue with the active landslide. Perhaps the west-end interchange attached to Alternative D is a better fit? 	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft EIS. I look forward to the continuing development of this project.
81	Mr. Clopton	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		This project should have been done twenty years ago. It's time to quit worrying about offending someone or diminishing the value of someone's property. Anyone who bought a home or business in the potentially impacted area in the last 10-20 years should reasonably have known that something was going to need to be done regarding the bridge in the very foreseeable future. It's time for someone to make a decision.
82	Mary and Gene Saylor	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>I like the arched bridge with the round-a-bout. The round-a-bouts seem to work everywhere ilhave experienced them. So mjch better at Wankers Corner and Lewis and Clark College. Also have been on the r-a-b in Europe and California -keeps traffic moving.</p> <p>I also think one wider lane for bicycles and pedestrians is enough – just 3-4 feet wider . I am 63 and love to ride bikes, but will not on that bridge until it is safer. Since costs will be a problem, we do not need lanes on each side of the bridge</p> <p>I also do not understand why the City of Portland or Clackamas County could not contribute to this project since so many residents are using this bridge on a daily basis. Perhaps they could forgo the bridge over 405 in Portland and prioritize the Sellwood Bridge project as more important – because it is!!!</p> <p>i do not want to see the bridge given a "band-aid" just to put off construction for another day.</p>
83	Kenneth Ruecker	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>2 day notice of the meeting shows your effort to limit the input from the general public.</p> <p>There were multipule meeting for the locals with many weeks notice.</p> <p>you have already allowed the locals to make a choice.</p> <p>Leave it the way it is! you don't and won't have the money.</p> <p>all of the proposed builds are ppipe dreams that do nothing to improve the traffic.</p> <p>Portland department of transportation abortions.</p>
84	Richard Poulton	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		As a condo owner in the Riverpark complex on Spokane St. The EIS document does not properly address the defacto condemnation of our Tower building with the Temporary Bridge options. Building the temporary bridge would in fact place our buildings between two construction sites for the term of the project rendering our units unsalaeble. In addition the document only briefly addresses the impact of lost HOA dues with the loss of Townhouse #1 and the financial impact to the HOA @ Riverpark. This could impact the future viability of the Home Owners Association as it would require an increase the monthly dues to a level making the units again unsaleable even after the bridge project was completed.
85	Harriet Leshar, River View Cemetery Plot Owner	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>I am in favor of Option E in the DEIS plan for the Sellwood Bridge. Please do not even consider option C--a bad mistake.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
86	Emory Powell	Received via Web Site
	<p>My wife and I live in Riverpark in the townhome closest to the bridge. We are history in four of the six plans. The process to date has been slow and frustrating. Our entire neighborhood has been effected financially and it is virtually impossible to sell our home or anyone elses in the neighborhood while no decision is forthcoming. As to the plans themselves I am opposed to any of the plans that include a circle or roundabout. Nj and Mass two of my former states have spent the last 20 yrs systematically removing them as they are terrible for effecient traffic flow and very dangerous especially as it was explained that bikers and pedestrians will have to negotiate these obstacles. I feel that the option to the North E makes the most sense when taking in future requirements down the road. Considering the lack of funds at this time the less costly of all options should be considered. I hope whichever option is chosen is done as quickly as possible to have the least impact on the neighborhood. Option E also has the obvious advantage of leaving the current brige intact while building the new bridge. Thank you for concidering my comments.</p> <p>Emory Powell</p>	
87	Karen Ripplinger, The Silver Lining Clothing Co.	Received via Web Site
	<p>Being a small business owner in the Westmoreland neighborhood for 25 years, I am very concerned that there be any closure of the bridge during construction. Having survived the Bybee bridge being closed, we know from that experience that people do not go around, they just go some where else that is more convienent. That small overpass closure was difficult times for business's financailly. Primarily customers are within a 5 mile radius and being that we are less than a mile from the Sellwood bridge that cuts off a huge customer base. This possible bridge closure could mean the end to quite a few small businesses and neighborhoods. Customers are not loyal if there are huge barriers to getting to a potential business. We can not have a bridge closure it will be bad for business and the neighborhood! Thanks</p>	
88	Robert Peterson	Received via Web Site
	<p>I understand the reasoning behind making decisions for each of the three proposed bridges (Columbia River Br, Sellwood Br, and the Wilamette River walk/bike/train Br.) as a stand alone project. However, I believe we should be looking at these bridges as a total package that will have significant impact on our area and how we commute.</p> <p>The Columbia River bridge should not be a designed to make a statement but should be designed to handle traffic efficiently while allowing our electric train/bikes/walkers to cross the river. The bridge should not interfeare with air traffic in or out of the Vancouver airport. The bridge should allow truck traffic from the ports at each end of the bridge to quickly and efficiently enter and exit the bridge.</p> <p>The Sellwood bridge design should be simple and basic, allowing traffic to once again cross the river unrestricted because of weight. The bridge routs traffic through a neighborhood and any significant increase in traffic over the bridge will only cause the usual bog down during high traffic times. Thus, the bridge should be a basic box design, which requires minimal maintainence over the decades this bridge will be in use. Two oversize lanes for traffic to cross the bridge safely is key. The oversize lanes will allow emergency vehicles to get up on the bridge once traffic moves off to the sides.</p> <p>In my opinion, the design statement bridge should be the new bridge proposed for the electric train, including bike/walking, to cross the river from OMSI to the new OHSU campas on the river. Making this the statement bridge will draw local and out of state tourist to the city as well as serve as a public transportation connector with down town and the outlying areas.</p> <p>The Sellwood bridge should stay where the current bridge is. I believe the traffic circle on the West</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	end will bring traffic to a stop is the North and South bound flow lanes are replaced by the circle. Historically drivers use common sense and take turns onto the bridge from the West end during heavy traffic. Bikers could easily use the new train/bike/walking bridge by OMSI rather than the Selwood bridge.	
89	Patricia Powell, RiverPark	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>As the resident of TH #1 (RiverPark – right beside Sellwood Brige), our Unit will be condemned in four of the build options.</p> <p>One of my concerns is the amount of time that this process has taken. We were told over a year ago that a decision would be made in December 2007. We are now a year out from that date still no option has been chosen.</p> <p>During this time, home prices have declined and the economic climate is in a major downturn. The majority of funding required to complete any of the build options is expected to come from the Feds – however, I think that based on our current economy and the current "bail-outs" of major corporations/industries, obviously this funding is in no way guaranteed and in fact, may not be available.</p> <p>Therefore I think that a "no-build" option should still be on the books...but again, this option or any other should be made ASAP.</p> <p>All the residents of the Riverpark community have been in "freeze" mode for a number of years during this process.</p> <p>The option to build a temporary bridge while replacing the existing bridge would prove to be a major problem for any residents located near the bridges. The RiverPark residents would have to live between two construction sites for a number of years, which would make for negative livability and noise and parking/accessibility problems. Also, no one will be able to sell their property.</p> <p>In summary, I would like to see an intelligent decision made very quickly based on economic conditions and impacts on livability along with a guarantee that the funds have been awarded for this project.</p>	
90	Steven DeMonnin	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I don't care for alternative E. It is the most destrive of the choices and the configuration of west end seems to offer more problems than it solves.</p> <p>as for the choices, I think the under pass ono the east side and the alternative Con the west side look like they make traffic flow best.</p> <p>I like bridge type C as it keeps bikes away from traffic. I think that is the safest way to orginize the traffic.</p> <p>Building a sepearte bike bridge is not cost effective.</p>	
91	Tyler Havener, Resonant Media Co	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Tyler Havener, owner of Resonant Media, a creative and design agency which maintains a small satelitte office co-located within Campbell Salgado Studio on Tacoma.</p> <p>I am not an Oregon resident. The livelihood of my business is not dependant on Sellwood/Moreland or Oregon, and I am not dependant upon Sellwood/Moreland. Additionally, bridge construction or closure would not have any effect on my ability to get to or from our offices each day. But I am writing to state for the record that any option that includes a bridge closure, for any length of time, is</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>not plausible.</p> <p>On each day I commute to work, I conduct leisurely and personal errands in the Sellwood/Moreland community. Lunch. Dinner. Grocery Shopping. etc.</p> <p>It is abundantly clear to me as a patron of the local businesses, that they consist of, almost entirely, small boutique businesses. The size and economic scale of these businesses is absolutely dependant on constant and available access for patrons outside of the community, and the flow of potential patrons through the area.</p> <p>Residents and others in areas surrounding Sellwood/Moreland to the east would certainly be inconvenienced by a closure. But given that there are sufficient bypasses for a significant volume of traffic to be channeled around the neighborhood, local businesses would no longer be able to sustain themselves without the exposure.</p> <p>And the time required for the businesses in the community to rebuild after a reopening would be significantly longer than the closure itself, if the community was not altered permanently as a result.</p>	
92	Judith Brock	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Dear Project Members,</p> <p>My husband and I are Lake Oswego residents who have our only two sons (died at 18 and 26 years old) buried at Riverview Cemetery. In what has been a very chaotic and uncertain world for us, this quiet acreage is a place of peace and solace and permanence to us. We visit there regularly.</p>	
93	Judith (Mrs. Richard H.) Brock	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I just wrote and submitted comments on this site in support of Riverview Cemetery and alternative E, but am not sure they were actually sent.</p> <p>Did you receive them?</p> <p>Thank you, Judy Brock</p>	
94	Jamie Strohecker	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I would like to submit my choice for Alternative E. It appears to provide the best plan for access to Riverview Cemetery for families and unlike Alternate C, it does NOT completely eliminate the lower access to the cemetery and funeral home.</p> <p>I would hope the goal of the new bridge plan is better and safer access as well as preserving the historic and beautiful values of Riverview Cemetery and Funeral Home, since Riverview is historic in its own right and a Portland treasure.</p> <p>Thank you for including my opinion and again, I choose Alternative E... NOT C !!</p>	
95	Blair Campbell	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I understand that there were several concerns expressed about the impact of the northernmost bridge alignment on the little church. If that really amounts to a significant problem, let's move the church.</p> <p>I can easily picture it being moved into a picturesque section of Sellwood Park for a relatively small amount.</p> <p>Let's not let an issue that is so easily and inexpensively mitigated stand in the way of the most practical solution.</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
96	Fred Nomura	<i>Received via Mail In (96_Fred_Nomura.pdf)</i>
	<p>I am a Sellwood resident who will be directly affected by the upcoming decision on bridge alignment, the options of which are covered in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).</p>	
	<p>I have viewed the lengthy video summarizing the DEIS and conclude that there is a strong bias of decision-makers to support Alignment D.</p>	
	<p>I strongly oppose Alignment D (A-D) and support Alignment E (A-E), for the following reasons:</p>	
	<p>1. A-D will destroy at least four condominium units in Sellwood Harbor. These are owner-occupied units, two of which are occupied by widows on fixed incomes. Three of these four units are in Building A, which is a nine unit building consisting of three units on each of three levels. It is not yet determined whether architecturally or structurally it is feasible to shear off the three end units and maintain the integrity of the remaining six units in the building. To put the entire nine units at risk would be disastrous.</p>	
	<p>2. The loss of at least four condo units will cause financial hardship to the owners of the remaining 33 units in several ways. First, the operating expenses will remain essentially the same but will be shouldered by only 33 owners, not 37, thus increasing the monthly association dues, and the ongoing capital expenses will likewise create additional financial strain on the remaining owners. Second, the market value of the remaining 33 units will be significantly less than the value would be if all 37 units remained intact.</p>	
	<p>3. A decision to approve A-D, even if construction does not begin for many years, will hold Sellwood Harbor owners hostage; they will not be able to sell their units because the extent of the potential damage to their units' value, while considerable, cannot be quantified. This harm to Sellwood Harbor owners is already apparent; at least three elderly owners who need continuous care facilities have been unable to see their condos because there have been no buyers willing to take the risk created by your Alignment D scenario. A fourth owner, who moved out of state to be closer to family, also cannot sell his vacant unit and is hurting financially. All other owners who wish to move for any reason will be denied this freedom by the damage of your Alignment D.</p>	
	<p>4. Alignment D will build the West End interchange on unstable soil, requiring costly accommodation to make this interchange feasible. A-E provides for the West End interchange to be north of the current alignment, on stable ground.</p>	
	<p>5. It appears that A-E can be built faster and at less cost than A-D, when using a box-girder configuration.</p>	
	<p>6. Contrary to some voiced concerns, A-E will not harm either the Oaks Pioneer Church or the Sellwood Waterfront Park. The sound increase from the A-E has been estimated to be minimal, and should cause no adverse effect. Sellwood Waterfront Park will not be harmed; in fact, A-E will provide usable land from right-of-way purchases to expand the park, something that A-D does not accomplish.</p>	
	<p>7. A-E does not cause loss of jobs. It will cause relocation of some businesses, but jobs will not be threatened. Relocation of some businesses seem (to me) preferable to the prospect of elderly people displaced from their homes and other owners harmed financially by your A-D.</p>	
	<p>For the above reasons, I very strongly oppose Alignment D and would strongly support Alignment E. Thank you.</p>	
97	Dee Poth	<i>Received via Mail In (097_Deepoth.pdf)</i>
	<p>Dear Sirs: I prefer Alternative E as the Sellwood Bridge replacement choice. I do not want Alternative D because it destroys the homes of four long time residents of Sellwood</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>who live at Sellwood Harbor. Of those homes destroyed, two are widows on fixed incomes. The right-of-way costs will not purchase any reusable land for other than the bridge alignment. The right-of-way costs do not appear to have a calculation to pay for 21 parking spaces that will be lost with this bridge alignment.</p> <p>There is no mention of the cost to compensate the Home Owners Association at Sellwood Harbor for lost revenues and to compensate home owners for depreciated home values caused by this alignment.</p> <p>There has been no structural or architectural certification that the county can only take out 3 homes from building A at Sellwood Harbor.</p> <p>As long as Alternative D is a possible choice, owner can't sell their homes. There are several owners, for health reasons, who desperately need to sell their homes now. However, they cannot sell because potential buyers are afraid of the consequences to Sellwood Harbor if at least four of the homes are destroyed by Alternative D.</p> <p>The West interchange for Alternative D is going to be built on unstable soils that are sliding toward the river.</p> <p>Alternative E: This appears to be the best long term solution for a new bridge.</p> <p>This is the only alternative that does not destroy owner occupied existing homes. This is the only alignment that accommodates transit. This is the only bridge alignment that has flexibility to accommodate future needs. This is the only bridge that has a West side interchange that lands on stable soils. Alternative E can be built 9 to 15 months faster than Alternative D depending on the type of bridge. When using box-girder configuration, Alternative E is \$12 Million less costly than D. If a hybrid and narrower cross section is used, the bridge will be that much less expensive than D.</p> <p>Alternative E has less impact on aquatic resources than D. Alternative E creates less impervious surface area than Alternative D, thus its impact on water resources is less. Alternative E requires the conversion of slightly less parkland area than Alternative D. Also, the land acquired for right-of-way can be used for additional park spaces on the East side.</p> <p>There are three half truth arguments against Alternative E: Below are the emotional arguments and the realities as documented in the DEIS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The alignment will force 216 people to lose their jobs. Truth is, no one will be forced to lose their jobs. People will need to RELOCATE to other office spaces. According to GVA Kidder Mathews, as of 10/1/08, there is nearly 2 Million square feet of vacant office space in Southeast and Southwest Portland. Finding new office space should not be a problem. 2. The alignment will cause great harm to the Oaks Pioneer Church. Truth is, according to the DEIS, there are only 2 decibels of sound increase from traffic levels in 2035. Further the report states that Alternative E will cause "no adverse effect" or historical impacts on Oaks Pioneer Church. 3. Sellwood Water Front Park will be harmed. Again, according to the DEIS there is no harm to the park. Fact, the E Alternative is the only alternative that will have useable land from the right-of-way purchases to expand the park. In other words, the purchase of right-of-way land for all other Alternatives will not yield any usable land for other than the bridge alignments. <p>Sincerely yours,</p>
98	Rolph B. Fuhrman	<i>Received via Mail In (098_Rolph_Fuhrman.pdf)</i>
		<p>Point #1 – My wife Janet and I are old. She is 85 and I am 88 – we have been married 65 years and for 28 of those years we have lived at Sellwood Harbor – The threat of losing our home has adversely affected our lives and many of our neighbors lives.</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>Point #2 – The industrial age is over and we are now in the informational age – no more polluting our water, air and ground</p> <p>Point #3 – fix the old bridge, it should last for 15 or 20 years – by that time we will know what changes the new age will bring – we may all be riding in small electric cars or bicycles.</p> <p>Point #4 – If you must build a new bridge we vote for Alternative E</p>	
99	<p>Cherie Nomura</p> <p>I am a Sellwood Harbor condo resident who will be directly affected by the upcoming decision on bridge alignment.</p> <p>It is obvious that the material as it is presented is slanted to support Alignment D. I absolutely oppose Alignment D more than any others. This alignment destroys at least four of our units. All are owner-occupied. By destroying four, you at the same time change all our remaining units in a very negative ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Three of the four condos targeted for destruction are part of a larger 9 condo building. How can you destroy these three without negatively affecting the remaining 6 condos in this building. So, in truth, 9 condos would have to be purchased by the county to compensate the owners. 2. By destroying four units you in fact cause a financial hardship for the remaining units. We would only have 33 residents to pay for our operating costs instead of 37. This means the homeowners dues would have to increase. 3. A decision to approve D, even if construction does not begin for many years, makes it impossible to sell our homes at a decent market value. Some of our owners, due to poor health, have had to move to assisted living and try to absorb that cost without being able to sell their Sellwood Harbor condo. Potential buyers are turned off by the unknown damage to the units caused by bridge construction. Buyers are waiting to see if alignment D is chosen. If so, they will not buy here. Your alignment D has caused us owners to be in a horrible, helpless position. You have other alignments that do not cause such havoc to home owners. 4. My first choice is Alternative E. No occupied homes would be affected. The 6 residential units in Grand Place that you have list have never been occupied. 5. For alternative E describe 9 business' in the Sellwood Building which is mostly vacant. 2 in Grand Place which is unoccupied, and finally 37 in River Park Center. Which I believe is for sale or willing to relocate. 6. Relocation of some businesses seems (to me) preferable to the horrible prospect of elderly people displaced from their homes and other senior owners harmed financially by your alignment D. 7. How do you intend to compensate owners of Sellwood Harbor if alignment D is chosen? You will have greatly devalued all of our condos, not just the four alignment D would destroy. <p>I strongly oppose alignment D and strongly support Alignment E.</p>	<p><i>Received via Mail In (099_Cherie_Nomura.pdf)</i></p>
100	<p>David Noble, River View Cemetery Association</p> <p>Testimony Re: Sellwood Bridge Project</p> <p>Before Policy Advisory Group & the Community Task Force</p> <p>At Public Hearing on Wednesday, December 10, 2008</p> <p>My name is David Noble and I am the Executive Director of River View Cemetery Association and River View Cemetery Funeral Home. I am testifying this evening on behalf of the more than 10,000</p>	<p><i>Received via Open House (100_David_Noble.pdf)</i></p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>members of the cemetery association and their families and friends, as well as the hundreds of families who annually patronize our funeral home.</p> <p>For the last several years, as Multnomah County officials and the volunteer Community Task Force have worked to finalize plans for a replacement bridge, leaders of River View Cemetery have closely followed and participated in the proceedings. Many who are here tonight have already heard about the principal issues and concerns of our membership, but I would like to review them for the benefit of those who are members of the Policy Advisory Group and anyone else who may not have heard our concerns.</p> <p>More than 125 years ago, long before the current Sellwood Bridge was even built, a group of business and political leaders, such as yourselves, had the foresight to see that the growing riverfront town of Portland needed a cemetery that was beautiful, centrally located, and that would meet the burial needs of Portland-area families for centuries to come. They chose a large parcel of land overlooking the Willamette River, which offered natural beauty, a serene setting and which was conveniently close to the Bonnes and Taylor Ferries, to provide access to east Portland. From its inception and to this day, River View Cemetery has operated under the supervision of a dedicated, volunteer Board of Trustees who have never lost sight of its initial vision and purpose – to provide a permanent place of beauty and peacefulness where Portland-area families can forever be remembered.</p> <p>From the beginning of its existence, an important and primary entrance to River View Cemetery has been located on what is now Oregon Hwy. 43, just a few feet from the west end of the Sellwood Bridge. In keeping with the founder's goals to create a burial ground that would match the architectural splendor of the city, they commissioned Ellis Lawrence, founder of the University of Oregon's School of Architecture and Applied Arts, to design the cemetery building located adjacent to that entrance. Presently, that building now serves as River View Cemetery Funeral Home. Additionally, architect A.E. Doyle designed the nearby historic cemetery gates which complement the funeral home building. To this day, for nearly 100 years, River View's lower building and gates have been familiar landmarks to area residents, yet depending on choices you make, their existence may be in jeopardy.</p> <p>In 1925, River View Cemetery Association donated land for the intersection at the west end of the current Sellwood Bridge. Later, the Association donated land along the river for what would become Powers Marine Park. Now, the Association is again being asked to forfeit land for the good of the community. Although willing to do so, River View's Board of Trustees respectfully request that the interests of the cemetery and funeral home be respected and upheld in the process. Specifically, those "interests" include being able to retain a lower entrance, leave an adequate amount of land around the funeral home in order for it to be able to function and expand; and to maintain a buffer between the intersection and funeral home large enough to minimize traffic noise. On the following page these concerns are more fully explained.</p> <p>#1 – A replacement bridge should not be allowed to eliminate the cemetery's lower entrance, since that entrance existed long before the current Sellwood Bridge was even built. It could be argued that we do have other entrances; however, this is still the primary entrance for cemetery clients coming from southeast Portland or Lake Oswego; and it is the only entrance for River view Cemetery Funeral Home, which is housed in the historic brick building near the lower entrance. Therefore, Alternative "C", and most importantly, the "trumpet" interchange should not be selected since they eliminate any access to the funeral home and a very important access to the cemetery.</p> <p>#2 – River View Cemetery has serious concerns regarding any long-term closure of the bridge. Funeral processions coming to River View Cemetery from East Portland and Milwaukie all utilize the Sellwood Bridge. Subjecting mourners to a considerably longer detour route would be emotionally difficult, time consuming and more expensive; therefore such a closure should be avoided if at all possible. For this reason, Alternative "C" should once again be avoided since it would result in a three and a half year closure. Alternative "A" is not acceptable for the same reason. River View Cemetery's</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>Board of Trustees endorses either Alternative "D" or "E", since they will both maintain traffic access to the bridge by utilizing staged construction.</p> <p>#3 – River View also has concerns regarding the proximity of the various proposed interchanges to the historic building that houses River View Cemetery Funeral Home. We have yet to be told just exactly how close the retaining walls and ramps of the nearby intersection will be to this important building; however, it would appear that they may be aesthetically unpleasing, would take land needed for future growth and would bring traffic noise unacceptably close to the funeral home. River View Cemetery Funeral Home is a growing business and had planned to utilize the area surrounding the funeral home for expansion and additional parking; but it would appear that the retaining walls and ramps would prohibit us from doing so. Like any funeral home, we make every effort to provide a quiet, peaceful atmosphere for our bereaved families, by minimizing noise around our building. Current plans will bring traffic and noise unacceptably close to the funeral home. Therefore, the cemetery Board endorses Alternative "E", since it would allow for the retaining wall and traffic to be at least a little further from the front entry.</p> <p>#4 – The status of our lower building has not been properly portrayed. Representatives of River View have attended nearly every public meeting held regarding the Sellwood Bridge in the last two years, as well as having multiple one-on-one meetings with county officials. Throughout that process, it was made imminently clear that the historic building near our lower entrance is not a "caretaker's residence", but rather, is a separate business entity known as River View Cemetery Funeral Home. Nonetheless, the building's use continues to be mis-categorized on the website, in the Environmental Impact Statement, and in other published materials. Please be aware that any alternative that closes our lower entrance will eliminate our ability to operate a funeral home out of that building. Officials have suggested that clients could easily find their way to the building by using other cemetery entrances. This would require elderly, bereaved individuals to negotiate anywhere from 1.5 to 3 miles of steep, narrow, winding, and often slippery roads to reach the funeral home; a requirement we do not consider reasonable. Eliminating the lower entrance would also subject funeral home clients to hazardous conditions outside the cemetery. To reach an alternate entrance, they would have to proceed north on Hwy. 43 (Macadam Avenue); turn left and go up Taylor's Ferry Road to an alternate entrance where they would have to attempt to turn left against heavy traffic coming down the hill without the benefit of a turn lane or a traffic signal. This would be a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>#5 – An important east-west bicycle corridor could be in jeopardy. Hundreds of bicyclists from Lewis & Clark Collete, Terwilliger Boulevard, the OSHU campus and other southwest Portland areas access the Sellwood Bridge by bicycling through River View Cemetery; specifically on the road descending to the cemetery's lower entrance. Any bridge alternative that results in the closure of the cemetery's lower entrance would most likely result in the eventual closure of this popular bike route, since River View would no longer have a business reason to incur the costs of maintaining the lengthy section of road that descends from the cemetery above down to Hwy. 43 and the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>In summary, the Board of Trustees of River View Cemetery Association, on behalf of its members, respectfully requests that the Policy Advisory Group select an alternative that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not eliminate River View Cemetery's lower entrance; • Does not result in any lengthy closure of the bridge during construction; • Does not take the land immediately surrounding the funeral home needed for parking and future expansion; and, • Protects the appearance and noise levels surrounding the historical building that houses River View Cemetery Funeral Home by requiring that all elements of the west end intersection be as far away from the building as possible, but no less than 25 feet from its front entryway. <p>It is the opinion of the Association Board that Alternative "E" with a signalized intersection will</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	best accomplish the above goals.	
101	Daniel Houf, Harper Houf Peterson Righellis Inc.	<i>Received via Open House (101_Harper_Houf.pdf)</i>
	<p>Harper Houf Peterson Righellis Inc. (HHPR) respectfully submits this letter as testimony related to the Sellwood Bridge Alternatives developed with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>As a multi-discipline consulting firm who focuses in transportation design, HHPR understands and appreciates the complex nature of your task, and we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the alternatives prepared to date.</p> <p>HHPR is a firm of senior-level civil engineers planners, landscape architects, technicians, and surveyors with design, technical, and management experience. Our Portland and Corporate office is located on the eastside of the Willamette River just north of the Sellwood Bridge. We are located in the second floor of the River Park Center Building, and our address is 205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 200.</p> <p>As reported in the Daily Journal of Commerce, HHPR is currently the 9th largest engineering firm in the region, and is the 4th largest Oregon Engineering firm with corporate headquarters in Oregon. HHPR has been rated consistently as one of the top 50 civil engineering firms to work for in the United States by Civil Engineering News.</p> <p>Our comments on the Alternatives are summarized below:</p> <p>We strongly oppose Alternative E. This Alternative would have the greatest residential and business impacts including hte relocation of our firm. HHPR is a major employer headquartered in the Sellwood area and employs over 50 professionals in the fields of engineering, surveying, land use planning, landscape architecture, accounting, human resources, and marketing.</p> <p>We enjoy our current location for a variety of different reasons, which include ease of access to and from work, close to downtown, access to the Springwater Trail (in September of 2008, 12.5% of all trips by HHPR employees to our Portland office were made by bicycle), and of course, the proximity and beauty of the Willamette River. Many of our employees live on the eastside of the river within the City of Portland and are able to utilize these benefits.</p> <p>In September of 2007 HHPR relocated its Corporate Office from Macadam Avenue to its current location in the River Park Center Building. It was a bit of a home coming for two of HHPR Principals Ron Peterson and Dan Houf who both grew up in the Eastmoreland area and attended Cleveland High School. As a company we are committed to a strong SE Portland/Sellwood community, and are excited about contributing to the built environment and improving peoples' lives such as our pro bono work for the new Cleveland Community Field. We feel strongly about maintaining our Sellwood location, and to say the least, it would be a disappointment and hardship to have to relocate from the community we grew up in and chose to grow our business.</p> <p>HHPR favors the general alignment Alternative D with the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We are in favor of this option because there are no closure periods. Closing hte bridge for an extended period would create a hardship to the surrounding areas of the eastside of Portland, as well as to the employees of our firm. The area would experience a substantial amount of cut-through traffic and congestion if the bridge were closed. 2) We also favor the roundabout intersection/interchange configuration on the Westside of the river. As the civil engineers for the Lewis and Clark Law School Roundabout, Staffort-Borland Roundabout, and the New SE 172nd Roundabout in Clackamas County, in addition to many others on the drawing board, we are in favor of roundabouts as a safer and more effective alternative to signalized intersections, and we encourage further evaluation of this configuration with Alignment D. <p>Thank you for your consideration of our comments. We look forward to being a part of this process</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	as it moves forward.	
102	Joan Beckley	<i>Received via Open House (102_Joan_Beckley.pdf)</i>
	<p>I am the owner of #9 Riverpark Townhouse at 152 SE Spokane Street. I am in favor of Alternative "E" due to the fact while construction is going on there would be no need to close the existing bridge. If Alternatives A, B, C, or D are chosen Riverpark will "lose" 14 parking spaces currently under the bridge. Now there is not adequate street parking during the day.</p>	
103	Greg Ripplinger, The Silver Lining Clothing Co.	<i>Received via Open House (103_Greg_Ripplinger.pdf)</i>
	<p>I would like to see Alt D because it seems to have the least closure which will affect our business. Also I would like to see a separation of ped and biks and auto by physical barriers so that peds, bikes, and autos stay in their own space (lanes). I would also like to see a design that enables cleaning of ped, bike, and auto lanes to remove dangerous debris, such as glass, screws, liquids, etc. . . .</p>	
104	Magdalena Valdivigso	<i>Received via Open House (104_Magdalena_Valdivigso.pdf)</i>
	<p>I am a business owner that commutes from Lake Oswego to Eastmoreland every day. Personally, I like option "D" bcause it will keep business open and provide access from Lake Oswego to the East side.</p>	
105	Monika DeBrakeleer	<i>Received via Open House (105_Monika_DeBrakeleer.pdf)</i>
	<p>Main concern: increase in traffic thru neighborhoods, cut thru traffic, more noise impacting Waterfront Park, Tacoma Street. Riverfront Park is an oasis of peace in Portland perhaps the only place that is real riverfront in PDX. Lets protect. Why not try and keep the existing bridge with improvements, and better bike lanes, ped widen the lanes, change the lighting, etc. Also, I think having a totally separate bike/ped is a danger for us all.</p>	
106	Hazel Gonsalves	<i>Received via Open House (106_Hazel_Gonsalves.pdf)</i>
	<p>After a very careful and thoroughly objective study of the various options, I have to come to a conclusion that Option "E" is the best solution.</p> <p>My reasons being –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Selecting "Option E" would immediatly eliminate the necessity of a temporary bridge, thus saving several millions of dollars which could be put to better use. 2) Option "E" will cause the least amount of hardship to the residents of the area. 3) The implementation of Option "E" will avoid the limitations and constrictions that will restrict the design and width of the replacement bridge recommended under the other options. Under Option "E" it will be possible to design a bridge with the maximum number of lanes and other facilities which will be necessary to meet future requirements of the community. 4) Selecting any of the other options will result in some residents losing their homes. Furthermore, even the residents whose homes will be saved, will have to endure tremendous hardships and health hazards from the demolition and construction equipment and materials that will almost literally operate through their living rooms. The noise, dust and pollution will be a constant source of aggravation and health hazard for years to come. <p>Many of these families are senior citizens and have contributed a major part of their resources to make these apartments their homes to live a peaceful life. All such hopes will be completely</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>shattered.</p> <p>5) As regards the loss of jobs in the event of implementing Option "E", it must be understood that the jobs will not be lost, but simply relocated to another nearby area. On the other hand, the families affected in implementation of any of the other options, will be trapped with no way of relocating as there will be no buyers for their apartments in the construction zone, even at a devalued price.</p>	
107	William Danneman, South Portland Neighborhood Association	<i>Received via Open House (107_William_Danneman.pdf)</i>
	<p>The west end interchange and queuing lanes heading southbound to the bridge need as much attention as the bridge itself. The most important aspects of a new bridge is ample room for pedestrians and bicycles. There needs to be sidewalks and bicycle lanes on both sides of the new bridge. Sidewalks need to be no less than 10 feet wide (if no bicycles) and 20 feet if it includes bicycles. The other requirement needs to be a future connection for streetcar so the system can head to the east and the south.</p>	
108	Mary Anderson	<i>Received via Open House (108_Mary_Anderson.pdf)</i>
	<p>Alternatives:</p> <p>A number of alternatives may include phased construction and/or a temporary bridge. Both of these things – phased construction and a temporary bridge will negatively impact those of us living very near the bridge (I live at River Park). They impact property values and quality of life, with no provision for compensation. Please decide and build the bridge asap and shut down traffic if need be to get it completed.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
109	Martha Richards	<i>Received via Open House (109_Martha_Richards.pdf)</i>
	<p>I like the alternatives that provides bike lanes in addition to shared sidewalks – fast-riding commuters don't mix well with peds (Alt. D)</p> <p>Alt. C's use of a straight (non-spiral) bike/ped ramp on west side is better than the spiral ramps in the other alternatives.</p> <p>Although the separate, covered bike/ped facility on Alt C is very appealing as is the separate bike/ped bridge of Alt. A, I would be more comfortable if those designs provided clear signage to keep bikes and peds separated.</p> <p>I'm no traffic engineer, but the trumpet interchange (Alt C) and the roundabout (Alts A and B) seem better than signals.</p> <p>Definitely include transit lanes (Alt E) excellent for long-term capacity!</p> <p>Whatever the details, make sure that it's designed for first-class bike/ped/transit access – that's the only way we can accommodate future growth in the region.</p>	
110	Del Scharffenberg	<i>Received via Open House (110_Del_Schurffenberg.pdf)</i>
	<p>I have been bike commuting across this bridge daily for 5 years, in rain, sunshine, snow, ice. I also drive across to access points in SW Portland. Unfortunately I do not much like any of your proposed alternatives much as I love roundabouts in general, the bridge end is not the place for one. What's wrong with the simple bridge approaches currently? They work. The problem is the too-narrow bike "lane/sidewalk". Alt. C, with a sub-deck would be great. But I am reluctant to fully endorse that because of the stupid interchange at the west end. Too complicated. Just rehabilitate the bridge as-is and add the lower ped/bike path. Do not even think about closing cemetery access. That's were most</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
111	Patti Shmilenko	Received via Open House (111_Paiti_Shmilenko.pdf)
	<p>bike commuters go. Or build a new car bridge and convert the entire old one to bike/ped use. The recent days the bridge was own only to bike/peds were awesome.</p> <p>Alt "E" is the only viable option period – This alt. has no closure, which is important to the broader base of all Sellwood biz owners and residents.</p> <p>A temp bridge is an insane idea and 100% unacceptable would need to condemn our property with this.</p> <p>The River Park office building can find other office space.</p> <p>#1 priority is livability period. We are families, people. Also this is not a regional fix for Clackamas Co. Don't destroy our neighborhood and homes. Also, we have been unable to sell for 2 years and our taxes are the same. We need resolution from Mult Co</p>	
112	Mark Romanaggi	Received via Open House (112_Mark_Romanaggi.pdf)
	<p>I have reviewed the mailings sent to me and read the articles in numerous local newspapers. I feel that getting the bicyclists and pedestrians away from traffic is absolutely essential.</p> <p>I feel that Alternative "C" is the best design to accomplish this. Ten different family members agree with me after reviewing the proposed designs. The alternative we have come up with is design "D".</p> <p>This design seems to comfortably "spread things out" so that vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians all have a safe right of way crossing the river.</p>	
113	Peter Pellegrin	Received via Open House (113_Peter_Pellegron.pdf)
	<p>Of the alternatives, I think C would best balance the needs of the region. Beyond that I would include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the bridge should be built to at least a 200 year standard. Beyond practicalities it should be beautiful and individually expressive. It should not look like a freight corridor in New Jersey, for example. 2) The bridge has regional significance. It links Southeast to I-5 and downtown. It should be regionally funded. 3) Macadam-Hwy 43- and 99E are both 4 lane roads. The bridge and Tacoma should be 4 lanes (or 2/1 that switches) to prevent bottlenecks. If lights on Tacoma were timed at 23 mph traffic would be calmed and drive slowly like it does on timed streets downtown. <p>Lets spend a little extra, if required, to build a bridge we can be proud of.</p>	
114	Laura Miller	Received via Open House (114_Laura_Miller.pdf)
	<p>I strongly oppose the closing of the bridge, because of the severe detrimental impact on all business done in Sellwood Moreland area. This is a growing business/resident community that is unique in it's ability to combine small neighborhood community style and yet draw from all over the Portland/Metro and suburban area as a resident as well, I love this and is the reason I have lived and worked in Sellwood for 20 years; to close the bridge could be absolutely ruinous to this precious community which really serves as a prototype for what small neighborhood businesses can do with benefits to all -</p>	
115	Lorraine Fyre, Oaks Pioneer Church	Received via Open House (115_Document1.pdf)
	<p>I would like to voice my opposition to Bridge E – extremely large for our streets (Macadam & Tacoma) – the impact on the church and our neighborhood would be far reaching – we are so intertwined in all aspects of the neighborhood (funding) – not to mention the historical values – the</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		other bridges would cause disruption but in the long run that is only temporary – with the potential loss of the churches revenue that would be forever.
116	Matthew Galaher	<i>Received via Open House (116_Matthew_Galaher.pdf)</i>
		<p>Portland prides itself for it's progressive ideas that promote livability. Sellwood residents reflect this, in part in the traffic calming that has been achieved on the east side of the Sellwood Bridge. This has promoted small businesses in the neighborhood.</p> <p>Please choose a no closure alternative. Multnomah Co. should not fund a bridge for Clackamas and Washington Counties. Both bridge closure as well as any undoing of the Tacoma traffic calming (islands, two lanes, etc.) will impact both the community/neighborhood of Sellwood and small businesses.</p>
117	Lois and Marty Coplea	<i>Received via Mail In (117_LoisMartyCoplea.pdf)</i>
		<p>Firstly, let me thank all involved in the creation of the DEIS for their time and efforts in dealing with a volatile situation . . .</p> <p>Secondly, let me clarify, as substantiated by our address, we are Sellwood Harbor residents. With that established, let me say that regarding Bridge Alternative under consideration, I find it not only to reflect poor judgment but also that it shows a vivid degree of immorality that still under consideration is an alternative (D to be specific) which would have any portion (the West interchange) grounded in soils which are unstable. Portland is known for its pro-save the planet stance on so many levels and yet we have under consideration an alternative in which this massive amount of dollars would be spent to create a potentially disastrous configuration. Shame on us all if this goes further.</p> <p>Speaking of despicable possibilities, it appears that way to me to choose any alternative which would take even on person's home when not a necessity due to other viable choices which would provide better life alternatives. Office space is abundant in the SE and SW areas. There is a huge distinction between relocating and losing a job. Please do not insult our intelligence with this distortion of the facts.</p> <p>With the economic losses the residents at Sellwood Harbor are currently experiencing, the compensation by the county comes up. The argument that Alternative D is less expensive than E does not hold water as I read the facts. Consider environmental and logistical scenarios for transit and for meeting future needs of such . . . Alternative E is a better option we believe.</p> <p>So, we have park land, church issues, on and on. I ask you to look at the numbers under the numbers and truths amidst the half-truths.</p> <p>Again, Portland is known for putting people at the forefront of decisions when possible. It is possible in the selection of an alternative for the Sellwood Bridge. It would be different if there were not choices.</p> <p>I beg you to step out of the boxed in thinking and step into the more humanistic and eco friendlier possibility presented in your Alternative E. If you believe I plead my case for Alternative E "just because" I am a resident of Sellwood Harbor, I ask you to re-read my words. They would reflect the same principled thinking and beliefs in our government influenced decisions if I lived across the planet.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration to my plea.</p>
118	Wendi Tucker	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		Please do NOT do anything that would in any way harm the lower entrance to the RiverView Cemetary or its property. Four generations of my family are or will be buried there and we always use the lower entrance and love the beautiful drive up to the top of the hill, widening through the gravesites. I believe option "E" is the option that will have the least impact to the cemetery, its

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>grounds, and operations. Thank you for your time!</p>	
119	Amy Maki, Sellwood Playgroup Association	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Please consider how the new bridge will impact traffic and how this traffic will affect the safety of our kids. I cross Tacoma regularly with my young children on foot, in stroller, or on bikes. Please make sure the plan keeps young pedestrians in mind. Thank you.</p>	
120	Leah Verwey, Campbell Salgado Studio, Inc	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>After reviewing the options, I believe that Alternative D is the best option for fixing the Sellwood bridge.</p>	
121	Emily Harris	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I live in Sellwood and use the bridge to commute to work – most often by foot or bike. I tend to favor option B withOUT a temporary replacement bridge. My priorities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better, faster, safer bike and pedestrian access across the bridge and to ped/bike routes on both sides. I considered the alternative of a bike/pedestrian only bridge, but I travel in the dark often and I do worry about my safety. I also am not sure how much the impact of a ped/bike bridge would impact parkland. 2. Safe pedestrian crossings around Tacoma Street. Even just more striped crosswalks would be a big improvement! I cross Tacoma to visit friends and patronize businesses. I definitely do NOT want to see big back ups of traffic on Tacoma (much better to leave them, if they need to continue, on 43, where pedestrians/residents aren't impacted.) I realize that before the closure of the bridge to heavy traffic trucks used the route a lot. I say they have gotten used to whatever detours and increased costs that imposed and will be just fine if they can't use the Sellwood Bridge in the future. I want to continue to keep trucks off the bridge because to get there they have to drive through our neighborhood. That particular element of traffic is worse for the livability and sense of community in the neighborhood than anything else. 3. The least possible disruption of, in this order of priority, parkland, residential units, businesses. <p>Let me note that while there are elements of the other alternatives I think would be acceptable, Alternative E is not at all acceptable to me. It's far too big, seems to be designed mainly with cars/trucks in mind, and seems it could lead to backups as traffic flowed into two lanes off the bridge onto Tacoma (as well as neighborhood cut-throughs, as the EIS notes.) Pressure to widen Tacoma would only grow.</p> <p>Two other things for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If it's possible to keep the bridge open to even just foot traffic during construction, that would help out! (And I'm not the only one who walks to work from Sellwood!) It's a quick drive to the Ross Island Bridge; it's a longer bike ride and too far to walk. The reason I tend to favor no temporary bridge though, is because the irreparable impact that would have seems much bigger than the benefit. 2. As you look at connecting bikers/walkers to the northbound trail on the west side, please consider improvements to the area just north of Staff Jennings. The path dips below street level in two places – so pedestrians and cyclists are out of view of traffic. I am often traveling in the 	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>dark and they are great potential attack spots.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>	
122	Beth Woodward	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>As a frequent user of the existing bridge by car (for shopping), who would prefer to walk or bike across it more often, I would like to see the estimated increase in biking and walking under various alternatives. From my review of the alternatives presented in the Draft EIS, I believe Alternative D is the one that would encourage more pedestrian and bike use of the bridge and therefore reduce carbon dioxide producing traffic.</p> <p>Thank you for acknowledging that many pedestrians and bikers would not feel safe using a separated bridge. The ones proposed on a lower deck are disgusting, because in addition to the safety problem, users would be deprived of the esthetic rewards of crossing the bridge on foot or bike--enjoying the view and sky above.</p> <p>Please include the long term benefits and costs of the alternatives with respect to attracting more pedestrian and bike use, replacing vehicle use. (I believe Alternative D would provide the greatest net benefit in this respect.)</p> <p>Thank you for the chance to comment.</p> <p>Beth Woodward</p>	
123	Jean Elyse Gilbert	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>As a life-long resident of Portland, who has many relatives interred at Riverview Cemetery, and who owns a niche there herself, I have very definite concerns regarding the Sellwood Bridge Project. Any changes to the west end of the bridge could negatively affect the lower access to Riverview Cemetery. The loss of a lower entrance could jeopardize the future of the RVC Funeral Home which is housed in the historic building that was formerly the caretaker's residence. The proximity of the lower entrance to the west end of the bridge has put that entrance in very real jeopardy. I want a plan that maintains the historic lower entrance and access to the funeral home. This entryway existed long before the current Sellwood Bridge was built, and it is the only entrance to the funeral home, so a replacement bridge should not be allowed to take it away. Anyone who is familiar with the terrain knows that it is not reasonable to expect clients, many of whom are elderly, recently bereaved, to wind their way through miles of curvy cemetery roads to find the funeral home. And without its own entrance, its future is in serious peril, since there is no other suitable spot on the grounds to locate it.</p> <p>Option "E," which includes a traffic signal, and will provide better traffic flow than a roundabout interchange, is the best choice! It places the bridge and west end intersection further north a bit, therefore causing less impact on the funeral home property. "D" would have to be my second choice.</p> <p>J. E. Gilbert</p>	
124	Roz Roseman	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>The most important factors in choices for me are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid destroying people's homes including condos. 2. Avoid destroying people's businesses 3. Keep it simple – 2 lanes, wide sidewalks & bike lanes on both sides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoid enlarging the bridge; don't make it inviting to more traffic 4. No, for sure, to 4 lanes or any widening that would ever make 4 lanes possible, as continues to be feared in the neighborhood. 	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>So far, Alternative D seems to make the most sense because it destroys the least of any of the alternatives, even though it destroys 9 businesses and 5-6 homes.</p> <p>PLEASE – Don't give in to any design that would encourage 4 lanes down the line.</p> <p>Bluntly speaking, if the communities to the south and east feel greater traffic capacity is needed, then there should be another bridge added to share the traffic.</p> <p>We are a set of neighborhoods (Sellwood, Westmoreland, Eastmoreland) that don't want to become a throughway that will destroy the scale of living existing here now.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my views.</p>	
125	Priscilla Downing	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>We have family buried at Riverview Cemetery. It appears that only the "E" plan would allow current access to the cemetery.</p> <p>The cemetery is an historic landmark and those involved in the upkeep and visitation of family, should have convenient access to the property.</p> <p>I appears that the round about would infringe on the property and on access to the property.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my thoughts.</p> <p>Priscilla Downing</p>	
126	Bradley Heintz	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Dear Mr. Pullen,</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the failure of the DEIS to address the environmental impacts that the different bridge options will have on pedestrians and bicycles crossing SE Tacoma St and 17th Ave. The DEIS insufficiently analyzes safety in regard to the new traffic flows as a result of traffic changes associated with each Sellwood bridge option.</p> <p>The steady stream of Sellwood bridge traffic feeding the state's busiest two lane bridge travels across two lane Tacoma Street then down two lane 17th street to finally connect to two lane highway 224. In the process, motorists cross 17 intersections in the Sellwood neighborhood. Sellwood Moreland is home to over 10,000 residents. Pedestrians and bikers need to cross Tacoma street and 17th Street to access 2 elementary schools, one middle school, a community center, a community pool, a neighborhood association, a wildlife refuge (Oaks Bottom), three large parks (Sellwood, Westmoreland and Sellwood Riverfront Park) and nearly a dozen community churches.</p> <p>The DEIS states (DEIS, section 3.1.3, page 3-10) that congested conditions and capacity-constrained traffic currently exist on SE Tacoma St, and the signalized intersections at SE 13th and 17th Aves are performing at near-capacity or over-capacity conditions. As a pedestrian and bicyclist I have found it difficult to cross Tacoma St with the current traffic volume. I am concerned that an improved bridge will increase traffic volumes more making the crossing more unsafe for myself and my children.</p> <p>It is impossible to compare bridge options in regards to neighborhood pedestrian and children safety without an appropriate assessment in the EIS. The health, safety and quality of life of neighborhood residents, including children, is dependent upon a reasonable comparison of bridge build and no-build options in regards to the ability to cross SE Tacoma St and 17th Ave at a variety of existing intersections.</p> <p>As a father of two little boys, I am concerned for the safety of my children. We need to cross Tacoma Street and 17th Street to access Sellwood facilities. Just this month a little boy was struck by a truck at the intersection of 13th and Tacoma. The boy was not alone. Rather he was accompanied by his mother when a truck failed to see the boy. It's scary for me to find that a safety focused parent wasn't able to keep her son safe when crossing Tacoma Street. Tacoma Street safety needs to be part of any</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
Sellwood Bridge Project.		
127	Martha Mattus	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>1st comment: The safety and comfort of non-motorized bridge users is always less on a shared bridge. I recommend building a new vehicle only bridge on the north alignment (Alternative E) with no bike or pedestrian lanes and keeping the existing Sellwood Bridge as a bicycle/ pedestrian bridge. This would lower the size and cost of the new bridge and provide non-motorized users a safe crossing free of the noise and smell of motorized vehicles.</p> <p>2nd comment: In the event of a major earthquake, the safety of all bridges will be suspect. The foundations of the new bridge should include ferry docks with road access to allow the movement of emergency vehicles – fire trucks, etc- across the river by ferry/barge or on a quickly constructed temporary pontoon bridge in the event of a major earthquake.</p>		
128	Margery Howie	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>Do not use alternative "C"</p> <p>it makes no sense to remove the only logical entrance to Riverview based on the only location for the funeral home. Any new access would be way too difficult for the elderly and bereaved to navigate. My parents are buried at Riverview and in the future my siblings and nieces and nephew will be there. Keep in mind Riverview has been there longer than the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>Its entrance should be preserved for historic significance as well as other reasons.</p>		
129	Emily Gardner, Bicycle Transportation Alliance	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>For more than 80 years, the Sellwood Bridge has provided an important connection across the Willamette River for residents throughout the region. Unfortunately, for cyclists the Sellwood Bridge has been one of the largest single barriers to cycling in the region because of its sub-standard design, as we found when researching our Blueprint for Better Biking: 40 Ways to Get There. As it is now, cyclists on the bridge are legally required to walk their bikes on the narrow sidewalk or are forced to share narrow travel lanes with busy car traffic. Most cyclists choose to ride on the narrow sidewalk resulting in dangerous interactions with pedestrians and other cyclists. The Sellwood Bridge Project, which will repair and/or replace the bridge, offers us an opportunity to improve this facility for cyclists and enhance its value as a local and regional connector for all users.</p> <p>The BTA has been represented on the Citizen Task Force and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group for the project for the last two years, working to produce and evaluate alternatives and designs that would offer the most safety and comfort for bikers and walkers on the Sellwood Bridge. Based on that participation, and our experience with bicycle and pedestrian traffic on the other Willamette River bridges, any cross section must include at least 12 feet on each side (24 feet combined total) for a shared bicycle/pedestrian path in order to meet future use projections and provide the best experience for current users. In addition to the minimum width requirement, the new facility must also provide a carfree connection to the Willamette Greenway Trail.</p> <p>Of the 5 alternatives currently being compared in the Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS), we recommend Alternatives A or D for final selection as the locally preferred alternative. Furthermore, we strenuously oppose the facilities proposed in Alternatives B, C and E as they are all too narrow and have a variety of corollary problems related to safety, security, maintenance, transient activity and lack of intuitive design.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE A</p>		

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>Alternative A would provide a completely separate, 23 foot wide, bicycle and pedestrian bridge to the north of the Sellwood Bridge alignment. Such a facility would remove nearly all conflicts between bicyclists/pedestrians and motorists at the west side interchange area, and would create an almost 10-mile car free loop for transportation and recreational users. With creative design, it could become a signature landmark for the city and the region, and would make a positive and inspirational statement about the value of biking and walking in our communities.</p> <p>The approximately \$54 million price-tag raises several relevant concerns. The current lack of transportation funding has resulted in the creation of many plans and designs that are languishing due to lack of funding, and nothing indicates that the Sellwood Bridge bicycle and pedestrian facility would not fall prey to the same conditions. It is possible that if a separate facility is chosen, it could be subject to a different funding scenario and may not ever identify a funding source. The bicycle/pedestrian only facility should be built first, or if the auto bridge must be built first, that project must also fund the bicycle/pedestrian facility. We also recommend that a plan be made for concerns about safety, security, and maintenance on a completely separate facility.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE D</p> <p>We believe that money spent on biking and walking has always proven to be money well-spent, and these facilities consistently exceed expectations in terms of user counts. We also recognize the need to achieve a reasonable balance between our desires as cyclists to have high quality, safe facilities and the reality of the current financial climate. Alternative D is the preferred choice in lieu of a completely separate bicycle/pedestrian bridge. Alternative D allocates 36 feet to bike and foot traffic, including a 'commuter' style, wide bike lane designed for bicycle traffic that wishes to travel at higher speeds than are normally appropriate on shared use facilities.</p> <p>WEST SIDE INTERCHANGE</p> <p>Regardless of which bridge cross-section is selected, we recommend a signalized intersection instead of either the trumpet or roundabout options. With the high volume and speed of auto/truck traffic at the interchange, any of the free-flowing intersection designs currently under consideration will be less safe for cyclists and pedestrians, even if a bicycle activated "HAWK" signal is installed. Their design naturally encourages cars to go faster, and creates issues with drivers seeing cyclists and pedestrians as they try to make their way through the interchange.</p> <p>The trumpet configuration, in particular, could result in closure of the Riverview Cemetery access road, which is currently an important route for cyclists. Cyclists wishing to continue westbound from the west side of the Sellwood Bridge often use the Riverview Cemetery access road, instead of traveling significantly out of direction, making steep climbs and traveling on narrow roads with no shoulders exposed to high speed auto traffic.</p> <p>The road is owned and maintained by the Cemetery, and as such can be closed to traffic or left unmaintained by the Cemetery. The Cemetery has been gracious thus far, allowing the small number of hearty bicycle commuters to use the access road on their daily commutes. However, with improved bicycling facilities in the future, a significant increase in the number of cyclists traveling through the corridor is projected. We strongly encourage Multnomah County and the City of Portland to work with the Cemetery to reach a formal agreement on preserving access to the road for cyclists and maintenance of the roadway.</p> <p>COMBINING ELEMENTS IN THE DEIS</p> <p>A concept for a design based on a combination of elements has emerged from conversations with the Citizen Task Force, Program Advisory Group, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group. The concept is a variant of Alternative A, and includes a proposal to build a new bridge, rather than rehabilitate the current bridge. The new bridge would have two vehicle lanes plus shoulders, and a separate bicycle/pedestrian bridge. All three groups have requested cost estimates for this plan, but figures may not be available until after the close of public comment on the DEIS. We recommend</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>continued evaluation of this proposal to determine if the cost issues can be removed.</p> <p>The Bicycle Transportation Alliance is a statewide non-profit organization that works to open minds and roads to bicycling. We represent bicyclists and the bicycle industry with over 5000 members in Oregon and SW Washington, and have seventeen years of experience in bicycle engineering, planning, education and advocacy.</p>	
130	<p>John Holmes</p> <p>I favor Alternative E, as the best alternative by far. However, I favor this alternative with a 64' cross section.</p> <p>Unfortunately, your publication Volume 3, Number 1, Fall 2008 is inaccurate and unfair in its presentation. It is skewed in favor of Alternative D, which is by far the worst alternative presented (this alternative was almost dropped by the original Task Force, and only remained in consideration with a member or two of that group suggesting that everyone could take another look at it after the Draft EIS. It should have been dropped.</p> <p>The problem with Alternative D is that it is destructive of a significant part of the inner Sellwood neighborhood, the Sellwood Harbor Condominiums (where my wife and I live along with 36 other households). It is also damaging to the River Park Condominiums next door to a lesser degree.</p> <p>We love our neighborhood and do not want to see it destroyed, as is contemplated in D. Although the above referenced publication refers to 4 residential displacements in Sellwood Harbor, this is both false and extremely misleading. We have 38 units(homes) in Sellwood Harbor. 27 of these units are in 3 buildings with 3 floors in each building, and 3 units per floor. Then, we have 11 Townhouse units that are in additional buildings, with either 2 or 3 units per building.</p> <p>Your publication contemplates chopping the end off of one of the 3 story buildings, and taking 3 units, and chopping the end off of one of the Townhouse buildings and taking one more unit (out of three units in that building). Neither of these suggested "choppings" is possible or feasible. The residential displacements in Sellwood Harbor will be 12, and not 4 as represented.</p> <p>Further, all 38 units in Sellwood Harbor are affected by Alternative D. We all own an undivided 1/38 interest in all of the common areas, walkways, garages, siding, roofing, etc. In addition, our economic model is based on 38 owners paying dues and assessments. Thus, we are all damaged by Alternative D. The cloud of this proposal has substantially devalued our properties, and no one will buy a home in Sellwood Harbor. Contrary to your publication, all 37 owners in our Sellwood Harbor section of the greater Sellwood neighborhood will be severely damaged by Alternative D.</p> <p>The inaccuracy and slant of your publication absolutely prevents a fair survey regarding comments. It should have pointed out that Alternative E could be done with a 64' width (which it does not) and costed with the narrower width. It further should have pointed out that the displacements in Alternative E only involve a couple or a few owners in that Grand Place is brand new, and River Park Center does not have multiple owners to my knowledge, while Alternative D is extremely damaging to 37 households in a community that has been an integral part of the Sellwood neighborhood since the early 1980's.</p> <p>In addition to the above comments, Alternative E provides the best, the most flexible with transportation options, and the most cost effective transportation corridor for our Sellwood neighborhood and all of the other users of the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted'</p>	<p>Received via Web Site</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
131	Ariel Smits	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>The option to do nothing but repair the bridge is not acceptable. This would spend public money with no tangible gain in the long run.</p> <p>As far as the bridge itself is concerned, a replacement cannot be more than 2-3 lanes (2 lanes alone or with a "suicide" lane). There is no way a larger bridge could be accommodated by neighborhood roads without a severe detriment to the community</p>		
132	Nicole Navas, Oregon Department of State Lands	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>On Section 3.17 – It would be nice if you could provide a map of the wetland and the proposed impacts. Also state the size of the delineated wetland.</p>		
133	Cordell Hull, TriMet	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>Working for Trimet I like the transit lane option and believe track should be built into the transit lane decks for future streetcar extension routed on Tacoma St. South on 13th Ave Sellwood via Bybee St. to or trough Reed College campus and up Woodstock or Steel to connect to future 39th Ave Streetcar</p>		
134	Loulie Brown	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>I strongly approve of Option B. In balancing the constraints of bridge closure, rights of way, relocation, and ongoing access, it makes most sense to maintain the current structure, bring it up to code, provide better pedestrian and bike access, and minimize the amount of public resources (money and park land) impacted.</p>		
135	John Wold	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>Please arrange to have the bridge open during the project. I live work and go to church in Sellwood. To do otherwise will have major detrimental effect on the residents and businesses in Sellwood.</p>		
136	Cathy Prentice	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>I am a homeowner that could be impacted by the Sellwood Bridge Alignment options. When I went to vote on the survey offered by the EIS, I couldn't find the Alternative E with a 64 foot span. Why is this? There are many good reasons to vote for Alt.E-64'-less intrusion to our neighborhood, flexible pedestrian-bike lanes, cheaper to build, etc., and this Alt. was specifically mentioned prior to this survey, so I feel the public hasn't been given the opportunity to vote on Alt. E with a 64 foot span. Without presenting all the Alignment options that were decided on, this survey loses credibility. Can you remedy this?</p>		
137	Tom Wakeling	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>Sellwood Bridge Comments on DEIS DEIS pp. 3-54, 55, 62, 63, 75, and 76 (temporary detour bridge):</p> <p>Any 'temporary detour bridge' on SE Spokane St. will place my family's home between the existing Sellwood Bridge and the 'temporary' detour bridge. This action will render our property a value-less piece of land between two major construction projects for an extended period of time.</p> <p>In building a temporary detour bridge, utility relocations and disruptions will add additional project costs, considerable noise and environmental dangers, and long-term negative impacts to adjacent residences and businesses. Any alternative that includes a temporary detour bridge will adversely</p>		

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>affect 49 families in Riverpark Condominiums as well as Oaks Pioneer Church, and many others on Spokane St.</p> <p>We have retained legal counsel and will pursue litigation if the temporary detour bridge is advanced.</p> <p>DEIS pp. 3-74 through 3-78 (property values):</p> <p>Our property values have ALREADY been severely reduced due to the publicity and the uncertainties surrounding the bridge. During construction of ALL alternatives, our properties will be virtually un-sellable. We would certainly seek, at the very least, tax abatement. What does the county propose for mitigation?</p> <p>DEIS 3-52, 54, 56 (parking):</p> <p>There is not presently adequate street parking on SE Spokane St. during the day between SE Grand and the Willamette River. In addition, late afternoon-evening parking takes up all present space most evenings. We want the county to make Spokane St. west of Oaks Parkway a permit parking (residents) zone.</p> <p>DEIS 3-58 (Grand Place vacant):</p> <p>States that Grand Place is a 'vacant complex'. This is not accurate. Grand Place has several residential units occupied as of this writing (12/18/08).</p> <p>DEIS 3-80</p> <p>We feel Alternative D is in a reasonable cost range, seems to have the least overall negative impact for residents, businesses, and bridge users, and seems to provide the most 'bang for the buck'. Though the other Alternatives might be of shorter construction duration, we are willing to endure a longer construction time for what we feel is the best outcome.</p> <p>We favor building the bridge on the current alignment as long as no detour bridge is built on SE Spokane St.</p> <p>We are very much against Alternative E, as it will negatively impact our family and our neighborhood and is not as cost-effective.</p> <p>We favor Alternative D (delta frame bridge), using the narrowest possible width necessary to keep a river crossing open during construction.</p>
138	Scott Rozell	<p><i>Received via Web Site</i></p> <p>Give bikes at least as much consideration as cars. The cycling community is continuing to grow and we provide a clean alternative for Portland's environment. Lastly, as this is the only southern portal to the west hills, give bikes a healthy space with which to cross (unlike the renovations to Ross Island Bridge).</p>
139	Maggie Jarman	<p><i>Received via Web Site</i></p> <p>My biggest concern is putting in a bridge bigger than "the Neighborhood" can handle!</p> <p>This is the only bridge that feeds into a neighborhood! We can barely handle the traffic it currently has. We/YOU need to stay focused, and not try and provide room for more cars, just make the bridge safe! That is the Original goal of this project.</p> <p>The Ross Island is designed for traffic and no bikes. The I224 signs even say for traffic to use Mcloughlin not 17th and Sellwood bridge.</p> <p>I would like to see a three lane bridge AT THE MOST, third lane a "flex lane" for bus's and emergency vehicles only, changing for rush hour only!</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>Bikes COMPLETELY off the bridge. Under or their OWN bridge. For their safety. Even now when they are not suppose to be in the car lanes they are.</p> <p>Their "own" lane on the bridge is not safe.</p> <p>Too many "like to" ride side by side, and feel they have a right. It's their nature and there is no "policing" for this just traffic jams.</p> <p>We barely have the money (of which most recently federal \$\$ where given to a new bike bridge, go figure?????) so we don't need to spend more than we need.</p> <p>PLEASE stay focused! Don't try and please everyone and be more than we need. We Are a neighborhood with a bridge. Come and See!!</p> <p>Our Street lights don't even accommodate our traffic!</p>	
141	Mike LaTorre	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	Must have lots of room for many bikes	
142	Reba Tobey, Sofas By Design	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
143	<p>Jim Longwill</p> <p>Hello Task Group,</p> <p>Thank you for hearing my comments. I live in SE Portland and work at the River Park Center next to the bridge. I do <i>*not*</i> speak on behalf of my employer (PSMFC) or River Park Center; however, I do hope you would avoid alternative 'E' inasmuch as it would obviously compel our office to move away. That said, there are other arguments I would like to make.</p> <p>Having attended a public hearing and heard many arguments. I understand that there is great resistance to having a closure of any length of time, and that budgets are <i>*very*</i> tight these days. I have considered the options and would suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please build an actual new bridge! I am against the 'no-build' alternative; • Avoid building a 4-carlane (super-wide) bridge such as in alt 'E'. I believe it will tax Tacoma St. and invite more car-only trips in an age when travelers would better be encouraged to consider transit alternatives; • Avoid doing a temporary detour bridge such as in alt 'B'. The cost (~\$30 mil as I understand) —is simply too high to sink into a mere construction phase only; • Please consider a Trumpet-style interchange on the west side such as in alt 'C'. This looks like the only option that safely avoids traffic snarls over the long term. I hope you can provide some compensation due to the unfortunate impact on Riverview cemetery; 	<i>Received via Web Site</i>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the near term, as a way of paying for the bridge, consider implementing a toll bridge! While over a temporary period a toll booth (probably on West end) might hold up traffic — “ this is an excellent way to help pay for a bridge. ‘You use it, you pay for it.’ -- is truly democracy in action! I think a \$2.00 toll would be fine—and have provision for a ‘nexus’ pass /decal for frequent users. <p>With the above adjustments and with an effort to minimize overall disruptive impacts; I strongly favor alternative ‘D’ and with the Delta-frame style of bridge. I like the sleek look of the Delta frame and with less cost than the Deck-arch.</p>	
144	Tony Dal Molin	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>The impact of bridge traffic capacity on cut-through traffic was not directly considered. While some thought was given to the effect of the SE 6th Ave. interchange on cut-through traffic, the obvious correlation with increased overall bridge traffic capacity was never mentioned.</p> <p>Regardless of the east-side interchange design, more traffic to/from the bridge will undoubtedly increase cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods immediately north and south of SE Tacoma St. What is less obvious, but IMHO much more impactful, is that this cut-through traffic spreads out through the neighborhoods affecting a much wider area. I personally have tracked cut-through commuters between my house and the bridge despite being located 16 blocks away.</p> <p>Options E, and to a lesser degree C, would clearly increase the traffic pressure trying to find ways around the bottlenecks on SE Tacoma St. While the design of the east-side interchange could increase this pressure, the root cause of the problem is that the bridge already accommodates more traffic than Tacoma can handle. Any design that increases the bridge's capacity will only aggravate the already unsafe level of Sellwood neighborhood cut-through traffic.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to note that ‘cut-through’ traffic does not do justice to the gravity of its impact on the livability of our community. The areas of concern are nearly 100% residential, front porch living, kids playing in the street neighborhoods — the kind of environment that builds community and counters suburban flight. The consequences of a single careless driver in too much of a hurry to get home can be devastating and irreparable. Reducing this immense impact to a ‘moderate increase in neighborhood cut-through traffic’ is disingenuous at best.</p>	
146	Paul Notti, Sellwood Moreland Improvement League	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>December 10, 2008</p> <p>PAG Members</p> <p>Re: Sellwood Bridge Consideration and Neighborhood Impact</p> <p>To the Policy Advisory Group Members:</p> <p>On behalf of the Sellwood Moreland Improvement League, I am writing you to express our neighborhood's commitment to achieving and maintaining all aspects of the Tacoma Main Street Plan, especially as it relates to the future of the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>You will be faced with making a difficult choice on a preferred alternative over the next several months. While the options and issues are undoubtedly complex, the neighbors of Sellwood will be significantly impacted by the decision. The neighborhood has consistently advocated that any bridge choice support the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid increasing traffic pressure on the two lanes of Tacoma Street No increase in neighborhood cut through traffic Preserve the economic vitality, ambience and prestige of the Oaks Pioneer Church, a nationally 	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>registered historic structure.</p> <p>Several of the proposed options increase traffic throughput onto the west side of the bridge, which will likely bring more traffic onto Tacoma Street than the current bridge. Ensuring a future bridge does not increase the available cars at one time in our neighborhood is a high priority for the neighborhood.</p> <p>In addition, there exists concern that increased traffic volume in our neighborhood will put additional pressure on traffic cut through, both north and south of SE Tacoma Street. Reducing cut-through traffic has been a long time policy of the neighborhood association and we urge you to consider options that have the least potential for cut through traffic.</p> <p>Finally, proposed alignment changes in Alternative E would adversely affect the operation of the Oaks Pioneer Church, as well as affect city and neighborhood treasures, including the Sellwood Riverfront Park. We urge you to reject modification of the bridge alignment.</p> <p>SMILE has been concerned from the beginning of this process that neighborhood impacts would not be adequately addressed in the design of a new Sellwood Bridge. Especially challenging has been the CTF and PAG's self limited scope to not include impacts to the neighborhood past SE 6th avenue, the entrance into our neighborhood. SMILE appreciates the overwhelming support of the PAG and city and county leaders, especially Mayor Elect Adams, Metro Councilor Robert Liberty and others who have publicly professed support for the Tacoma Main Street plan and vowed not to support alternatives that would put pressure to undo this neighborhood achievement, which promotes livability and urban renewal.</p> <p>This is an historic time for Sellwood – Moreland, as well as for the tri county area. SMILE appreciates your consideration in this matter. We view this as an opportunity to ensure neighborhood livability can coexist with regional transportation issues.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
147	Tom Edwards, Daimler Corp	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I have ridden to work for years and have risked my life on this bridge as it is the only one available to route myself to work on my bike. PLEASE provide a safe bike lane in your design or a separate pedestrian/bike passage bridge as we need this VERY MUCH!!!!</p> <p>Thank you!</p> <p>Tom Edwards</p>	
148	Cindy Anderson	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Even though I do not use this bridge on a regular basis anymore, I do think that it is critical to have a bridge in this area, and the "no build" option is not viable. Making what at best are temporary repairs is not a fiscally responsible action, and will not allow the use of the bridge ie public transportation etc in the long run. Please consider building a new bridge even though in these tough economic times this is a tough call, it is important to the Sellwood community and the Portland community as a whole to have this east/west connection remain open.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
149	Shanta Calem	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Please take the time to assess the affects of the bridge changes on the Sellwood/West Moreland neighborhood. If Tacoma Street were to become a thoroughfare it would split the neighborhood in two. In addition, please consider the safety of pedestrians. The appeal of this neighborhood is the ease with which we can walk to the schools, local businesses, and to each other's homes.</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	Thank you.	
150	Janet Dockstader	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>If the bridge is 4 lanes, make the street on the east side 4 lanes. If the bridge is 2 lanes, leave the eastside street 2 lanes.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>i trust you will do the best with whatever funding you can provide.</p>	
151	Sheila Catterall	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Riverpark Community, along with our neighbors to the south Sellwood Harbor, consists of more than 70 homes with families representing a microcosm of any neighborhood in a community.</p> <p>Residents of the Riverpark/Sellwood Harbor neighborhood reflect a microcosm of diversity: single, married, old, young, gay, straight, ethnically diverse, students, professionals and a significant number of retired seniors.</p> <p>Our home values are currently affected by the discussion of the bridge construction, so our homes cannot be sold and will not be sold if Alternatives A-D are approved.</p>	
152	Lance Lindahl, Brooklyn Action Corps	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>This letter of comment is submitted on behalf of the Brooklyn Action Corps (BAC) Neighborhood Association.</p> <p>At this time, the BAC does not have an opinion as to which specific bridge option should be adopted. However, we strongly believe that a closure of the Sellwood Bridge, whether temporary or permanent, would have a catastrophic effect on nearby neighborhoods and must be avoided.</p> <p>The Brooklyn Neighborhood has a vested interest in the well-being of Milwaukie Avenue. It is our "Main Street" and our direct link to both the Central Eastside and to Sellwood-Moreland. It also the only major street in our neighborhood that is friendly to both pedestrians and bicyclists. Numerous community development efforts in our neighborhood over the past twenty years have worked to strengthen Milwaukie Avenue as a pleasant place to both live and work.</p> <p>This very livability would be seriously threatened by a closure of the Sellwood Bridge. Whenever this bridge is closed for maintenance, or for a special event, congestion along Milwaukie Avenue brings traffic to a standstill. This past summer, when the bridge was closed for repairs at night, it was not unusual to find bumper to bumper traffic on Milwaukie Avenue at 9:30 in the evening.</p> <p>Any bridge option adopted must look closely at the traffic impacts that will likely occur. Any construction to the bridge will no doubt increase traffic along both Milwaukie Avenue and McLoughlin Boulevard, and these streets are already in desperate need of modernization and safety improvements. Very little attention has been given to how these major streets would function without a Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>The Executive Board of the Brooklyn Action Corps hereby requests that any plan for a new Sellwood Bridge must be one that keeps the existing bridge open during the period of construction.</p>	
153	Claudia Hutchison	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Moving the Bridge to the North side would unfairly force those of us who purchased north-facing condo homes to face a bridge. (We waited for a north-facing condo to become available and we paid much more for it than the equivalent south (bridge-facing) condo. A decision to move the bridge north should accompany a fair "buy-out" for condo owners who prefer not to face a bridge out their</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	windows.	
154	Brad Hathaway	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I've heard others refer to the proposed new bridge as a 100 year structure. While I don't know if this is a fair characterization, I can certainly see that the choices now being made will have a lasting effect far beyond the bridge span, the affected road segments, and nearby landscape. Certainly, livability for nearby residents will be impacted for decades.</p> <p>It is really important that we get this structure 'right-sized'. A 'super-sized' bridge begs the question, 'to where?' Tacoma Street serves the local community and, in its current configuration, also makes a significant contribution to regional needs. As regional needs continue to grow, solutions must extend beyond what this single bridge can achieve.</p> <p>Alternative D seems best suited and most appropriately scaled for the site. It just doesn't make sense to spend so much money salvaging the existing structure (Alternatives A or B). Security issues related to Alternative C make it seem significantly less attractive. Alternative E seems too large without radically rethinking the traffic flow coming off the east end.</p> <p>Further still, after leaving the open house recently held at OMSI, I wondered about the cross-section just east of the west-end interchange. I was told by one of the staff members (on site that evening to answer questions) that the extra lanes were needed to store or queue traffic as it waits to get through the interchange and in a way that prevents construction on OR 43 (I'm sure they explained this better than I just did). I later wondered way these lanes couldn't be stacked horizontally along OR 43 (to the side of the lanes needed to keep the traffic moving north and south). It might take additional excavation along the west side of the river to support these additional lanes, but wouldn't it be cheaper to build extra lanes on land than suspend them in the air over a river?</p>	
155	David Collins	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>The alternatives in the draft EIS do not specifically address impacts to the Tacoma Main Street Plan. Alternatives are considered that contradict findings from South Willamette River Crossing Study.</p> <p>The fourth bullet in the project need statement "Existing and future travel demands between origins and destinations served by the Sellwood Bridge exceed available capacity" contradicts the recommendation from the South Willamette River Crossing Study that "providing adequate regional traffic capacity in the Sellwood Bridge/SE Tacoma Street travelshed is not the responsibility of SE Tacoma Street."</p>	
156	Sheila Strachan	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>I just finished reviewing the Draft EIS and taking the "survey". The survey was superficial and did not address any real issues about the bridge, the public involvement process or the range of alternatives put forth in the DEIS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scope of the EIS failed to consider a Hwy 224/43 crossing by narrowing the project scope so as to focus the outcome to get the answer the county wants: one which forces the Sellwood bridge to become the South Willamette Crossing. By piling multiple conflicting objectives into this one project, the Sellwood bridge becomes a regional bridge, when a regional bridge should undergo a separate EIS. 2. The timeline for the DEIS is ONE YEAR behind schedule. This seriously undermines the public involvement process by dragging the process out for such a long time. 3. The DEIS failed to address the values of the Tacoma Main street plan. The effects of all alternatives on the Tacoma Main Street plan should be fully evaluated. 4. The DEIS failed to fully analyze effects to the neighborhood traffic patterns and pedestrian and 	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>bike safety. Each bridge alternative will result in significantly different traffic volumes and cut through traffic in the neighborhood east of the bridge. These effects should be fully evaluated.</p> <p>5. Alternative E in the Draft EIS is completely beyond the scope of this analysis. It constructs Trojan horse transit lanes where no transit corridor has been identified. Alternative E deserves no further analysis.</p>	
157	Mike Coyle	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Please consider and comment on the following items regarding build alternatives, bridge closure, and phasing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In alternative "A", why can't a temporary bridge be built similar to alternative "B"? This would maintain vehicular traffic and be beneficial for the commuter as well as local businesses. 2. If alternative "A" is selected please consider constructing the pedestrian/bike bridge prior to decommissioning the existing Sellwood Bridge. This would allow the ongoing use of at least some form of transportation over the river at this location for the estimated 2 years of construction. 	
158	Christie Glynn	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I'll be brief. My husband and I were the first family to move into Riverpark Condominiums nearly nine years ago. Our community has thrived, and as a result the city has gained valuable citizens.</p> <p>As you are well aware, there are several bridge options that threaten the very structure of our buildings. If you must proceed with any option other than the No Build Alternative, condemn our building. Please do not trap us in a location that will be besieged by construction for the foreseeable future and may, depending on which bridge option is selected, become surrounded by bridges, reducing our quality of life.</p> <p>Condemn our building and allow us to relocate. It's the only fair alternative.</p>	
160	Joan Beckley, Riverpark Homeowners Assoc.	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Re: Chapter 3 – IMPACTS & MITIGATION</p> <p>My property value has been severely reduced due to the uncertain future of this issue.</p> <p>I live in one of the 10 Riverfront Assoc. Townhomes of which two have been for sale for TWO YEARS. A third Townhouse was for sale for 9 months and recently taken off the market.</p> <p>As you know our Riverfront Homeowner's Assoc. will seek legal action if a temporary bridge idea happens. We will seek TOTAL CONDEMNATION OF THE ENTIRE COMPLEX. Our health will be threatend from the dust and pollution. Our Assoc. will lost 14 parking spaces currently under the existing bridge plus loss of property value.</p> <p>I URGE YOU TO PLEASE CHOOSE ALTERNATIVE E.</p>	
161	Stan Scotton	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>My concern is the impact that the chosen bridge choice will have on my residence (and the surrounding neighborhood) at SE 7th and Spokane St. Noise, litter, traffic (vehicle and truck), parking, paving and ramping over park space, and the liviability of the remaining residential neighborhood (at the east side terminus) are my major concerns. Whatever choice is made, I request that efforts be made (and funded) to make the impact on those living, working and recreating in the area as minimal</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>as possible.</p> <p>How will access to the Springwater Trail be handled? Both during construction and after completion. Because of the break at Umatilla St., Spokane St. is a major access to the Springwater Corridor and needs to be maintained and needs to provide safe access for pedestrians and bicyclists.</p> <p>Moving traffic through our neighborhood seems to be the issue. Not the effect on the neighborhood. I always have and remain a supporter of the "do nothing" option. Close the bridge to vehicle and truck traffic and use it for pedestrian and bicycles only.</p>	
162	Frank Winicki, West Linn/ Wilsonville School District	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>The impact of bridge traffic capacity on cut-through traffic was not directly considered. While some thought was given to the effect of the SE 6th Ave. interchange on cut-through traffic, the obvious correlation with increased overall bridge traffic capacity was never mentioned.</p> <p>Regardless of the east-side interchange design, more traffic to/from the bridge will undoubtedly increase cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods immediately north and south of SE Tacoma St. What is less obvious, but IMHO much more impactful, is that this cut-through traffic spreads out through the neighborhoods affecting a much wider area.</p> <p>Options E, and to a lesser degree C, would clearly increase the traffic pressure trying to find ways around the bottlenecks on SE Tacoma St. While the design of the east-side interchange could increase this pressure, the root cause of the problem is that the bridge already accommodates more traffic than Tacoma can handle. Any design that increases the bridge's capacity will only aggravate the already unsafe level of Sellwood neighborhood cut-through traffic.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to note that 'cut-through' traffic does not do justice to the gravity of its impact on the livability of our community. The areas of concern are nearly 100% residential, front porch living, kids playing in the street neighborhoods – the kind of environment that builds community and counters suburban flight. The consequences of a single careless driver in too much of a hurry to get home can be devastating and irreparable. Reducing this immense impact to a 'moderate increase in neighborhood cut-through traffic' is disingenuous at best.</p>	
163	Eric Miller, Sellwood Playgroup Association	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Introduction: I submit these comments regarding the DEIS on behalf of the Sellwood Playgroup Association, an affiliation of 5 playgroups in the Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood with well over 100 children ranging from 0 to 5 years of age. I am also writing on behalf of Amber Bozman and her 4-yr-old son, Aidan. On November 14, 2008, while he was legally riding his bike across SE Tacoma St, Aidan was struck by a truck. While his helmet was destroyed, he miraculously escaped uninjured. The primary focus of my comments relates to the failure of the DEIS to address the environmental impacts, positive or negative, that the different bridge options will have on the neighborhood children's ability to cross SE Tacoma St and 17th Ave. The DEIS insufficiently analyzes the health, safety and quality of life of children in this same regard as required by NEPA.</p> <p>Neighborhood: Sellwood Moreland is home to over 10,000 residents. Pedestrians and bikers need to cross Tacoma street and 17th Ave, both heavy with bridge commuter traffic of some 30,000 daily vehicles, to access 2 elementary schools, one middle school, a community center, a community pool, a neighborhood association (SMILE), a wildlife refuge (Oaks Bottom), three large parks (Sellwood, Westmoreland and Sellwood Riverfront Park) and nearly a dozen community churches.</p> <p>Sellwood Bridge Project NEPA required components of the DEIS: NEPA requires an EIS (NEPA regulations, 40 CFR, Sec. 102(2)(C)) whenever a major federal action significantly (NEPA regulations, 40 CFR, Sec. 1508.27 Significantly). affects the quality of the human environment (NEPA regulations,</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>40 CFR, Sec. 1508.14 Human environment). The Scope of the Sellwood Bridge Project is required to include indirect effects (NEPA regulations, 40 CFR, Sec. 1508.25 Scope) of the action. Indirect effects are defined as those caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable, and include those related to induced changes in the pattern of land use and health (NEPA regulations, 40 CFR, Sec. 1508.8 Effects). The Sellwood Bridge DEIS is required to include reasonably foreseeable changes that will occur in the pattern of use of the affected facilities, health and safety of any induced changes upon the affected facilities, and the quality of the human environment upon the affected facilities.</p> <p>SE Tacoma St is an affected facility: SE Tacoma Street is a facility within the affected environment and is included within the Sellwood Bridge Project DEIS study area in regards to economic analysis, environmental justice, and various demographics. The fact that SE Tacoma St has been studied from the bridge at SE 6th Ave through to 99E indicates that it is recognized by the Sellwood Bridge Project that the alternative build options A through E would impact this facility.</p> <p>SE 17th Ave is an affected facility: SE 17th Ave between SE Tacoma St and Rt 224 in Milwaukie is significantly impacted by bridge commuter traffic. Data in the DEIS (Table 3.1-2, page 3-9) shows that in an existing 24-hr period some 1,000 of the 14,600 total eastbound vehicles crossing the bridge turn off of Tacoma before SE 11th Ave. An additional 2,400 turn off before SE 15th Ave. Then a full 4,200 turn off of Tacoma St prior to SE 23rd Ave. Examining together both the volume of these numbers and the difference between them is a strong indication that a substantial number of vehicles do not use SE Tacoma to reach 99E and Rt 224. SE 17th Ave (as well as smaller neighborhood streets as cut-through traffic), is providing Clackamas County commuters an alternative and often used short-cut to Rt 224 and should be included in the traffic analysis components of the DEIS.</p> <p>When the Tacoma corridor is not congested or over-burdened, any changes in traffic flow from the bridge will effect traffic flow along the corridor: The DEIS states (DEIS, section 3.1.3, page 3-10) that congested conditions and capacity-constrained traffic currently exist on SE Tacoma St, and the signalized intersections at SE 13th and 17th Aves are performing at near-capacity or over-capacity conditions. Language in the DEIS states that these conditions exist ‘during peak periods’, and that ‘By 2035, the SE Tacoma St corridor will continue to function at congested conditions for several hours each day’. Using a general definition of ‘several’ (Merriam-Webster Dictionary: Several: 2 a: more than one <several pleas> b: more than two but fewer than many <moved several inches>) and assuming there are 12 daylight hours in a day, there are as many as 10 daytime hours that are not congested, not capacity-constrained, nor at near-capacity conditions. Under these conditions, any changes or differences in traffic flow from the bridge onto Tacoma St at SE 6th Ave will alter traffic flow and patterns through the Tacoma St corridor, including SE 17th Ave south to Rt 224. The different bridge alternatives could alter vehicle-traffic-carrying capacity, flow, or other traffic patterns along this corridor during times that the corridor is not congested, over-burdened or over-constrained.</p> <p>Each of the alternatives, no build, and A through E, provide different traffic constraining components at the 2-lane connection to SE Tacoma St at 6th Ave, therefore presenting differing traffic flows that will move onto and through SE Tacoma St and 17th Ave: The alternatives provide differences in presence or not of turning lanes and presence or not of a stoplight at SE 6th. Some of the alternatives clearly have been designed to handle higher traffic volume and flow over the span of the bridge than others. For example, Alternative E has a span of 5 vehicle lanes at the western cross-section, 4 vehicle travel lanes at the middle cross-section, and 3 vehicle lanes and 1 turning lane at the eastern cross-section while Alternative A has a span of 3 vehicle travel lanes and 1 turning lane at the western most cross-section, 2 vehicle travel lanes in the middle cross-section, and 2 travel lanes, 1 turning lane and 8’ of shoulder at the eastern cross-section. These differences will pose different traffic volumes and patterns at the eastern edge of the bridge project. The fact that all alternatives maintain two travel lanes on SE Tacoma St does not mean that all of the alternatives provide the same flow of traffic onto SE Tacoma St. For instance, a stoplight at the east end of the bridge at SE 6th Ave, which</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>exists for Alternatives D and E, will interrupt eastbound traffic flow onto SE Tacoma at regular intervals. Alternatively, no stoplight at SE 6th Ave, consistent with the no-build option and Alternatives A, B and C, will present a flow of cars onto Tacoma St either consistent with the current flow (which is currently a streaming, continuous flow of vehicles during peak hours), or dependent upon the degree to which a west-side interchange is constraining traffic. There are at least 3 alternative west-side interchanges being examined in the bridge project, each of which will constrain or allow flow of traffic differently.</p> <p>Differing effects of pedestrian safety crossing SE Tacoma St and 17th Ave: Based on the above information, it is reasonable to believe that a pedestrian crossing Tacoma St on the existing crosswalk at SE 7th Ave, 1 block east of the bridge connection, will have a different experience in regards to health, safety and quality of life, depending upon which bridge option is chosen. It is also reasonable to believe that a pedestrian crossing Tacoma St at the next signal controlled intersection, at SE 13th Ave, will have a different experience in regards to health, safety and quality of life, depending upon which bridge option is chosen. The same is true at the next intersection in the Tacoma St corridor, SE 17th Ave. The same is true at controlled intersections along SE 17th Ave south of Tacoma St. Further, pedestrians crossing Tacoma St or SE 17th Ave at any of the streets that intersect them will have a different experience in regards to health, safety and quality of life, depending upon which bridge option is chosen. This is worrisome because Oregon law allows pedestrian crossing of Tacoma and 17th Ave at any uncontrolled intersection. Any change in traffic flow, for better or worse, onto Tacoma St, presents a significant, indirect and reasonably foreseeable health, safety and quality of life environmental impact to neighborhood pedestrians crossing Tacoma St and 17th Ave. It is required by NEPA that this be reported in the DEIS. The current DEIS fails to address these impacts in regards to pedestrians crossing SE Tacoma St at existing designated crosswalk intersections as well as the undesigned intersections.</p> <p>Changes to traffic controls at SE 13th and 17th: It is reasonable to believe that the above stated differences in traffic flow onto Tacoma St that would be created by the different bridge options will create a need to change how the intersections at SE 13th and 17th Avenues are controlled. Regardless of whether or not these intersections are controlling existing traffic flow sufficiently well, or that some hours of the day these intersections are functioning at over-capacity, if different bridge options provide different flows of traffic into these intersections, even if it occurs only during non-peak, unconstrained or not overburdened hours of the day, there are foreseeable indirect effects that must be addressed in the EIS. This falls within the NEPA defined scope of the EIS as indirect effects, defined as those caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable, and include those related to induced changes in the pattern of land use.</p> <p>Any bridge option meeting two of the stated goals of the project would present increased traffic onto SE Tacoma St: Improved traffic mobility (stated project goal, pages ES-9 and I-9) as well as improved mass transit circulation and capacity (stated goal, pages ES-10 and I-9) across a new Sellwood Bridge would alter, and likely increase, traffic flow onto SE Tacoma St at SE 6th Ave. The statement that “vehicle-traffic-carrying capacity and performance on the Sellwood Bridge would not be substantially improved by any of the Build alternatives” (DEIS, page 3-10) directly contradicts these stated goals. Any bridge option that meets either of these two stated goals would present increased traffic mobility, circulation and capacity onto the Tacoma St corridor.</p> <p>Comparison of bridge options in regards to the health, safety, and quality of life of pedestrians as stated above is impossible with the current DEIS: It is impossible to compare bridge options in regards to neighborhood pedestrian and children safety without an appropriate assessment in the EIS. The EPA describes the public's role as an important one in the NEPA process, providing input on what issues should be addressed in an EIS and in commenting on the findings in an agency's NEPA documents. This letter is such a provision to the lead agency: The health, safety and quality of life of neighborhood residents, including children, is dependent upon a reasonable comparison of bridge build and no-build options in regards to the ability to cross SE Tacoma St and 17th Ave at the variety</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>of existing intersections.</p> <p>Closing: Aidan was lucky when that truck hit him last month. I hope that another accident does not happen in the future. If it does, I hope that the child will be as lucky as Aidan was. The safety of neighborhood children who need to cross commuter traffic moving to and from the bridge needs to be considered a high priority. Absence of assessment of this environmental impact of the different bridge options is a negligent omission from the EIS. This may leave the city, county, the Sellwood Bridge Project legally liable if another accident does occur. Inclusion of such an assessment in the EIS is necessary for a valid comparison of neighborhood safety between the bridge options. This is critical to the safety of neighborhood children and necessary to minimize the risk of accidents like Aidan's occurring in the future.</p>	
164	Dorene Petersen	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Good morning my name is Dorene Petersen. My husband, Robert Seidel and I have owned our home and lived at Riverpark Townhome #5 since the Riverpark complex, which is immediately north of the Sellwood bridge, was built – so about 6 years. My husband is a business owner in Sellwood – http://www.essentialoil.com/ and I am a business owner in Portland City with my office near Macadam on Hood Ave – http://www.achs.edu.</p> <p>In addressing the Sellwood bridge replacement issue both my husband and I would prefer alternative E.</p> <p>Clearly we would suffer as will all of Riverpark's families with increased noise, impacted view, health issues from pollution, and reduced property values just to name a few, with any alternative other than E.</p> <p>More importantly though, alternative E is the obvious choice primarily because it has more potential for expansion in the future. It could be expanded with a streetcar. In a conversation with the engineer from CH2M Hill at the recent public meeting, he informed me that alternative E has enough room for a streetcar and that it would not take a lane away from traffic. This is not a possibility with the other alternatives. Adding a streetcar would decrease the total amount of traffic reducing the overall total carbon footprint. Barack Obama's new transportation secretary, LaHood has shown he will find funds to support the financially strapped highway trust fund, which pays for roads and bridge projects nationwide. With a more farsighted plan that reduces the carbon foot print the Sellwood bridge replacement project could attract some of those funds.</p> <p>Alternative E would have less impact from the geological issues that have plagued the bridge in its current position or the bridges in the other proposed areas.</p> <p>Alternative E would have less impact on the families who live in the area. There is the office building that would require businesses to relocate but even the owner of the building agreed in the latest public meeting that businesses could be moved with less upheaval than people's homes.</p> <p>Alternative E would allow the present bridge to stay open while E is built and prevent business closures in Sellwood or Westmoreland. This was a major concern at the public meeting.</p> <p>Alternative E would not require a temporary bridge to be built with obvious savings as a result.</p> <p>I appreciate your consideration of these points.</p>	
165	Kathleen P. Holahan	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>While it has been clear since the beginning of this project that the Multnomah County engineers favor alternative D, including their making a formal presentation to get it back on the table after it was removed by the Community Task Force as a whole, Alternative E, the alternative suggested by the community, appears to be the most flexible, cost effective alternative, and would require relocation of</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>the fewest established homeowners. The office building affected by E contains many small businesses which could be relocated. The owner of the office building has publicly indicated that he felt that people's homes were more important than commercial offices. The "homes" mentioned as being impacted by Alternative E are mostly unoccupied newly built condos.</p> <p>The instability of the hills and the site of the current west side interchange has been downplayed, and it is indicated that there is an engineering "fix" for that. Well, the hills of Portland do not stop moving, and that instability has been the cause of the historic problems with the current bridge, required removing segments of the current bridge as the ground relentlessly shifts towards the east. The west side of Alternative E would involve more stable ground, which would promote long-term stability of a new bridge.</p> <p>I am a widow on a fixed income living in one of the Sellwood Harbor condominiums that would be demolished by Alternative D. My intent has been to live in my home for the rest of my life -- as long as possible.</p> <p>While it is stated that Alternative D would only take 4 condominiums from Sellwood Harbor, and one from the group north of the bridge, no engineering studies have been done to demonstrate that this is feasible, and original projections were that 12 condominiums would be removed from Sellwood Harbor. The developers of the project have expressed concern that the integrity and construction of the buildings are such that units cannot be removed in a piecemeal fashion.</p> <p>In summary, I strongly support Alternative E as the best alternative with the most flexibility for the foreseeable future of this area.</p>
166	Bernie Bottomly, Portland Business Alliance	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>The Sellwood Bridge, as the only river crossing between the Ross Island and I-205 bridges, is an important component of the region's transportation system. The bridge provides local access for neighborhoods on either side, but also provides critical regional connections between Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. Further, any replacement bridge will serve this community for nearly a century. It is essential that transportation projects of this physical and financial scope be evaluated within a long-term regional context of economic and transportation needs and impacts.</p> <p>The Alliance feels the following elements must be addressed in considering the alternatives for addressing the obvious shortcomings of the existing structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost. While this should not be an overriding factor, it must be an important consideration in selecting an alternative. Neither the state, the region nor Multnomah County currently have sufficient funds to construct any of the proposed alternatives. While a federal stimulus package may be a potential alternative, the level of demand for these funds nationally means the likelihood of securing them for this project is small at best. In this case we should not let the perfect (and expensive) be the enemy of the good (and fiscally realistic). 2. Address underlying issues. The project should address the underlying issues of structural adequacy, safety, seismic stability and, to the extent possible in this constrained corridor, capacity. The Alliance continues to believe that this facility is and will continue to be part of an important commuter and freight facility and its design should reflect that fact. 3. Safety. The reason we are considering a new structure is because the existing bridge has significant safety concerns that will, in the short term, grow worse as the approaches to the bridge continue to deteriorate. We should not spend the vast sums being contemplated for this project in addressing the structural safety problems just to create new ones in the traffic flow patterns or isolation of bike and pedestrian users. 4. Minimize impacts on business and neighborhoods. No project of this nature can be completed without some impact on the neighboring community. That is just a fact of living in an urban

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>environment. However, to the extent possible given financial realities and the necessities of constructing a project of regional importance, the impacts on businesses and neighbors should be minimized.</p> <p>After assessing the characteristics of the options presented, the Alliance finds that Option D unphased sub alternative comes closest to meeting the decision criteria stated above. While it has some drawbacks, no project of this kind can be conceived without some tradeoffs.</p> <p>Our reasoning for eliminating the other alternatives from consideration is as follows:</p> <p>Option A. This alternative fails on a number of our criteria. It is one of the most expensive, it does not fully address the underlying shortcomings of the existing structure and the construction of a separate bike/ped bridge could have significant impacts on existing businesses. Finally, under either a phased or unphased approach this alternative would require extensive closures of the existing facility, which will have significant impacts on businesses in the Sellwood area. Finally, this option and Option B include a roundabout, which the Alliance believes may be unworkable in this configuration.</p> <p>Option B. This alternative has the same failings as Option A, but is more expensive. The Alliance has difficulty in seeing how the construction of a temporary bridge at a cost of \$30 million is viable given the difficult questions regarding the financing of the overall project. At the end of the day, the rehabilitated bridge will not have a useful life expectancy that could justify the investment of \$222 million in reconstruction costs.</p> <p>Option C. While this option is attractive from a cost standpoint, the Alliance believes it has two drawbacks. The first is the length of closure required, particularly in the unphased sub alternative. The second is the proposal to place the bike/ped facilities under the roadway. Our experience with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) makes us highly averse to creating spaces that are not visible, have periods of low use, and would tend to be dark and isolated. These tend to be areas prone to criminal behavior, graffiti, drug use and other undesirable behaviors that will tend to make this facility unattractive to commuters and recreational users.</p> <p>Option E. The cost of the through arch bridge sub alternative for this option appears prohibitive but the greatest disadvantage to this option is the significant adverse impact on existing businesses on both the east and west side of the river. As we stated earlier, it's impossible to pursue a project of this scale without some business impacts, but this alternative seems to maximize rather than minimize such impacts and should therefore be rejected. While this bridge provides significant additional capacity, the constraints of SE Tacoma Street are such that the additional bridge capacity may not translate into decreased transit times Sellwood neighborhood.</p> <p>The Alliance has serious concerns regarding cost escalation for the phased sub alternatives. Inflation, the mobilization and demobilization of work crews and contractors, the likelihood of changing political leadership leading to modifications to the design are all likely to add considerably to the total cost of the project. For this reason, the Alliance recommends moving forward with the unphased sub alternative to Alternative D to minimize cost and maximize the efficiency of the construction process. We acknowledge this will require a longer period of construction impacts to bridge users and Sellwood area businesses, but believe this is mitigated by the fact that this alternative can be achieved with a minimum period of full bridge closure.</p> <p>We acknowledge that there will be impacts on the adjacent neighborhoods and fully support design and engineering options that minimize those impacts to the extent possible while still providing for local and regional mobility.</p> <p>Resources for transportation projects are highly constrained at the local, state and federal levels. In order to maximize potential financial support, improvements should be made to address the significant capacity problems that currently exist. This will be an extremely costly project with a very long lifespan.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
167	Dick Springer	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>Dear People: Native Oregonian & SE Portland resident most of my life -- Sellwood homeowner for 24+ years. Former state legislator representing SE & SW Portland for 16 years (1981-96, including service on the Senate Transportation Committee and as Senate Majority Leader).</p> <p>Though I was not a member of the Community Task Force, I attended most of its meetings as well as several of the the elected officials (and agency directors)meetings. I have testified and presented written comments to both groups (spring '07).</p> <p>As a candidate and legislator I have participated in countless neighborhood meetings and visited thousands of constituents door-to-door. Traffic congestion, and adverse impacts on local residents was always among the top five issues identified by voters.</p> <p>I represent only myself in these comments and have no financial, business or other tangible interest in the bridge options. My primary concern is to protect the best interests of my neighbors consistent with prudent public policy.</p> <p>I prefer a conservative approach -- either no build or the least disruptive re-habilitation option, recognizing that the west approach requires relatively immediately attention regardless of the choice. Multnomah county and the state have a wealth of experience in the successful restoration of older and more heavily traveled bridges -- St. Johns, Ross Island, Hawthorne & Broadway, to name a few.</p> <p>In my previous appearances noted above, I have stated that bikes & pedestrians are a priority, as well as public safety and Tri-Met buses -- heavy trucks are not. The trucking industry rep testified candidly at the 12/10/2008 public hearing that truckers do not now (due to weight limits) and will not rely upon the Sellwood Bridge in the future. I hope he is correct as far as his prediction and accurately reflects the position of his peers.</p> <p>We can buy more time at a reasonable annual cost in order to re-evaluate needs in 10-20 years when transportation modalities & usage will most certainly have changed in ways that we may not be able to foresee. Perhaps in that time, other jurisdictions and/or the region will recognize responsibility for another South Willamette River crossing or at least share the financial costs.</p> <p>Of particular concern to me is the lack of any helpful information about the impacts of massive constructon upon the extremely sensitive habitat for endangered species -- natural riverbank and park lands. It is equally as difficult to learn what mitigation may be recommended, or how much funding will be available, or how it will be allocated among competing interests.</p> <p>Thank you for you kind consideration.</p>	
168	Miriam Nolte	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>My preference is for option E for the new Sellwood Bridge. With alternatives A, B, C, and possibly D, a temporary bridge could be an option. Since I live at Riverpark Condominiums in the tower building, the idea of having a bridge on either side of the building for an unknown amount of time, seems an incredible inconvenience, impacting our property values and quality of life here. Option E does not take out any homes. Also Option E would require no bridge closures during construction of the new bridge to the South.</p>	
169	Sanford Rome, Thersa Terrace Apartments	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	<p>The snow has limited my ability to provide a real insite analysis. Postponement of the filing date would</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		be helpful if extended to at least 1 week after the snow thaws.
170	Kate MacCready	Received via Web Site
	<p>Of the four bridge plans presented, I was disappointed to note that in all there was such an emphasis on auto lanes. Although some ped lanes were included, I would have liked to see designated bike lanes. Also, some reference to earlier mentioned possibilities for trolley tracks would have been far sighted.</p>	
171	John Gillam and Mauricio Leclerc, Portland Bureau of Transportation	Received via Mail In (171_Memo_Sellwood_Bridge_PDOT_EIS_Comments.doc)
	<p>Below are comments focused primarily on the Transportation section of the EIS. Other City bureaus are expecting to comment of different sections of the document. Comments are organized in different sections to address travel patterns, traffic operations, a review of the alternatives from a bicycle and pedestrian perspective, comments on the different cross sections, and other considerations.</p> <p>Travel Patterns</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Reason for why bridge improvements would not lead to increased vehicular capacity in both corridors is not satisfactorily explained.</p> <p>Congestion points on the two corridors (Hwy 43 and Sellwood/Tacoma) during peak hours are located at signalized intersections north at Taylors Ferry Rd/Macadam in the west and at Tacoma at SE 13th and SE 17th in the east, as well as on the bridge itself. To increase vehicular capacity, these signalized intersections would have to be widened in addition to widening the bridge. Doing this goes beyond the scope of this project. The Bridge being two lanes also assists in metering traffic volume that otherwise would use local streets on the east side to bypass congestion in the Tacoma corridor.</p> <p>As a result, travel speed improvements are modest/insignificant (1 or 2 mph in 2035) across the River, which leads to unchanged travel patterns.</p> <p>On Highway 43, as a result of west end interchange improvements, there are significant travel speed improvements (up to 7-8 mph) in the immediate area (SW Nevada to SW Riverdale). However, there are still significant congestion points north and south of the study area for people driving the Lake Oswego/Oregon City to downtown Portland corridor. In addition, the geographic constraints of the corridor limit the ability to attract more traffic onto the facility from other facilities. The end result is that the project does not lead to noticeable shifts in auto traffic.</p> <p>The EIS does not analyze travel impacts of alternatives on opening day, year 2015.</p> <p>The traffic effects of tolling have not been incorporated into the EIS. This should have an effect on peak travel demand if tolls are instated during the peak times.</p> <p>Mode split</p> <p>The EIS does not adequately explain the effect of the built alternatives on mode split. EIS is silent on mode split policy at the City and region.</p> <p>Compared to the No Build option, alternatives A through E provide significant improvements for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. The EIS identifies significant latent demand and continued growth of bicyclists. Transit service across the bridge would be resumed but it is not stated what future transit ridership across the bridge would be. As such, the EIS is silent on mode split changes as a result of the built alternatives. The EIS document would benefit from a combined table listing travel by different modes today and in 2035. The end result would be to show that the Built alternatives promote multimodal traveling and are more sustainable options than the No Build. In addition, the</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	City is embarked on a Streetcar System plan that will inform new streetcar alignments throughout the city, including this corridor. A potential outcome could be two streetcar alignments: the line to Lake Oswego and one crossing the River via the bridge to connect to Tacoma Street on the east.	
	Greenhouse gas emissions	Building on the points above, the EIS is silent on the effect of the alternatives on greenhouse gas emissions. Analysis should indicate that, while vehicle travel on the corridor would remain unchanged, greater transit and bicycle and pedestrian travel result in greater multimodal travel, leading to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions per bridge/study area user.
		EIS is silent on climate change and Peak Oil policy at the City.
	Freight	EIS should more clearly state the effect of the built alternatives on freight, which is to reinstate truck access currently limited as a result of the bridge's weight limitation. The effect would be to add about 1,500 trucks/large vehicles, or 4 percent of total daily traffic volume, back onto Tacoma and the bridge. The EIS should also state that the percentage and total truck volume (as well as truck type) would remain largely unchanged from the time prior to the 2004 weight restrictions).
	Traffic Operations	
	Eastern Interchange	
	Traffic	The EIS analyzed the effects of three treatments: a No Change, a full traffic signal at SE 6th Ave. and a loop road connecting north and south of Tacoma under the Bridge using SE Grand Avenue. The EIS states that in terms of operations, the No change and the loop does not significantly affect traffic operations on Tacoma but full signal leads to failing level of service (LOS) on Tacoma, spilling traffic onto the western interchange. This is the case if generous green time is given to SE 6th Ave. The City finds that a) even under the No Change, traffic during the PM peak backs up onto the west end of the bridge, and b) that a traffic signal with significantly reduced green time on SE 6th Ave. leads to congestion levels on Tacoma and the bridge that are not significantly different than the No Change.
		A pedestrian activated signal should be evaluated at this location given need to access across Tacoma and to community land uses, particularly to the north (Oaks Park, Sellwood Riverfront Park, Sellwood and Oak Pioneer Parks) as well as to future bridge sidewalks and bike lanes.
		City TSP LOS policy for Tacoma, a Main Street, is not stated. Instead, page 3-9 of technical report uses RTP LOS policy, which is different (LOS E for two hours is considered "acceptable"). As regional and City policy on LOS should be similar, we assume that a different classification was used to measure Tacoma. TSP Policy allows for F for the first peak hour and E for the second for Tacoma Street classified as a Main Street.
	Travel on local streets	
		The EIS indicates that the full signal would lead to the most cut through traffic using local streets, followed by the loop. The full signal, as designed in the EIS, would likely lead to more cut through, though it can be managed via a pedestrian activated signal or by reducing the amount of green time allowed for SE 6th Ave.
		The loop has considerable impact for cut through traffic, acting as a free flowing off ramp from the bridge to access the area north of the bridge. This loop would be hard to manage to diminish cut through traffic.
	Access to land uses	
		Oaks Park, Sellwood Riverfront and Pioneer parks, and commercial and residential can benefit from improved automobile circulation to serve local and non-local trips. The challenge is to have greater

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	neighborhood auto circulation not lead to greater non-local cut through traffic. Both the signal and the loop improve local accessibility to these land uses over the No Change.	
	Special events	A signalized intersection would be able to be managed for special events. A loop helps primarily eastbound traffic but gaps in traffic on Tacoma are still needed.
	Western Interchange	Three alternatives were evaluated as part of the EIS: a roundabout option (with and without pedestrian/bicycle facilities), a signalized option (single-point urban interchange) and a free flowing option (trumpet design). Below are some comments:
	Roundabout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear that the roundabout works well for pedestrians and bicyclists. The metering device helps traffic flow within the interchange during peak times so that it doesn't shut down, but how vehicles are supposed to allow for the safe crossing of peds and bicyclists is not clear (motorists in roundabouts are generally looking at oncoming traffic from the left, which may lead to less visibility for peds/bicyclists trying to cross using the marked crossings). • • Not clear whether design would accommodate streetcar operations over the bridge from Hwy 43; it may require some additional engineering design and traffic control devices.
	Trumpet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Pedestrian access and bicycle access severely limited. Access to cemetery poses significant negative impacts to business services and for pedestrian and bicycle access across cemetery. • • Transit access severely limited via out of direction travel and longer distances.
	Signalized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Works best for pedestrians and bicyclists accessing Hwy 43 and the cemetery • • Free flowing northbound movement onto Hwy 43 from the bridge, needs more analysis, if there is a lot of pedestrian use during the AM peak. • • Traffic operations seemed to have been modeled assuming a different intersection design: operations allow north to east traffic to occur at the same time as north to west traffic. Interchange design does not seem to allow that to occur. • • Interchange could be designed to have one southbound/through lane onto Hwy 43 south and to access the cemetery.
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Project team should ask for exemptions from ODOT as to the required spacing for access to the interchange in the Hwy 43 corridor. As designed, alternatives cut off access to existing land uses or lead to access that is more costly and with more environmental and social impacts. • • Tolling is not properly analyzed in the EIS. Particularly, the traffic effects of tolling have not been incorporated into the EIS. This should affect the design of the western interchange in particular.
	Bicycle/Pedestrian Elements of Alternatives	
	Alternative A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides very good treatment of bicycle and pedestrian operations across the River because of the nature of the separated facility. • It avoids conflicts with the west side interchange. It avoids conflicts with the crossing of Tacoma and the need for cyclists and pedestrians to choose one side of the bridge over another. It may

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>lead to longer travel for bicyclists/pedestrians traveling south on Hwy 43 and to the cemetery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of Hwy 43 is an integral part of the design.
	Alternative B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides substandard facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. A minimum 5' bike lane on a high volume roadway is not the type of bicycling infrastructure legacy we wish to leave to the next few generations who will use this bridge. Ten-foot shared use pathways (as we currently have on the Hawthorne Bridge) are inconsistent with the expected volumes projected to use that bridge. With the promise of a pathway on the west side of the river, and a streetcar stop on the west side of the river, bicycle and pedestrian traffic on the bridge is expected to be high. Our knowledge with shared use paths informs us that pedestrians and cyclists alike may have generally negative experiences using such a narrow combined facility and that this type of facility will deter from cycling, or at least not attract to cycling, the very people we wish to have riding in an area as thick with off-street pathways as are found in South Portland. It creates uncomfortable crossings within a roundabout that will be more difficult for pedestrians to navigate than other proposed options.
	Alternative C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The undercrossing makes for a terrible design for pedestrians and cyclists. In recent years the City has closed pedestrian undercrossings because of the unsafe conditions fostered by covered, out-of-the-way and car-free public spaces. An alternative that would avoid pedestrians and cyclists being underneath would greatly improve this option.
	Alternative D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It provides very adequate facilities. Most importantly it provides opportunities for faster cyclists to separate themselves from both slower-moving cyclists as well as from pedestrians by creating 6.5' bike lanes. At the same time, this option provides adequate width for pedestrians to share space with slower-moving cyclists (one-way) cyclists.
	Alternative E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is awkward in the unbalanced cross-section it presents for pedestrians and cyclists. The suggested 8-foot pathway on the south side is too narrow for shared use and includes connections at the west end that are difficult at best. The shared 16-foot pathway on the north side is likely too narrow for the expected volumes of two-way bicycle and pedestrian traffic the bridge is expected to carry in the future.
	Cross Section Elements of Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For alternative A and C, which do not have sidewalks next to travel lanes, they would benefit from having pedestrian access via a sidewalk in case of stalling or other emergency access issues. They may be required as part of reconstruction. All alternatives should have the preferred bicycle lane and sidewalk width in the east end of the bridge at SE 6th Ave: that is, 12ft of sidewalk and 6.5 ft wide bicycle lanes. Per the Tacoma Main Street Plan, sidewalk width is 12ft and is to be acquired via dedication of land for right of way from adjacent properties. Alternative E's transit lanes. The EIS does not clearly state what the transit benefits would be in terms of travel time/operations savings. Transit lanes do not seem to provide for sufficient travel timesavings to merit the extra cost.
	General	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36 ft curb-to-curb or wider would better satisfy emergency response needs and special events. • A cycletrack design should be analyzed. • The alternatives would benefit from the continuation of the third, non-continuous lane from Tacoma to be carried all the way across the bridge. This would allow vehicles to rely less on bicycle facilities during emergency/special situations but it would not lead to more vehicle capacity on the bridge and on the corridor. <p>Other elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impacts of long bridge closure on the City’s emergency response are significant. • The impacts of long bridge closure on travel patterns and access to commercial areas are significant. • The impacts of long bridge closure on bicycle and pedestrian accessibility across the Willamette River are significant. • Bridge architecture, as with tolling and funding, is an important element that, even though it is not prominently detailed in the EIS, it does have a bearing in the City’s decision on the Locally Preferred Alternative. 	
172	Tom Armstrong, Portland Bureau of Planning	<i>Received via Mail In (172_BOP_Sellwood_Bridge_DEIS_comments_12-22-08.pdf)</i>
	<p>Dear Mr. Pullen:</p> <p>The City of Portland's Bureau of Planning offers the following comments on the evaluation of the potential impacts of the Sellwood Bridge Project in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The Bureau of Planning supports the rehabilitation or replacement of the Sellwood Bridge, especially as a means to restore east-west transit service, enhance pedestrian and bicycle connections, and provide for future expansion of the streetcar network across the Willamette River.</p> <p>However, the Bureau of Planning thinks the DEIS does not adequately consider or address the following issues:</p> <p>Consider the long-term impacts of the width of the bridge deck. The Sellwood Bridge project will restore and enhance a regional mobility corridor through the Sellwood neighborhood and Tacoma Main Street. By adopting a narrow definition of the project and project area, the DEIS does not adequately address the long-term impacts to livability in the Sellwood neighborhood in terms of community cohesion, north-south access across Tacoma Street, or vehicle cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. More importantly, the DEIS analysis of bridge deck cross-section alternatives does not consider the implications of the physical curb-to-curb width and the potential for future reconfiguration of the cross-section into a four-lane vehicle bridge.</p> <p>Create a more rigorous analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions. The DEIS includes a blanket statement that all alternatives have the same energy impact because the traffic volumes would be the same under all build alternatives. However, this analysis fails to consider the impacts of the travel time benefits on Highway 43 and the potential to induce additional vehicle traffic on this route. Also, the DEIS does not analyze the potential impact of enhanced transit service from dedicated transit lanes (Alternative E). This analysis is critical given the state, regional, county, and city goals with respect to climate change and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Address the impacts of re-establishing a de-facto freight route. The DEIS mischaracterizes the truck impacts as “enhancing local delivery service” when the project will re-establish a regional east-west truck route across the river with a forecasted 1,600 trucks per day. The DEIS also does not directly address the potential conflicts between 1,600 trucks and a forecasted 9,350 pedestrians and bicyclists. These potential conflicts need to be factored in the evaluation of the size, type and</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>location of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and would appear to favor a significant separation or separate facility. The DEIS does not adequately assess the impacts of this large volume of trucks on the character and quality of the Tacoma Main Street and its potential to degrade the attractiveness of the area for transit-oriented, pedestrian-friendly development.</p> <p>Re-evaluate Alternative C with respect to the pedestrian/bicycle facility as a separate facility that utilizes the structural support of the bridge, but not necessarily running directly under the bridge. As shown in the illustration below, a separate ped/bike facility that is attached to the bridge structure but separated from the bridge deck would provide a buffer from the vehicle traffic while achieving cost savings by utilizing the bridge structure and minimizing the number of in-water structures. Also, a winding ped/bike path gives greater linear length to absorb needed changes in elevation, which will provide a gentler slope to be more bike and pedestrian friendly. If properly configured it is conceivable that the ped/bike path could be almost at the same level as the roadway at the crest to minimize the height of the bridge for navigational clearance, thereby saving cost. Separating the ped/bike alignment and elevations can also optimize their east and west landings by providing direct connections to the trails on either side of the river and not requiring sharp corkscrew ramps. Concerns about safety, illegal camping, and pigeons are moot due to the exposure to the elements and the fact the alignment is for the most part not under the road deck.</p> <p>Evaluate the risk associated with optimizing the west interchange to provide access to River View Cemetery. Maintaining bicycle access to and through River View Cemetery is an important, but potentially risky objective. The final interchange design should be contingent on the acquisition of a public easement to maintain public access through the cemetery. At the same time, a cost-benefit analysis should consider other alternative routes or facility enhancements that provide an equivalent bicycle access from the bridge to SW Terwilliger Boulevard.</p> <p>Ensure the west interchange is designed to optimize the future capacity for streetcar service across the Sellwood Bridge. Transit corridors are a fundamental component of Portland's growth management strategy and all infrastructure investments should be optimized for higher capacity transit. Specifically, the DEIS evaluation of the three interchange alternatives does not address the suitability of the interchange design for streetcars in terms of slopes, curve radii, alignment, and ramp length to enable a streetcar connection across the bridge and onto the Willamette Shoreline Trolley tracks.</p>
173	Alan Mela	<p><i>Received via Mail In (173_AlanMela.pdf)</i></p> <p>I'm Alan Mela. My wife Karen & I own the Office Building at 380 SE Spokane – under the East end of the Sellwood bridge.</p> <p>We very much appreciate the work the Citizen Task Force has done in discussing and evaluating alternatives to replace the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>Receiving community input, considering it in light of past regional / local transit plans, and bearing in mind requirements for current transportation construction has been a difficult job. We have taken the surveys, and written some letters expressing our opinions on the situation as it has progressed.</p> <p>We also appreciate the consideration the Policy Advisory Group has given to the process and community concerns.</p> <p>Our office building seems originally to have been a door manufacturing plant comprising part of the East Side Mill complex in Sellwood's early years. Much evidence of that era remains in the exposed rough-hewn ceiling rafters & joists and post & beam supports, and even a large walk-in safe (built in Ohio) installed on the first floor that is used now for document storage. Not to mention some footings for an old bridge that was incorporated into the structure in the late 1920s.</p> <p>The office-clients range from Professionals, to Crafts-manufacturing offices, to Non-profits to Specialty Press. An eclectic and enjoyable group, many have been there for a number of years.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>This is not "your average office building". It is a very interesting place, and a special community of businesses – that we have had a great time working with. It is also a very 'efficient' building – expenses are low relative to comparables. And it exemplifies re-purposing and updated use of a major part of Sellwood's history – reinforcing the character of the immediate neighborhood and the community of Sellwood (which appeals to us from so many perspectives). It would be a shame to lose it.</p> <p>Karen & I are in the process of retiring to Portland (though looking to continue working), and to that end have bought a home nearby (an updated 1930s cottage). Aside from our 'day jobs' and raising a family, over the course of 30+ years we have owned seven small interesting (residential) income properties. We have enjoyed improving them & left them better for our tenure. This is our first office building, bought four years ago – intended to be the last, and a major source of retirement income.</p> <p>We are very seriously impacted by this. Most of the alternatives require condemning our office building. So we are looking at having to go through the very arduous process of finding a replacement within the narrow property-exchange-driven constraints of time, finances, and type of property. Doing this while transitioning into 'retirement' will only be more complicated and difficult.</p> <p>As we understand it, Alternative E would only 'take' it for nearly a year – vacating the building to remove the old bridge. There are multiple renters with varying lease expiration dates – as leases expire and vacancies rise, we still have to pay the mortgage & other bills. This also presents major challenges.</p> <p>The article on our building's history in the October BEE commented that in 1924 automobile travel was deemed less important than lumber operations, so that the old bridge had to be built to accommodate the Mill – a truly mind-boggling notion today. What remains of the Mill may have to be removed to accommodate a new bridge and its automobile traffic. But we have hoped that the 'Troll Building' might continue to be a part of the Sellwood community, a tie to its past, and to support such a terrific group of clients for many years into the future.</p>
174	Bob Akers, 40-Mile Loop Land Trust	<p><i>Received via Mail In (174_Sellwood_Br_Final_EIS_Letter.doc)</i></p> <p>The 40-Mile Loop has enjoyed great success and is now approximately three-fourths complete. As you know the 40-Mile Loop is a linear open space and trail network encircling much of the western part of Multnomah County and is nearly 140 miles in length. Of the 16 remaining gaps in the Loop, the Sellwood Bridge is one of the most important and strategic as the Loop makes its way back and forth from the west side of the Willamette River to the Springwater Section of the trail via the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>The 40-Mile Loop cannot be completed without it crossing the Sellwood Bridge. Equally important is that the trail over the bridge be a multi-use trail (12' wide), separated from traffic, not just sidewalks and bike lanes.</p> <p>The trail has become an important part of the region's multi-modal transportation system. This multi-use crossing is essential for serving the public in the years to come as alternative transportation becomes more and more important.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration and assistance with "Closing the Loop"</p>
175	Zari Santner, Portland Parks & Recreation	<p><i>Received via Mail In (175_Sellwood_Bridge_001.pdf)</i></p> <p>As detailed in the Draft EIS and Section 4(f) Evaluation, lands owned and managed by Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R) will be adversely impacted by Alternatives A-E. As stated on page 4(f)-1 Project actions requiring use of such resources must document that no feasible and prudent alternatives to their use exists, and must fully consider measures to minimize harm to those resources. The Director of PP&R must agree in writing that the project has avoided or minimized impacts to park lands</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	affected by the project.	
	The following are PP&R's preferred elements and ranking of alternatives (some with suggested modifications) based on avoiding or minimizing impacts to natural areas, developed parks and bike/pedestrian trails with the project area. Public safety and park access were also considered when selecting preferred elements and alternatives.	
	Portland Parks & Recreation Preferred Options for 4(f) Evaluation	
	Preferred Project Elements	
	East-side Connection	
	Free flow intersection as shown in Alternatives A and B. A proposed modification would be to include a bike/pedestrian only signal.	
	West-side Interchange	
	Signal interchange as shown in Alternatives D or E.	
	Access Road to Powers Marine Park	
	PP&R staff and visitors currently access Powers Marine Park from Hwy 43 and the Willamette River. New staff vehicle access can be made from relocated and improved west-side Greenway Trail. PP&R staff do not need an access road as shown in Alternatives A, B, and D.	
	Bridge Location	
	Rehabilitate or replace in current location as shown in Alternatives A-D.	
	Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Location	
	1st Choice: Underneath the bridge deck if the bike/pedestrian deck is off-set from the motorized use deck. This is a modification to Alternative C first proposed by Arun Jain of the City of Portland Planning Bureau.	
	2nd Choice: On the bridge deck as shown in Alternatives B or D.	
	3rd Choice: Separate bike/pedestrian bridge as shown in Alternative A, though PP&R would prefer a different location. Ramp between bridge and trail should be located in the developed area to the south, outside natural resource area.	
	Preferred Alternative as Detailed in the DEIS	
	1st Choice: Alternative C with a signal interchange on the west-side, free flowing intersection at the east-side connection and the bike/pedestrian deck off-set from the vehicular deck.	
	2nd Choice: Alternative D with a free flowing intersection at the east-side connection with a bike/pedestrian only signal.	
	Oaks Pioneer Church	
	PP&R does not support alternatives that impact or (potentially) involve relocation of Oaks Pioneer Church (Alternatives A, B-temp detour bridge, and E).	
	The following table details the rationale for selecting the preferred element and alternative and mitigation options for off-setting unavoidable impacts to park properties.	
	Element or Alternative/Rationale/Proposed Mitigation	
	East-side Connection, Free flowing intersection with a signal for bike/pedestrian crossing. (PP&R recognizes it is not the lead Bureau on this issue)/Avoid adding vehicles to neighborhood streets that serve as Willamette Greenway (Spokane) that full signal or under-crossing would make possible/ -	
	West-side Connection, Signal intersection; Hwy 43 relocated farther west as shown in Alternative D/Minimize impact on natural area acreage, width and connectivity from wider roundabout and trumpet designs/Minimize impact of pair of spiral ramps by shifting both landward out of river and	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>away from river bank. Minimize impact of spiral ramps by design to extend bike/pedestrian route along bridge approach ramps or to provide straighter ramps partially above west-side trail</p> <p>Bridge location, Rehabilitate or replace in current location/Although bridge will be somewhat wider, this area is already impacted and avoids new impacts elsewhere/ -</p> <p>Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Location, 1st Choice: Underneath the bridge deck if the bike/pedestrian deck is off-set from the vehicle deck. This is a modification to Alternative C./Make the most direct connections to trails on both sides of river by minimizing the vertical climb; Eliminating the three layer spiral ramp; Eliminating need for on-street travel; Least impact to natural resources./Minimize loss of riparian area by relocating Hwy 43 to west as in Alternative D; Replace riparian area and improve habitat connectivity northwest of bridge.</p> <p>Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Location, 2nd Choice: On the bridge deck as shown in Alternatives B or D./Less confusing and potentially out of direction travel if cyclists and pedestrians are next to vehicles; Less desirable trail to trail connection; More impacts to natural resources/Minimize impact of pair of spiral ramps of pair of spiral ramps by shifting both landward out of river and away from riverbank; Consider extending bike/pedestrian route along bridge approach ramps or partially straightening ramps above west-side trail; Replace riparian area and improve habitat connectivity northwest and southwest of the bridge.</p> <p>Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Location, 3rd Choice: Separate bike/pedestrian bridge as shown in Alternative A though PP&R would prefer a different location./Impacts of smaller bike/pedestrian bridge in Sellwood Riverfront Park are less than that of larger vehicular bridge adjacent to Sellwood Riverfront Park and Oaks Pioneer Church; Additional impacts to natural resources./Minimize loss of riparian area by relocating Hwy 43 to west as in Alternative D; Replace riparian area and improve habitat connectivity northwest and southwest of vehicle bridge; Relocate the bike/pedestrian spiral southward, out of the existing natural area.</p> <p>If you have any questions about PP&R's comments, please contact me, or Brett Horner, Planning Manager, at (503) 823-1674.</p>
176	Erin Hayes	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>My biggest concern, as a Sellwood-Moreland community member, is the affect of traffic in our neighborhood. Tacoma Street used to be terrible to cross, it was a 4-lane mess. Over the last several years, we've worked to create a much better Tacoma Street which encourages pedestrian use. It still needs needs further efforts, but as a community, we're working on it. We need to build on what we've created, not destroy it by increasing traffic.</p> <p>Apparently commuters from Clackamas County have felt that their needs are more important than the people actually living in the neighborhood. Despite the fact that they aren't paying for the bridge. They don't care about Tacoma Street traffic or the pedestrian community. It's clear they're working to ensure our neighborhood become the most convenient thru-way for their inter-county commute.</p> <p>The DEIS needs to take Tacoma traffic concerns to heart as we do. Please don't cave to the demands of people who don't even live in the county.</p> <p>Thank you, Matt, Erin and Josh Hayes</p>
177	Greg Olson, Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee	<i>Received via Mail In (177_12-19-08_BPCAC_Sellwood_DEIS_Letter.pdf)</i>
		The Multnomah County Bicycle and Pedestrian Citizen Advisory Committee (BPCAC) appreciates the opportunity to provide input on this critically important project. Representatives of BPCAC have

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>participated in the project's community involvement process and have been impressed with the openness and comprehensiveness with which this effort has been conducted.</p> <p>BPCAC recognizes the importance of the Sellwood Bridge in providing a transportation connection for all modes of roadway travel and that some modes such as bicycling and walking have been at a growing disadvantage due to design and operational shortcomings of the existing structure compared to modern standards and travel needs. BPCAC also recognizes that the context for solving the Sellwood Bridge problem is a difficult one with competing environmental, modal, planning, and funding interests. Because of this complexity, BPCAC has chosen to focus its input on important design characteristics a successful project solution must have to serve bicycle and pedestrian users rather than signaling out a recommended design alternative. These essential characteristics would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An operationally safe and attractive crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians that encourages a growing use of these modes. The design should be mindful that these users range from experienced riders and walkers to casual recreationists including small children on a family bicycle outing. A sufficiently wide multi-use path or a combination of shoulder bicycle lanes and sidewalks could be suitable for meeting this need. • Full network access for non-motorized travelers. Linking bicyclists and pedestrians just to Greenway trails or adding the Cemetery cut-through does not go far enough in addressing bicycling and walking as key travel modes for the future. Within the 75-year design life of the new bridge, it is reasonable to expect improvements along Highway 43 to support non-motorized travel – an important consideration in choosing the design for the west intersection. • A secure crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians that gives users a reasonable feeling of safety from criminal activity or other attractive nuisances. This would be especially important for solutions that involve removing bicyclists and pedestrians from the view of other travel modes and activities. • construction and phasing plans that minimize disruption to bicycle and pedestrian travel. Non-motorized modes of travel are generally more adversely impacted by lengthy detours or prolonged route closures than other travel modes. • Convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to transit on Tacoma Boulevard and Hwy 43. • A visual asset that is attractive to the different user modes and complements the natural setting and community context. • Consider principles of sustainability in the design and maintenance of the facility. <p>Among the alternatives currently being considered, Alternative "D" comes the closest to achieving the above desired characteristics.</p> <p>Please keep this committee informed of the Board's plans for the Sellwood Bridge.</p>
178	Paul Henson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	<i>Received via Mail In (178_SellwoodbrDEIS.doc.pdf)</i>
		<p>The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Sellwood Bridge Project, SE Tacoma Street and Oregon State Highway 43, Multnomah County, Oregon. The Service has reviewed previous National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) stages of this proposed project through the Collaborative Environmental and Transportation Agreement for Streamlining (CETAS) process. Early agency coordination through the CETAS process has the goal to effectively implement the policy of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of impacts to natural resources and to provide early input regarding a project's impacts under other laws, such as the Endangered Species Act. As project planning continues, the Service anticipates working with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) through CETAS on recommendations for</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>appropriate restoration and/or mitigation associated with a preferred alternative per our Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401) responsibilities.</p> <p>A no build, and five build alternatives have been presented in the Sellwood Bridge DEIS. The five build alternatives include two alternatives that involve rehabilitation of the existing bridge (Alternative A includes a separate bike/pedestrian bridge), and three replacement bridge alternatives. Of the three replacement bridge alternatives, alternatives C and D would be built along the existing bridge alignment while Alternative E would be on a new alignment north of the existing bridge.</p> <p>The proposed project site is within a heavily developed corridor generally with degraded environmental conditions. However, the Willamette River provides anadromous and resident fish habitat and is a critical migratory corridor. Riparian habitat in the Willamette River corridor is relatively limited laterally but does provide some habitat to various species of resident and migratory birds. Much of the historical habitat was forested wetlands and uplands. Currently, commercial and residential development occupy most of the land around the proposed Sellwood Bridge Project with Oaks Bottom Park just north and River View Cemetery to the east providing forested open areas.</p> <p>The Service supports Alternative C with the through-arch bridge because we believe it has the fewest impacts on the aquatic and terrestrial habitats in the Sellwood Bridge Project area. The Service believes Alternative C best balances the long-term environmental objectives of minimizing habitat removal and disturbance, minimizes the amount of new impervious surface needing stormwater management, and beneficially reduces the amount of bridge structures (number and volume) in the Willamette River which influences fluvial processes and fish passage.</p> <p>The Service is interested in the development of a restoration or mitigation plan that compensates for habitats being impacted in a biologically sound and equitable manner. Determining the location, habitat quality and type and the long-term management of sites are important factors the Service wants to remain involved in the for the Sellwood Bridge Project. The Service will continue to work on the alternative specific environmental mitigation items through the CETAS team process.</p> <p>If you wish to contact us to discuss these comments, please contact David Leal of my staff.</p>
179	Michael Brodeur, Sellwood Medical Clinic	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>I have a medical clinic on S.E. 133th and Umatilla. We provide primary care medical pediatric and specialty cardiology services. Closing the bridge would be difficult for our patients and staff who come from the west side.</p> <p>I live in Sellwood Harbor. Bridge option "D" would displace nine and possibly twelve families. Therefore option "D" should not be a consideration.</p> <p>The effect of the project on people and families is the most important priority.</p> <p>I appreciate all the work that has been done</p>
180	Julie Weis	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
		<p>Keeping the Sellwood Bridge open during construction of a replacement bridge is essential -- hence I support either Alternative D or Alternative E. My husband and I bought our home in Sellwood in 1998 and never dreamed that our access would be cut off for an extended period of time by a bridge closure. I travel the bridge twice a day, both for work and to access service providers on the immediate west side of the bridge. There simply is no good alternative route for those of us in Sellwood seeking to travel in that area -- forcing people to take the Ross Island Bridge would be incredibly wasteful of resources and time, not to mention extremely disruptive.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
181	Dee Horne	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>As I live in Sellwood close to the bridge and commute to Beaverton each day, my first priority is to keep the bridge open during the entire construction process. Also, the whole neighborhood is defined by the quaint small businesses that would suffer if the bridge were closed.</p> <p>My choice is D as future development is possible, bridge will be open, safety considerations for bikes, peds and cars are dealt with, not as many businesses, residences to be removed. The interchange on each end I'm not so concerned about as long as it is smooth and doesn't create huge back ups as is now. There should be access for autos entering from south of Tacoma during morning rush hour. Perhaps a light half way between bridge and 13th or light at east end of bridge for commuters between 12th and river, south of Tacoma to merge into traffic and onto bridge during commute times. This light would only function at commute times.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my comments.</p>		
183	Barbara Sloop	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>You have accumulated many statistics and figures on the Sellwood Bridge and have a decision to make.</p> <p>I am an 18 1/2 year resident of Sellwood Harbor Condominiums and, in contrast, offer an emotional, human price tag for you to consider. I am a widow in my seventies, living on a fixed income (which has diminished considerably in this distressing economy), and my wonderful home is one of the four which would be removed for Alternative D. This alternative would affect me tremendously, but would affect all the others living at Sellwood Harbor, as well. It would actually destroy our entire community of seniors – financially, emotionally and aesthetically – by reducing revenue to the condo association for monthly expenses and by destroying its amenities and basic ambiance. None of us wants to move at this stage of life but if we did, our condos are not saleable with this onus on the property and our property values continue to be severely eroded. This fact wouldn't matter if it were only on paper and we did not have to move at great expense.</p> <p>In contrast, Alternative E, which we all favor, has many positive factors: it impacts office space (easily relocated) instead of homes; it is the least expensive (if built at 64') and quickest to build; it lands on stable soil on the west bank of the river; it retains Oaks Pioneer Church (which was moved to the present site and could be moved slightly to the north) and Oaks Park with little impact.</p> <p>We residents of Sellwood Harbor are proud and active participants in the Sellwood neighborhood. We LOVE the location and do not want to lose our homes – but we are also thinking people and offer these sound reasons for you to study and select Alternative E. Alternative D does not consider the impact on the lives of good citizens. It is a known fact that when people have major changes in their lives (a death in the family, divorce, loss of job, loss of home, etc.), people become ill. Think of your own parents in such a situation. I urge you to vote for Alternative E as the best long-term solution.</p>		
184	Michael Crean	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) – An LCCA is the most appropriate methodology to compare project alternatives which contain rehabilitation and replacement options. It would more accurately estimate the overall costs of project alternatives and result in the selection of a design that ensures the facility will provide the lowest overall cost of ownership consistent with its quality and function. It is because it factors in not only construction cost but operation and maintenance costs as well as economically useful lives of the various alternatives. For instance the economical useful life of a rehabilitation option is much shorter than that of a new replacement. Its' maintenance and operation costs are also higher. These would be taken into account with a LCCA.</p>		

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
185	Jim Friscia, SMILE	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>As a member of the Sellwood Moreland neighborhood, I want to be sure that whatever choice is finally made takes into account the Tacoma Main Street plan that as adopted by the city. I also want to reiterate the position as taken by the SMILE board that any choice made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoids increasing traffic pressure on the two lanes of Tacoma Street; 2. Does not increase neighborhood cut through traffic; and 3. Preserves the economic vitality, ambience and prestige of the Oaks Pioneer Church, a nationally registered historic structure. <p>Personally I also want to add that I support replacing the bridge on the current alignment and that bridge closure during construction be minimal or not at all to avoid adverse impact on neighborhood businesses.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		
186	Dustin Posner	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Preferred alternative is option 'B'. 2) I really dislike the separate Alternate bike/pedestrian bridge to the north of option 'A' 3) I really dislike the underdeck pedestrian/bike section of option 'C'. 4) Option 'E' is totally unacceptable because of the destruction of the little community chapel building in Sellwood park. 		
187	Adam Barka	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
<p>The West side a traffic light intersection, or a trumpet shape intersection.</p> <p>The bridge cross-cut should be Alignment B, this has enough space for both peds, bikers, and vehicles, with the possibility for an extra lane.</p> <p>The East side should have a right-turn underpass onto SE Grand Ave, or a 3 lane setup with the center lane turning North onto SE 6th Ave.</p> <p>Bridge style does not matter, I am a man of function over form. \</p> <p>The open house very informative since I had the chance to ask engineers about what has to be done on the bridge.</p> <p>Phasing also makes more sense after a small economic discussion, and there were also some structural and historical point made clear which I didn't find in the DEIS – namely that a very small part of the structure on the East side is ~120 years old.</p> <p>I'd either support a light or the trumpet shaped intersection. Roundabout would be very hard to deal with.</p> <p>However, a light means a built in cost of operation... This is just a note on making it efficient in the long run too.</p> <p>Thanks you for asking for our opinion.</p>		
188	Jim Brick, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	<i>Received via Mail In (188_Sellwood_Bridge_DEIS.doc)</i>
<p>The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) has reviewed the DEIS for the Sellwood Bridge Project and offers the following comments:</p> <p>ODFW supports alternatives and design options that create the least amount of negative impacts to</p>		

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	fish and wildlife populations.	
		When the final alternative and design options are chosen, ODFW looks forward to working with the Oregon Department of Transportation and Multnomah County to assist in the final design or mitigation measures that provide the most benefit to fish, wildlife and their habitats.
		ODFW also provides the following specific information pertaining to the DEIS:
	3-13 Water Quality-ODFW suggests mapping proposed locations of water quality treatment facilities for inclusion into the FEIS.	
	3-14 Hydraulics-Balancing of cut/fill	
	Page 3.151: 3.14.3 Mitigation-	ODFW recommends round piers as a mitigation option. Inwater bents with square pier designs create greater scour than round piers. Inwater bents with square piers also increase the amount of large woody debris captured which can lead to gravel bar development.
		Excavating stream banks as a mitigation measure to offset potential “rise” in the FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area is not advisable. This type of mitigation measure destroys valuable riparian habitat, upsets habitat forming process and likely require additional mitigation to offset impacts to stream and riparian function.
	3-15 Aquatic Resources;	
	Page 3-156: Habitat in the Project Vicinity-	The sentence within the last paragraph of this section states, “The lower river was used by salmon and steelhead trout as a migration corridor”. A clarifying sentence is needed. Historically the lower Willamette River was a major rearing area for salmon and trout. In the resent past, as a result of human influences on the river, the lower Willamette is primarily considered a migration corridor. Recent ODFW investigations documented evidence of salmon spawning in the lower Willamette River.
	Page 3-157: Other Anadromous Fish Species-	ODFW suggests changing the title to: Other Native Anadromous Fish Species. American Shad are an anadromous fish species but a non-native fish species.
	Page 3-160: Piers in the River-	This is a good opportunity to discuss the type of instream habitat within the proposed cross section of the river and how various pier types (square, round, ect.) effect or would not be affected by scour associated with different pier shapes.
	3-16 Vegetation	
	Page 3-166: Mitigation & Page 3-170 Mitigation (Stephens Creek)-	Removal of mature trees within the project area will occur as a result of the project. ODFW suggests utilizing mature large woody debris in either the restoration project on Stephens Creek, donating them to a local watershed council or other entity with planned restoration projects within the lower Willamette River basin.
	3-18 Wildlife	
	Page 3-174: Build Alternatives-Environmental Consequences-	This section states no effect on Peregrine Falcons. This section also states, “American Peregrine Falcon uses the area, but has not nested on the Sellwood Bridge”. Recent reports (October 30, 2008) by Audubon field workers indicate a falcon fledgling sighting on the Sellwood Bridge in the spring of 2008. The Audubon Society plans to monitor the site in the spring of 2009. ODFW suggests monitoring of the site with plans for mitigation measures assuming nesting is occurring on

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>the bridge. If the final bridge design chosen does not contain elements that would lead to successful nest building then a nest box should be considered for placement on the bridge.</p> <p>Page 3-175: Alternative Specific Impacts and Mitigation:</p> <p>Mitigation measures to minimize impacts to wildlife from blasting should be included in the FEIS.</p> <p>Appendix F-Summary of Permits and Clearances Needed:</p> <p>Need to included ODFW-Fish Passage Plan approval (OAR 635-412)</p>	
189	<p>Thomas J. Walsh</p> <p>Subject: 1) Sellwood Bridge Draft Environmental Impact Statement. 2) My preferred alternative for the project</p> <p>Dear Mr. Pullen:</p> <p>I have some comments on the DEIS. I have labeled them with the number and title of the section of the DEIS to which they pertain. The DEIS contains a lot of useful information. However, it does not comply in many areas with the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations. The DEIS is supposed to give the environmental consequences and impacts of the proposed actions [40 CFR 1502.16]. It is not at all complete in this respect and for one environmental effect assessed, noise, it is erroneous, misleading and contradictory. My comments are not exhaustive. Although, I discuss some technical issues and I am certain that what I say is correct, I claim no technical expertise. Following the comments on the DEIS, is a brief discussion of my preferred project alternative. It is a modified version of Alternative C.</p> <p>DEIS COMMENTS</p> <p>Section 1.6 Why is the project needed?</p> <p>The Sellwood Bridge is described as a Truck Access Street. Some Sellwood neighborhood streets are also truck access streets. In the DEIS there is little discussion of the need for or the benefits of large trucks having ready access to the area and none whatsoever of their adverse effects. Most local businesses cannot accommodate them. There is little parking for them. The few that currently make deliveries often double park on side streets leaving barely enough room for an automobile to pass. They make a lot of noise (see Section 3.1.9 below). Their exhaust fumes, especially under certain atmospheric conditions, are obnoxious and unhealthy. The bigger ones fail to stay in designated lanes when making turns. When they turn at street corners they sometimes go onto the sidewalk. Also, drivers waiting in left turn lanes may have to back up out of the way of a truck so that it can complete its turn. Trucks block the line of sight at street intersections when they ignore the law and park too close to the intersection, which they often do.</p> <p>Section 2.3 Construction Activities</p> <p>Blasting will be used on the west side of the river for all build alternatives, most likely at night and on weekends. No information on the size, frequency, noise and shock generation, chance of damage to nearby structures from ground shaking or details on the times of day – other than that they will be at night – of these blasts is provided. The purpose of an EIS is to inform the public of environmental effects, especially adverse ones, which in this case has not been done. This should be remedied in the FEIS.</p> <p>Section 3.18 Wildlife</p> <p>It is well known that sea lions are found in the Willamette River. The federal Marine Mammal Protection Act makes it illegal to harm them. Possible impacts on them of this project are ignored in the DEIS. Some people do not like them, but others enjoy seeing them. Deer may venture into the project vicinity. I have seen them on East Island while walking on the Springwater Trail. The bald eagle uses the project area. It is still listed as threatened by the state. There is a federal Bald Eagle</p>	<p><i>Received via Mail In (189_TomWalsh-SellwoodCommentL.pdf)</i></p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	Protection Act.	<p>Compliance with federal and state mandates for treatment of the species is not mentioned in the DEIS. Further, the public is interested in any detriments to the eagles which might occur despite compliance with the mandates. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has responded to a recent petition from the Center for Biological Diversity, et al., and agreed to consider the red tree vole for listing under the Endangered Species Act. This creature lives in Douglas fir trees and, according to park personnel, inhabits Tryon Creek State Park. The northern boundary of the park is about a mile from the west end of the Sellwood Bridge. It is possible that the vole can be found in Douglas firs close to or within the project and that it could be listed by the time construction is initiated. If there is any possibility of this situation arising, then the effects of the project on the vole must be treated in the EIS</p>
	Section 3.19 Noise.	
		<p>There are a number of problems with the noise analysis in the main DEIS volume. They appear to have come about from commission of errors and attempts to mislead. In the DEIS (Fig. 3.19-10), traffic noise levels are given at selected locations affected by the project for what is described as existing conditions. They are not for existing conditions. They were computed assuming that the current vehicle weight limit of 10 tons was not in effect. This limit was imposed in 2005. A limit of 32 tons had been set in 1985. The composition of the traffic over the bridge used in the computations included all vehicles licensed for highway use. No mention is made of this fact. One has to happen to come across it in a document [Sellwood Bridge Project Noise Technical Report, CH2MHILL] which is not issued with the DEIS but is only available upon request. The result of this deception is to make the existing conditions appear noisier. The proposed alternatives, by comparison with these fictitious existing conditions, will cause a lesser increase in noise than they really do [Noise levels memorandum, Table 1, Noise Technical Report]. Also given in the DEIS are the predicted levels for the future traffic conditions at these locations for the different alternatives. The noise levels are said to be in units of dBA. This is basically untrue. The implication is that they are fast response measurements which is what the human ear would hear. They are not. They are Leq(h) which is the hourly average of the noise in dBA [Noise Technical Report]. Misrepresenting them in this way leads one to believe of course that the noise, though objectionable, is much less worse than it really is. I consider these averages very misleading. They are very much favored by groups and organizations which do not want limits placed on it, e.g., aircraft owners, off-roaders, the Federal Aviation Administration, the USDA Forest Service, Federal Highway Administration, etc. Noise levels should be given in environmental documents as it would be measured by rapid response meter settings (0.2 second) as a function of time. Maximum values and those exceeded 0.1%, 1%, 5%, 10%, etc. of the time for each hour of the day should be given. If averages are given for some reason, they certainly should not be mislabeled.</p>
		<p>Maximum stated values for noise (Fig. 3.19-10) range up to 72 dBA. If they really are in dBA, as the term is ordinarily used, they are much too low. A casual walk along Tacoma St. will show that this value is now constantly exceeded. A low-priced sound meter (may not meet ANSI specifications) indicated that the emissions of most vehicles exceeded 72 dBA and many approached 83, 84 and even 85 dBA. There is even a contradiction in the noise section. Large trucks will be traveling Tacoma St. under the build alternatives. Table 3.19-1 gives the noise of a large truck at a distance of 50 feet as 90 dBA, not 72 dBA. On Tacoma Street, one cannot get 50 feet from passing traffic.</p>
		<p>Under the Build Alternatives, the resulting increase in noise from traffic is, for the most part, said to be negligible. There will be 9 times the heavy truck traffic on the bridge with many trucks weighing about 4 times that of those currently allowed on the bridge. The daily number of heavy trucks using the Sellwood Bridge in 2035 is predicted to be 1600. That, on average, is more than one a minute. A good portion of the time these large trucks will be accelerating from a stop. They will certainly be noisy (see Table 3-19.1 of the DEIS) and the increase from present conditions, which are bad, will greatly worsen on the bridge and Tacoma St. In addition to the increased truck traffic, on weekdays</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>there will be 10 bus trips across the bridge every hour.</p> <p>The claim is made in the DEIS that humans cannot distinguish between noise levels which differ by less than 3 dBA. This may be arguably so. (A chart in a reference on the subject [Cyril M. Harris, Handbook of Acoustical Measurements and Noise Control, Acoustical Society of America, 1998, Figure 17.13] would seem to indicate otherwise.) However, humans can certainly distinguish between some Leq(h) which differ by 0 dBA. A constant noise of 60 dBA for an hour is certainly different to the human ear from one which is well above 60 dBA for a few seconds and then silent for the remainder of the hour but which also has an Leq(h) of 60. The noise section seems very confused about the information it is presenting.</p> <p>Currently, traffic noise from OR 43 can be heard, as is admitted, in Sellwood Riverfront Park. It can also be heard in Sellwood Park and is annoying in both places. This situation will worsen with all the Build Alternatives since they will greatly increase the number of trucks using the route. Noise should be inaudible to humans and wildlife beyond the very local, immediate boundaries of its source. For roads, that would be the right-of-way.</p> <p>Even if the Oregon exterior Noise Abatement Criterion of 65 dB leq(h) for a residence is met, the noise at that location is still very intrusive and objectionable. Speech interference occurs at a noise level above 60 dBA when people are more than 6 feet apart and they are not speaking loudly ["Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety," EPA/ONAC 550/9-74-004, March, 1974 - other sources give lower levels for speech interference]. Hard-of-hearing individuals have much more difficulty understanding speech in noisy conditions than do those with normal hearing [Hearing Loss, Harvard Health Publications, 2000]. The needs of those so handicapped should be taken into account in any noise analysis. A letter from the Multnomah County Health Department to the Columbia River Crossing Project commenting on its DEIS [dated June 9, 2008; signed Lillian Shirley and Gary Oxman] cites studies showing the harmful effects of noise on health.</p> <p>Noise impacts from construction equipment such as that from trucks, cranes and other construction equipment is absurdly described as low. Yet, as pointed out above, Table 3.19-1 of the DEIS gives the noise of a heavy truck as 90 dBA and that is at a distance of 50 feet. Drilling of shafts and vibratory compaction are admitted to have high noise levels, but no quantitative data for them are given. Vibration and vibration induced noise are not treated. Mitigations are mentioned in the Noise Technical Report, but are very lacking in detail. Acoustic barriers around stationary equipment is one, but no description of their effectiveness or what the minimum levels would be which would require their use is discussed. Blasting is mentioned briefly in Section 2.3. Noise and shock waves from it and their effects on humans and other creatures are not analyzed. It is common knowledge that many dogs are very disturbed and/or frightened by fireworks. Mine is. The same would be true for blasting. It is reasonable to assume that much wildlife would react similarly. Many nocturnal predators, such as raccoons and owls, have hearing thresholds 10 dB below that of a human with good hearing (threshold 0 dB) [Richard R. Fay, Hearing in Vertebrates, Hill-Fay Associates 1988]. There is a good chance that many animals, both domestic and wild, would be panicked by blast noise.</p> <p>If noise from trucks, which can emit 90 dBA, is stated to be low, what level is considered high? The DEIS treatment of noise is not only deficient, it is illogical.</p> <p>Section 3.21 Air Quality</p> <p>In the determination of the effects of the project on air quality, it was assumed that the traffic levels for all alternatives, including that for the No-build, would be the same. This is perhaps reasonable. However, ignored was the fact that the composition of the traffic differs considerably between the No-build and other alternatives. The number of heavy trucks per day in the latter, projected to be 1600, exceeds the number per day in the former by a factor of 9. The effects of air pollution can be very local. On stagnant air days, when walking on Tacoma St., there is from time to time the smell of exhaust. This exhaust is most likely, and will be for years to come, harmful to those residing on</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>Tacoma St. and immediately adjacent to the bridge. A long study of children living within 500 yards of freeways showed that they suffered impaired lung function [“Freeways’ tainted air harms children’s lungs, experts say”, Los Angeles Times, January 26, 2007]. Traffic levels on the Sellwood Bridge and Tacoma St. are nowhere equal to that on a busy urban freeway. However, those living very close to the bridge and Tacoma St., say within 15 to 25 yards, may very well be harmed by the exhaust gases. It is asserted that stricter emissions controls on motor vehicles will reduce pollution over time. Contrarily, the letter from the Multnomah County Health Department to the Columbia River Crossing Project states that the increasing use of alternative fuels may worsen air pollution. Ethanol will increase acetaldehyde concentrations. Compressed natural gas will raise formaldehyde levels. Both of these chemicals are said to be probable carcinogens [Sellwood Bridge Project Air Quality Technical Report, CH2MHILL, October 2008]. A more complete analysis of air pollution is required.</p> <p>PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</p> <p>My preferred alternative would be keeping the current bridge and limiting its use to bicyclists and pedestrians. Of the build alternatives offered in the DEIS, I would like to see a version of Alternative 3 built. No matter which alternative is selected, the current weight limit on trucks of 10 tons should be kept. Large trucks are just too burdensome to the Sellwood neighborhood. Buses could be exempted from this limit. Walking and cycling across the bridge would be much more pleasant if the paths for these modes were separated from motor vehicle traffic and its noise, exhaust fumes and collision danger. This is achieved in Alternative C by putting the pedestrian/bicycle paths on a separate level beneath the one for motorized traffic. One objection to having the non-motorized traffic on this separated path is that its users are not visible to motor vehicle occupants and, therefore, in more danger and less likely to get timely help if needed. There are portions of the Springwater Trail which are not visible from a roadway over much greater distances than the length of the Sellwood Bridge. This does not seem to be much of a problem for the trail or discourage its use. A second objection is that the path suspended beneath the vehicle roadway would be covered overhead and attract the homeless and pigeons. This is a problem. As stated in the DEIS, the problem of the homeless and criminally intent can be mitigated by video cameras. Frequent patrolling by law enforcement would also help. This costs some money. The project sponsors seem ready to spend money on fancy, but not necessarily attractive, structures to make a statement, e.g., the through-arch bridge. Yet, I think, because better law enforcement costs money, it was not listed as a mitigation. Nowadays, most bridge users have cell phones and can easily notify police should any homeless loitering or camping occur. The pigeon roosting problem may be minimized by not having exposed ledges, girders, etc., suitable for their nests.</p> <p>Alternative C should be modified by the elimination of the 2nd traffic lane in the west bound direction in the middle of the bridge. Further, the simplest structure compatible with the underneath bicycle-pedestrian path should be selected. The simpler the structure, the less it will degrade the views of the surrounding cityscape and landscape, both of which are attractive. The through-arch design selected for this alternative is expensive, not pretty, and will interfere with other views.</p> <p>A SE Grand Ave. extension is part of this alternative. The DEIS admits that the extension would increase cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. It therefore should be eliminated from the project.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>I ask that you remedy the faults of the DEIS. I further request that one of my choices for preferred alternative and its method of operation (no large trucks) be selected. Livability is very important. It is very beneficial economically. Also, there are ethical duties to the environment and domestic and wild creatures.</p>
191	Claudia Martinez	Received via Mail In (191_Martinez.pdf)
	Mike I am a senior citizen and have arrangements at RiverView cemetery.	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>Please seriously consider using Alternative "E" so I can easily access the funeral home there and my family and friends especially the handicapped and elderly can conveniently access.</p> <p>Your consideration is deeply, gratefully appreciated on this matter of concern.</p> <p>Anything but C, maybe D, prefer E</p>	
192	Jerome and Judith Partch	<i>Received via Mail In (192_Partch.pdf)</i>
	<p>My wife and I purchased burial plots several years ago at River View Cemetery. One of our reasons for choosing River View was the availability of the Funeral Home at the main entrance of the cemetery. It is our opinion that Alternative "C" jeopardizes the future of the funeral home by closing the lower entrance to the cemetery from Macadam Avenue. The only access to the funeral home would be by a very difficult winding road through the cemetery from SW Taylors Ferry. Alternative C also closes the most convenient cemetery entrance for visitors from southeast Portland and Lake Oswego.</p> <p>Alternative E appears to be the best for continued access both during construction and into the future. But any of the other alternatives are better than C.</p> <p>WE know it is difficult to balance all interests in a project like this, but we urge you to consider the interests of all the people represented by the cemetery and reject Alternative C.</p>	
193	Wayne Skall	<i>Received via Mail In (193_Skall.pdf)</i>
	<p>Please do not displace homeowners in order to build a new bridge when option E is available. This is the most sensible option because no residences are destroyed. Residences and families should take precedence over businesses. The church can be moved away from the new bridge just as it was moved before. The temporary detour bridge would totally destroy any chance of our being able to sell our homes at Riverpark Condominium and would create an unlivable situation for us. We would be forced to take legal action and seek total condemnation and fair value for our homes. We would be placed in a construction sandwich which would destroy the quality of life that we now enjoy.</p>	
194	Dee Poth	<i>Received via Mail In (194_Poth.pdf)</i>
	<p>I sent a letter with my Sellwood Bridge comments and choices two weeks ago. I would like to add to that letter. I continue to support Alternative E but I neglected to say that I support the 64 ft. span not the 75' span that's being presented in the survey and the EIS. It was made very clear at the Task Force meeting and Policy Advisory Group meeting that this could go forward only if it was understood that all of the alignments and their integral parts could be interchanged among each other. The EIS doesn't address this mix and match concept in its analysis of costs of the alternatives. Multnomah County, in its not very well veiled support of the Alt. D alignment saddled Alternative E with the 75' span. The needs of the Sellwood-Moreland community will be served by the 64' spanned bridge while the threat of a 4-lane monstrosity going through the neighborhood would not be. The bridge can remain open while its being built. There's no question in my mind that the survey will result in overwhelming support for Alt. D, particularly from the neighborhood, because the opportunity to vote on Alt. E as a 64' spanned bridge was not made available to the public. While the survey provided some flexibility on changes to the choice you make, it's not adequate to make the point that we're really voting for the Bridge described in Alt D with an E alignment. Alt. E will not be getting the votes it deserves because it's a vote for a 75' bridge and the community doesn't want it. It's obvious from the EIS numbers that Alt. E as a 64' span bridge would be substantially cheaper to build than Alt. D. Alt. E is the best approach to replacing the Sellwood Bridge.</p>	
195	Gerald Fox	<i>Received via Mail In (195_Fox.pdf)</i>
	<p>l) In the short term, consider replacing the failed west approach with a steel structure.</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Appearance is vital. This must be a bridge to be proud of. 3) I think a cable stay would look dramatic and cost less. 4) The tower and abutments could be built around the existing bridge to reduce closure time. 5) See if the military is interested in building a temporary bridge. 6) Make sure the bridge can carry the streetcar. Actually designed for it, not just "lip service" 7) The east/west commute cannot be carried on Tacoma alone. Advocate for a future train service on the Milwaukie/Lake Oswego/Beaverton rail line. 8) Why does this bridge cost 3 times more than the proposed light rial bridge at OMSI? Cut out some or all of the interchange to save cost. 9) If neither Macadam or Tacoma is being widened, why do we need an expensive new interchange?
196	Martha Irvine	<p><i>Received via Mail In (196_Irvine.pdf)</i></p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>As a senior citizen who visits RiverView Cemetery where many family members, including my husband are buried, I am concerned about traveling from the East Portland area and not being able to have the lower entrance to River View Cemetery!</p> <p>Please consider maintaining this entrance for all those from the East side of Portland and of Gresham.</p>
197	C. Clark Leone	<p><i>Received via Mail In (197_Leone.pdf)</i></p> <p>I have read the Draft Environment Impact Statement on this subject, and for the record submit these comments about it.</p> <p>Of the five alternatives, only the "No Build" does not have an adverse impact on the setting of River View Cemetery, an historic resource. Alternative C is the worst, however, for in addition to having an adverse impact, it utterly destroys access from Macadam to the cemetery's historic Superintendent's House (now the funeral home). I am unalterably opposed to Alternative C for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My family has lived in and around Portland for five, going on six, generations. Most of my ancestors are buried in River View (even some who did not reside and expire in Portland) and have used all of its facilities. Hence River View is an ancestral burial ground for us. My relatives and I visit the cemetery frequently. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Because I live in Multnomah Village, I can conveniently use the Taylors Ferry Road entrances. When returning home from the Sellwood or Dunthorpe areas, however, I use the Macadam entrance to visit the cemetery. b. Other family members will encounter great inconvenience if the Macadam entrance is obliterated. Those relatives live on the east side, near Sellwood, or in Dunthorpe, and use the Macadam entrance exclusively. 2. No matter what time of day, and regardless of the season or weather, I see numerous bicyclists coasting from the Taylors Ferry/Palatine entrances down to Macadam, and pedaling uphill from Macadam to Taylors Ferry/Palatine. They use the route as a short cut and in order to avoid heavily trafficked streets. I believe that cyclists will be, and should be, dismayed and outraged to find that the cemetery's quiet, lovely roadway will no longer be available to them. <p>I therefore support Alternative E. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
198	G. Livingston	<i>Received via Mail In (198_Livingston.pdf)</i>
	<p>I am writing to you as an associate member of Riverview Cemetery, in regard to the lower entrance of said property on Macadam Avenue. I am in agreement with the board as to the preference of Alternative E.</p> <p>I have many relatives and friends interned at Riverview and other unfilled plats. I fully support the administration of Riverview on any alternative that seems to be the wisest.</p>	
199	Richard Atiyeh	<i>Received via Mail In (199_Aityeh.pdf)</i>
	<p>I was deeply disturbed when I read about the different alternates for the new Sellwood Bridge. My family has been in Portland from 1900. We have may of our family interned at River View since 1920.</p> <p>I do not understand why you have to destroy an old established entrance of a Cemetery that has been in the location since 1882. It was there before the existing Sellwood Bridge was built. Your plan calls for the removal of the historic building that is at the entrance of the cemetery. If the building has to be removed there is no other place for the Funeral Home on the River View property.</p> <p>I think that your plans disregard the people that use the cemetery entrance to visit their loved ones. Some times when you want to change a plan you do not consider who is going to be hurt by your decisions.</p> <p>I have reviewed your 5 alternatives and feel the only one to preserve the River View Funeral Home is E since it places the bridge and west end intersection further north. If this is not possible I strongly suggest ANYTHING BUT C.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my letter and I hope my feelings will be heard by the ones who will be making the decisions.</p>	
200	Victor Christiansen	<i>Received via Mail In (200_Christiansen.pdf)</i>
	<p>My wife and I have burial plots in Riverview Cemetery, and live in the Lake Oswego area, so our entrance to the cemetery is from the lower east entrance on highway 43 at what is now the west end of the Sellwood bridge. The lower entrance has so much historical value, and what we will us as our mortuary.</p> <p>The best plan for the west connection to the bridge is the plan E. Plan E would preserve teh historic lower entrance and the funeral home facility. We are losing so much historical property, so when we have choices as we do with this bridge west end, we should preserve what we can.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this matter, and we hope that the Sellwood Project committee will see the merits in saving the historical lower entrance. Many of use use the lower entrance to access the cemetery, and would find some hardship if it were to be removed.</p>	
201	Lois and Marty Coplea	<i>Received via Mail In (201_Coplea.pdf)</i>
	<p>Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment – Additional Comment – Please add to my original letter.</p> <p>Often when expressing concerns and preferences on an important project, it is an afterthought which in its "slow burn" becomes a front and center and extremely relevant thought which should impact the decisions being reached.</p> <p>With that said, please add to our comment letter which should be in the hands of Mike Pullen well before this writing, these additional comments:</p> <p>In reading the EIS there is initial confusion for the reader. There is now clarity of thought regarding</p>	

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>the possibility for different width spans to be adapted. I urge you to focus on the interchangeability of these various spans, if you will, for the various alignments under consideration.</p> <p>There are many considerations, demands, restrictions as well as many possibilities. Let us focus on the Alignment E with the 64' span. Let us ASK WHY THIS ALIGNMENT E WITH A 64' SPAN WAS NOT . . . HAS NOT . . . BEEN MADE AVAILABLE FOR A PUBLIC VOTE? This is our questin to each of you. Why is this possibility being kept away from the public? Why would "A Community Task Force" NOT present this alternative to the community? How can we residents demand this be offered up for vote?</p> <p>With deep concern,</p>
202	Robert Ehni	<i>Received via Mail In (202_Ehni.pdf)</i>
		<p>It came to my attention that the Sellwood Bridge Project may interfere with the lower level of River View Cemetery. At this time there are 5 alternatives that are being considered. I would like you to know that my choice would be option E. I would like the lower level of River View Cemetery to remain unchanged and to also maintain the lower entrance into the cemetery. Thank you for considering my comments.</p>
203	Anne Darrow	<i>Received via Mail In (203_Darrow.pdf)</i>
		<p>Riverview has been in my family for over 60 years when our lot was purchased by my father for his brother who was killed in WWII in the South Pacific. It would be a shame for people to come to the cemetery and have to travel over narrow roads, that were not meant for many cars, to reach the main building. In our case the families no longer live in Portland and are not familiar with the site. Also at issue would be the cost to Riverview.</p> <p>I cast my vote for E. Thank you.</p>
204	Mary King	<i>Received via Mail In (204_King.pdf)</i>
		<p>After attending the public hearing regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I wish to provide the following comments.</p> <p>Restoring direct TriMet bus service from Tacoma Street across the Sellwood Bridge to downtown Portland is my top priority.</p> <p>I commute by bus to downtown Portland from my home in Westmoreland and support any bridge option that favors public transportation and will not increase the number of vehicle lanes. Bus interchange stops should be included in the bridge design.</p> <p>Although I am in favor of the dedicated transit lanes in Alternative E, I am opposed to its northerly alignment.</p> <p>Providing safe access on the bridge for bicyclists and pedestrians is very important to me.</p> <p>I prefer the pedestrian and bicycle paths in Alternative D. I would also support a double-deck bridge design with a separate lower deck for pedestrians and bicycles, but I don't like the three lane vehicle design of Alternative C.</p> <p>I adamantly oppose Alternative E because it would encroach on Sellwood Riverfront Park.</p> <p>Honoring the Tacoma Main Street Plan is essential.</p> <p>Tacoma Street must remain a two-lane neighborhood street and must not become a through-fare for Clackamas County vehicle commuters. I favor a hybrid design that includes an east-side underpass to allow bridge users to travel to north from Tacoma Street without having to turn left across Tacoma. This will benefit visitors to Sellwood Riverfront Park and the Oaks Amusement Park.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>Avoiding negative impacts to Sellwood Riverfront Park is a significant issue to me.</p> <p>Alternative E is unacceptable because the northerly alignment will diminish the quality of Sellwood Riverfront Park. Noise, visual impacts, air quality and associated health concerns would detract from this important community resource. There is no comparable place to enjoy the river, gather on the lawn for concerts, events, off-leash dog exercising, and a respite from crowds, cars, and congestion. Although Willamette Park is nearby across the river, there is an entry fee. I also value preserving the current location of the Oaks Pioneer Church.</p> <p>Free-flowing traffic is necessary to reduce the potential for cut-through traffic into the surrounding neighborhood on the east side.</p> <p>I would not support a traffic light on the east side of the bridge, and I favor an underpass instead. I do not like traffic circles and prefer the west-side trumpet interchange. Preventing cut-through traffic into the surrounding neighborhood on the east side by keeping traffic moving is very important.</p> <p>Keeping the bridge open would be good.</p> <p>Although I consider the long-term benefits of building the best bridge possible more important than living with bridge closure, it would be good if the bridge could remain open during construction.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns.</p>
205	Jerry Renfro	Received via Mail In (205_Renfro.pdf)
		<p>I have attended the meetings for the Sellwood Bridge Project for the past two years. I have read the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and considered the five options proposed, Here are my thoughts on the bridge itself.</p> <p>One of the most important resolutions of the bridge project should allow for the smoothest flow of traffic possible upon its completion. I suggest that the trumpet interchange proposed in Option C allows for this. A stop light at each end of the bridge (or either end for that matter) will congest traffic just as many motorists currently experience at the intersection of 13th and Tacoma. A roundabout on the west end of the bridge seems to have a high likelihood of causing major congestion in peak traffic hours as well. Option C resembles what currently exists for the Sellwood Bridge. Although it is not perfect, it is probably the best in maintaining a continuous flow of traffic under all circumstance. The frustration of impatient drivers in stand-still traffic often causes behavior to deviate from the norm in a negative way.</p> <p>The proposed loop at the east end of the bridge for eastbound traffic should be considered regardless of which type of bridge is selected. Traffic bound for Oaks Park or Sellwood Park that is proceeding east over the bridge should not have to negotiate a left-turn on 6th Avenue during peak hours. The cloverleaf loop in Option C resolves this conflict. The underpass associated with the loop also would allow for motorists to get from the north side of Tacoma Street to the south side without having to proceed to 13th Avenue to cross with a traffic light. As mentioned above, adding a traffic light at 6th Avenue would cause unnecessary congestion.</p> <p>Aesthetically, in my opinion the Through-Arch Bridge is the best suited for the Sellwood community. Consider the bridges in downtown Portland. The Hawthorne, the Steele, and the Broadway bridges are works of art. The Morrison is a flat topped bridge that lacks character in comparison to those around it. Thus, the Through-Arch Bridge does justice to the wonderful Sellwood community. In addition, I would suggest lighting the bridge daily at dusk to enhance its beauty.</p> <p>I love cycling, but I hate having to cross the Sellwood Bridge on a bike. If there is oncoming cycling traffic, one person has to stop and hug the cement rail just so the other can pass. Any of the bridge alternatives would greatly help the cyclists of the Portland area.</p> <p>The construction of the new viaduct between East Moreland and West Moreland was a big inconvenience. However, residents made the best of it and hardly give it a second thought today. I feel</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>that not long after the Sellwood Bridge Project is complete, motorists will forget about the inconveniences associated with it.</p> <p>It is the businesses in the Sellwood area that we must consider. Can they survive unto a forty-two month period without patrons who would normally use the Sellwood Bridge? If we choose Option C would we then consider building the \$30 million temporary bridge? I think residents can make it without the bridge, but the businesses, can they survive? We must be sensitive to the entire community needs.</p> <p>I respect the feelings of those who expressed their concerns at the recent public testimony meeting held at OMSI on December 10th.</p> <p>On a final note, Infrastructure Projects seem to be getting the attention of our President-Elect. Is it possible the Sellwood Bridge Project might qualify as one of these projects? It is certainly worth pursuing.</p>
206	Donaldina Yim	<p><i>Received via Mail In (206_Yim.pdf)</i></p> <p>Regarding the various proposed design changes for the bridge project that would affect my future home at Riverview Cemetery where many of my family members reside now, I wish to voice my opinion about the different designs proposed. I feel that it is in the best interest of all those who have family and members who enter from the Sellwood Bridge and are used to that entrance to not modify it any more than the suggested "E". It is ridiculous to expect even the younger baby boomers to drive carefully up the curvy road leading to the plot of my most recently buried sister, whom I will be placed next to the next time God calls. Have you tried it during a good day? I was born 86 years ago in Portland and now live in California, which I like but do not wish to be buried here. So when the time comes, I hope you have the consideration and thought to look in the future for my family and maybe your too may pay me the honor of passing by my resting place up one of those curvy hills.</p> <p>Thank you for making an easy "E" alternative plan for that rickety old Sellwood Bridge, which happens to be not as important as it is, teh best way to have accesss to burial sites, such a beautiful one overlooking the Willamette River towards Mt. Hood.</p> <p>God bless you for doing this right thing for us that will be residing at River View Cemetery.</p> <p>Pick alternative "E" please. I like to have flowers to smell where I rest. Thanks.</p>
207	Margaret Foster	<p><i>Received via Mail In (207_Foster.pdf)</i></p> <p>My option preference is option E for the new Sellwood bridge and I will list the reasons why below:</p> <p>With alternatives A, B, C & possibly D, a temporary bridge could be an option. I do not want a temporary detour ridge. It would make our 49 family homes and property a "construction sandwich" between 2 bridges and render our property valueless. Our property values have already been severely reduced due to the issues created by the uncertainty of what will happen to the property.</p> <p>DEIS p. 3-54, 3-79</p> <p>With alternatives A, B, C & D we will "temporarily" lose the 14 parking spaces currently under the bridge. Each condo that has one of these spaces pays yearly property taxes on that space. We would need a tax abatement for this issue. DEIS p. 3-52, 3-54, 3-56</p> <p>Our parking is limited now. With a temporary bridge we would also lose the parking on Spokane Street.</p> <p>Spokane St. is the only access to reach our homes. At the present time it is difficult to gain access to our homes when any special events are happening at Oaks Park. With a large increase in daily traffic of cars, trucks, and large equipment we will have even more difficulty getting in or out of our area.</p> <p>River Park has 49 homes with a number of the residents being senior citizens, some with severe</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>disabilities, which makes moving to another location extremely difficult.</p> <p>Increased air pollution and noise from the addition of large trucks and buses when options A, B, C, or D is chosen. Some of these options widen the bridge which also increases pollution and noise and would mean the bridge would only be 10 ft from our building and render our homes unsalable and unlivable.</p> <p>Option E has 4 lanes, 2 of which are for mass transit that could be converted for light rail and streetcars at a future date. This would be in keeping with the long range goals of Multnomah Co. to reduce carbon emissions and the greening of our Portland area. Options A, B, C & D reserves the right to widen the bridge at a future date which could then cause more homes to be taken out.</p> <p>Option E does not take out any homes.</p> <p>Option E would have no bridge closures during construction of the new bridge.</p> <p>People who work in any of the businesses displaced would not be losing jobs but just relocate to new office spaces.</p> <p>The amount of acreage impacted by option E would be less than any of the other options (3.8 acres).</p> <p>If using the box girder bridge style it would cost less than A, B, or D and the same cost as option C (\$280 million).</p> <p>There would be no phasing with option E so construction could not drag out for many years.</p>	
208	Steve and Megan Adkins	<i>Received via Mail In (208_4291_001.pdf)</i>
	<p>Our comments are about three specific points in the Draft EIS, the Detour Bridge, the Bridge itself and the Pedestrian/bike bridge.</p> <p>DETOUR BRIDGE</p> <p>We are unalterably opposed to a detour bridge on Spokane Street. This route as a permanent alternative (blue route) was eliminated early in the process because it would impose almost impossible living conditions on the 49 families living in the Riverpark Condominiums. It would also make working in the office complex adjacent to us completely unacceptable. WE see no reason to imagine that a temporary detour bridge for the years it would take to complete this project is any different.</p> <p>Property Values</p> <p>A detour bridge would sandwich our families between two ugly massive structures for several years. The instant this project was started our properties became almost impossible to sell. A final decision as to the route will make a great positive difference because it will eliminate uncertainty. If however a detour bridge is not immediately removed from the table we may well find our properties virtually ruined by the County for a decade.</p> <p>Elimination of Businesses</p> <p>We feel strongly that business complexes are necessary to the health of Sellwood. A detour bridge will further impact the ability of immediately adjacent business properties to thrive. This project has already effectively ruined the chances of getting customers into the new triangle building. It could easily do the same to the brick office complex.</p> <p>Parking/Access to the Park</p> <p>Today we are experiencing an increasing number of safety concerns in the Park and surrounding wooded areas. The homeless are basically taking over the area at night. AT a recent meeting with the Parks Department, the supervisor for the Sellwood Riverfront Park acknowledged this growing problem. The City of Portland has reported many times that all overhead structures attract transients. A detour bridge will certainly cause greater property and pedestrian/bike safety issues that</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>no one believes the County can control. The County can't control it now.</p> <p>Sellwood Riverfront Park is an important park of Sellwood. Growing safety issues and a detour bridge will unavoidably impact in a negative way, pedestrian and bike access to the park. This will be true for the Sellwood community in general and for our 49 families. Many our our residents and adjacent property owners are dog owners who use the park multiple times throughout the day. Construction of the detour bridge would add to this impact.</p> <p>Noise and Air Pollution</p> <p>With construction on both the north and south sides of Riverpark, increased noise, dust, vehicl emissions and vibration will be inflicted upon the Riverpark residents, thus interfering with their comfort, use of outdoor spaces, including decks, health and the structural integrity of the Riverpark buildings. In that regard, Riverpark owners are already impacted by noise from the current bridge, which will be exacerbated by the construction activity on both sides in addition to noise resulting from the use of the temporary bridge.</p> <p>A detour bridge would be built within a few feet of where several of our families live and sleep. Imagine trying to live and sleep with traffic and the associated noise and vehicle emissions within a few feet your bedroom window. It is absurd to consider this acceptable and will make the homes unlivable for the duration of the project. This will almost certainly result in very public litigation.</p> <p>Cost</p> <p>The cost of the detour bridge is just too high, notwithstanding the financial burden it will put on the facilities it will impact. Should the funds ever get approved it will cost more. it will take longer, it will be here longer and by the time it gets removed will be noisier, dustier with emissions worse than our current bridge. It will almost assuredly be a fiscal and environmental blemish on our community for a decade or more.</p> <p>PEDESTRIAN BICYCLE BRIDGE</p> <p>We should find a cheaper way to build this bridge. We all know that people, bikes and cars/trucks do not blend well on the same road. There are always increased safety concerns and the result is injury to the slowest and smallest. A separate bridge would enhance our existing bike paths and make the existing two lane bridge easier to build. It would also make it easier to build a round about on the est end.</p> <p>This bridge, if built first, would minimize the impact on pedestrians and bikes during a temporary shut down of the existing bridge.</p> <p>REHABILITATE THE EXISTING BRIDGE</p> <p>The Sellwood Bridge should be a permanent 2 lane bridge designed to support the current traffic levels allowed by Tacoma Street only. We do not care about the impact on Clackams County or Lake Oswego. There are alternate ways over the river and they should use them.</p> <p>Clearly, the County technical staff does not want to rehabilitate the existing bridge. Hopefully they will not get their wish. The cheapest solution, which is usually the best solution, is to address the west end issues by building a round about which is the preferred solution in the rest of the world. Then leave the balance of the bridge alone until additional repair monies are necessary to address the east end. It would last another 20 years before we need to repair the east end.</p> <p>Shut down the bridge for the time it takes to address the west end. There are other ways across the river and will suffice for the short time it is down. We have experienced it before and it worked well enough.</p> <p>Leave the east end exactly as it is today. We do not support the around and under to Spokane Street. It will create additional places for transients to collect and will set-up Spokane Street as a couplet to Tacoma. This must be avoided at all costs. We certainly do not trust Multnomah or Clackamas</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>counties, Metro, or ODOT to protect our home street.</p> <p>In conclusion, no Temporary Detour bridge should be constructed regardless of the bridge configuration or route that is ultimately selected. A pedestrian/bike bridge needs further fiscal consideration. And, fixing the existing bridge's fundamental short term problem, which is the west end, is the best solution.</p>	
209	Marychris Mass	<i>Received via Mail In (209_DEIS_Written_Public_Comments-2.pdf)</i>
	<p>#1 choice – no build</p> <p>1) The best idea of the evening: Building a "skinny" bridge over current bridge, drop it into place!! Great idea! Also just fixing west end and not rebuild.</p> <p>2) worst idea – E – I was on off-leash advisory committee. It took more than 10 years to get PP&R to adopt an off-leash program. This alignment adversely affects usage of OLA as well as affecting dogs and pedestrians from noise and other pollution and would make access dangerous.</p> <p>3) Most important!! Clackamas County has to build a bridge. This isn't something we can ignore in the decision!!!</p> <p>4) Tax the bike users!! They need to pay their share!</p>	
210	Mary Vaillancourt	<i>Received via Mail In (210_DEIS_Written_Public_Comments-2.pdf)</i>
	<p>I was unable to take the online survey. How about the no build alternative? Why?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. does not disrupt residents and businesses 2. park areas are left intact 3. cheaper 4. do we really want to encourage heavier traffic? <p>So in addition to the no build would it work to build the alternative A ped/bike bridge along side the no build plan?</p> <p>Thanks for all the info.</p>	
214	James Larpenteur	<i>Received via Mail In (214_JamesLarpenteur.pdf)</i>
	<p>This isn't a fair fight.</p> <p>In my opinion, the only Build Alternatives to the Sellwood Bridge redo project that will be seriously considered by the decision makers are the Alternative D and Alternative E alignments. I support a modified Alternative E alignment because Alternative D would require condemnation of our home in the Sellwood harbor Condominium and deny to the public the benefits that an Alternative E alignment with an Alternative D 64' span width configuration would provide.</p> <p>It's no secret to anyone closely following the Sellwood Bridge replacement saga that the Multnomah County Project Team is promoting the adoption of the Alternative D alignment. The concept of the Alternative E alignment was created by Sellwood neighborhood residents and active businesses on both sides of the Willamette River to alleviate congestion, disruption and the condemnation of owner occupied homes as well as solve the traffic needs of the local area. Survey recipients should have been given the opportunity to vote for the Alternative E alignment with the Alternative D 64' span width configuration. A strong neighborhood survey vote for Alternative D is every bit a reflection of the neighborhood's objection to a monstrous 75' width span four lane bridge as it is to anything else. Only a fool would ignore the threat of Alternative E as presently configured that at some point in</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>time some government agency will insist on converting Tacoma St. into a four-lane thoroughfare and disembowel the Tacoma St plan Sellwood residents fought so hard for and finally received.</p> <p>So the survey is fatally flawed fro its failure to permit a fair vote on Alternative E with a 64' width span in competition with Alternative D. It's no answer to say that the survey accommodates changes by the voter to the proffered Alternative. The ability to mix and match various elements of the configurations of each of the Alternatives within the Alternatives was an essential ingredient of the approval by the CTF and PAG of the current selection process. While the check-the-box feature for changes to the county's preferred Alternative (but only check one box) was an attempt to incorporate a mix and match element to the survey, it feel far short of being adequate. To add insult to injury, the County offers the survey participant to make written comments on the form but then advises that they won't be considered. Most participants don't have the background on these rather complex choices to make an intelligent decision and, if they do, the survey choices are confusing and unsatisfying. The closest an Alternative E proponent can come to a reduced span width is a reduction to something like the "narrowest width possible". Checking that box suggests just as well that we ignore bike and ped concerns which are well served by Alternative D and opt for something like an Alternative B configuration. Not fair!</p> <p>The DEIS represents a major body of work and its detail is helpful. Unfortunately, it doesn't go far enough. There is no cost information to provide us with a basis for mix and match analysis which is an essential part of this phase of the project. The public and the decision makers are entitled to know what an Alternative E alignment would cost with an Alternative D 64' span width configuration. That the cost would be substantially less and the time to build reduced is obvious.</p> <p>Much time is devoted in the DEIS to "key differentiators", some of which are made to look like Alternative E would destroy the quality of life in the Sellwood neighborhood. it's amazing how one decibel of increased noise can so tremendously negatively impact the revenues of SMILE. Certainly, the County engineers and SMILE can work out an accommodation for placement of bridge supports and Oaks Pioneer Church that reasonably satisfies both interests. Put another way, is it reasonable to condemn five owner-occupied homes, two of which belong to elderly widows, in order to spare the inconvenience of a possible minor relocation of the church.</p> <p>Although not give such status in the DEIS, there are several positive key differentiators, in addition to substantial cost savings, that should be considered when utilizing the Alternative E alignment with and Alternative D configuration. Alternative is the only Build Alternative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) that doesn't require condemnation of owner-occupied homes; 2) that permits use of significant right-of-way land for beneficial use such as additional parkland, a transit center, and additional parking, a current serious deficiency, for Oaks Pioneer Church; 3) that offers a smooth uninterrupted bridge crossing during the entire course of construction; and 4) allows for the west end of the bridge and its interchange to be built on known stable ground, the cost of which can be calculated reliably rather than the unstable ground supporting the existing west end of the bridge, the remediation of which is a presently unknown project. <p>It appears to me that the County has seriously underestimated the right-of-way acquisition costs for the Sellwood Harbor Condominium property it proposes to take for the project under Alternative D. Assuming the County can limit the acquisition of living units to just four, a conclusion we all question, it seems to be taking lightly the acquisition of significant common area including over half of our much needed overflow parking area, and the residual damages to the remaining owners in the complex, particularly the remaining owners in Buildings A and D, by reason of the taking.</p> <p>Neither the DEIS nor anyone else has come up with a plan for financing the project. The DEIS talks generally of building the bridge in phases. What an obnoxious solution to lay on the Sellwood community and others affected. Failure to have a financing plan in place or, at least, have a realistic</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>path to provide for one illustrates a lack of commitment by the powers that be to this project. That leads me to my last and most important point that I want to make in this comment letter to you. The owners of Sellwood Harbor Condominiums and River Park Condominiums are being held hostage by this dark cloud of negative uncertainty. Nobody can sell his/her home and at least four owners in Sellwood Harbor have health issues that require them to be living in assisted living facilities. It's absolutely essential that if the County can't raise the funds promptly to construct the Build Alternative of its choosing that the County publicly abandon the rehab/replacement project and proceed with a No Build alternative that meets the current needs of users of the Sellwood Bridge. Please be fair with us.</p>
215	Allen and Mary Lou Dobbins	<i>Received via Mail In (215_Dobbins.pdf)</i>
		<p>This letter is written in strong support of Sellwood Bridge Alternative E. Additionally, the letter carries a message of strong opposition to Alternative D. It ends with an appended personal note.</p> <p>Support of Alternative E: Our reading of the EIS does not apparently point out the following positive features of Alternative E:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternative E can be built more rapidly than Alternative D. 2. Alternative E can be the least expensive if the same width (64 feet) is used as shown in Alternative D. 3. Alternative E is the only one that has a west side interchange that lands on stable land. 4. Alternative E will have only minimal impact on the nearby city park. Dog-friendly functions and other activities can readily take place underneath most of the spans of the Alternative E. 5. Alternative E will NOT result in the destruction of the beautiful Oaks Pioneer Church. The building is historic, however, the site on which it stands is NOT. Indeed, the church has been moved several times in its life time. 6. Alternative E provides the least disruptive alignment relating to transit. 7. Alternative E is the only one that can later be modified to accommodate future transportation needs. 8. Most importantly, Alternative E is the only alternative that does NOT destroy owner-occupied existing homes! <p>Serious concerns regarding Alternative D: Our reading of the EIS did not seem to address the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project has provided conflicting information over time about the number of Sellwood Harbor homes likely to be condemned in this project. Initially, planners stated that all of both building A (9 homes, 16 residents) and Building D (3 homes, 6 residents) would be condemned if Alternative D were selected. More recently, the planners revised their estimate such that only 3 homes in Bldg A and 1 home in Bldg D would be condemned. We are skeptical regarding how many homes would ultimately be taken out. Serious questions about both buildings' foundations, engineering integrity, and aesthetics remain. The EIS contains no structure or architectural certification that the Alternative D plan can be implemented with the condemnation only of three homes from Building A, and only one from Building D. 2. The threat of Alternative D is resulting in the holding hostage of all residents of both River Park and Sellwood Harbor Condominium communities (88 homeowners) to the Sellwood Bridge project. At present, none of the residents can sell their property. If Alternative D is selected, this unacceptable hostage situation will continue indefinitely into the future, with dreadful economic consequences dragging on for months or years.

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<p>3. Alternative D will directly negatively impact River Park and Sellwood Harbor either through the loss of resident's homes, because of the proximity of the Alternative D new bridge, or both.</p> <p>4. Alternative D will directly negatively impact River Park and Sellwood Harbor because of the condemnation of homes and the resulting in reduced operating revenue received by their associations.</p> <p>5. Alternative D will directly negatively impact River Park and Sellwood Harbor because of the nuisance and annoyance of nearby Alternative D new bridge construction. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residents in Sellwood are seniors and do not easily adjust to change; • Two of the homeowners directly threatened by Alternative D are widows living on fixed incomes. Acquiring new living accommodations without full reimbursement of resulting costs will be extremely difficult. • One resident directly threatened by Alternative D is suffering from Alzheimer's Disease and is going blind (see Personal Note below). She desperately needs to sell her home for fair market value to receive sufficient revenue to move into a needed assisted living facility. <p>Isn't it more morally defensible to take a minimal amount of public parkland and one office building for a bridge than to take lands covered by significant numbers of homes in which reside live human Oregonians?</p> <p>A personal note from this writer: I am the husband of the woman mentioned immediately above. The threat of bridge widening nearby (Alternative D) is very unsettling to this person. Alzheimer's suffers require a stable environment. She, and I as caregiver, are troubled by the lack of decisions as to where and when the Sellwood Bridge will be repaired. Accordingly, following along the timeline originally published by the project staff, we committed, and mad a serious down payment, to move into the new continuous care facility at Terwilliger Plaza. The time for moving there was September 2008.</p> <p>Unhappily we found ourselves need to withdraw our commitment: the lack of any decisions about the Sellwood Bridge project resulted in the absence of interested buyers of our property, and so we had to remove our names from the list of those interested in moving into that continuous care facility. Indeed, because of the Sellwood Bridge project, we cannot move to ANY qualified continuous care facility whatsoever.</p> <p>If the decision-makers were to select Alternative D, with all its inherent problems of time, unavailable funding, and the unknown financial impact to our property, such a decision would probably lead us to appeal to the powers that be in hopes of an early condemnation and buy-out because of personal health hardship.</p> <p>If, however, Alternative E were to be selected, we are confident that within a reasonable amount of time the value of our property would return to that approximating our two recent real estate appraisals, so we could finally begin to implement the plans for how we will be living the last phases of our lives.</p>	
216	Alice Duff	<p><i>Received via Web Site</i></p> <p>Per your latest newsletter (Nov. 08), I favor Alternative A.</p>
217	Greg Meyer	<p><i>Received via Web Site</i></p> <p>In reviewing the alternatives sent to me, I am immediately drawn to Alternatives C and D. I essentially like different elements of each. Alternative C: Positives: The Trumpet interchange makes sense. First, no traffic signals and second, while I was initially very excited about the roundabout option, I am concerned about traffic coming off the bridge trying to head south on 43 competing with traffic</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	coming from the north (down Macadam from downtown) on 43 trying to get onto the bridge (the main flow of evening traffic). This seems like it will cause major traffic problems, as you add a third element to today's problems (you already compete with traffic from the south to get on). Other positives, only displacing 46 employees and one condo. Negatives: 42 month bridge closure...yikes! Alternative D: Positives: Only 30 employees displaced. Adequate bike and ped crossings. Future configurations possible. No closure period. Negatives: The major issue I have is the traffic light. 5 condo units affected. A D/C Alternative? Can you have a trumpet plan with alternative D? Maybe the traffic light system will work well, I just can't tell, but am afraid of a traffic light, especially when there may be a way may to avoid it and have good traffic flow. Thanks for the opportunity to comment!	
218	Linda Cahan	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	I'm sorry I didn't get this in by yesterday – didn't have power. I lived in Connecticut for many years. The state had to replace two bridges that received a huge amount of traffic. One was in Westport, CT – there was very limited room on either side to build a second bridge yet they were able to build a temporary bridge that, while ugly, worked better than the original that was historical. The solution was seamless and traffic was impacted only during the transition times between using the different bridges. The second bridge was on the Merritt Parkway in Stratford, CT. They also built a temporary bridge that worked great and again, traffic was only impacted when the road was "moved" to connect with the temp. bridge – and then with the new (original) bridge. The amount of traffic on both is very high yet the solutions worked very well with low impact. The town of Westport, CT probably has records on how it was done and the Stratford Bridge would have been built through the state – the office would be in Hartford, CT.	
219	David Parsons	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	We received a flyer about the various bridge alternatives for the Sellwood Bridge project, and I can't help but notice that *all* of the build alternatives, including the ones that repair the bridge and replace the bridge on the existing alignment, claim to take ~4 acres of parkland. Why?	
220	Christine Donnelly	<i>Received via Web Site</i>
	Alternative E is the only option! I live at Riverpark and any other option would cause further property devaluation. In addition, the construction of a temporary bridge is NOT acceptable as it would cause pollution, dust and an unhealthy environment for residents in the Riverpark community. PLEASE go with "E" option!	
221	Patty Rueter, Portland Office of Emergency Management	<i>Received via Mail In (221_PattyRueter.pdf)</i>
	The new Sellwood bridge piers and foundation should be based on bedrock. The river's edge is vulnerable to liquefaction and since major arteries of transportation cross the river it is necessary that the bridges built from now on are adhered to bedrock for stability. The need for our bridges to be on bedrock is due to earthquake risk in the liquefaction zone that is prevalent along the river.	
222	Joel Grayson, Maylie & Grayson	<i>Received via Mail In (222_Maylie_Grayson_DEIS_letter_12-18-08.pdf)</i>
	This office represents the Riverpark Condominium Association, a residential community consisting of 49 family residences. This residential community is located on SE Spokane Street, immediately to the north of the Sellwood Bridge. On behalf of our client, we convey its strong opposition to any plan that includes the construction of a "Temporary Detour Bridge." Among the reasons for this objection	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	are the following:	
	Negative Effect on Property Values	<p>Property values will be significantly reduced, as the Riverpark community would be closely surrounded on both sides by two massive structures. The value and marketability of the Riverpark homes would be severely impacted for an indefinite period of time, which could span a number of years. Should some future decision-makers decide to allow the "temporary" bridge to remain for pedestrian bicycle or other uses then the problem would become permanent, instead of temporary. In addition, mature trees and landscaping, which are important and valuable amenities for the riverside neighborhood, would likely be removed, and the current unobstructed views would no longer exist.</p> <p>In essence, the habitability and marketability of the property will be significantly impacted by the construction of the "Temporary Detour Bridge." The property values will be substantially reduced due to the construction and other impacts set forth in this letter.</p>
	Congestion and Safety	<p>Each option, with the exception of Alternative E, calls for the elimination of 14 parking spaces for the Riverpark residents and guests, with no absolute assurance that they will be restored after construction is completed. This parking is a required developmental element and an important amenity to the community. The elimination of on-site spaces puts serious pressure on other parking resources, including the local streets. As a result, congestion and safety problems will increase significantly. Construction of a "temporary Detour Bridge" only adds to the se problems, as construction would be performed on both the north and south sides of the Riverpark community, creating a virtual island of land trapped between and under to bridges. In addition, another bridge structure will attract more transients, exacerbating an existing problem in the area. Law enforcement has been unsuccessful in addressing the transient problems and threats to safety that have resulted from the existing bridge. Accordingly, the influx of more transients will only negatively impact the safety of families that occupy these residences.</p>
	Restricted Accessibility	<p>Access to Riverpark will be made more difficult due to the higher level of construction activity, congestion and street closures. This severe restriction on accessibility could have serious consequences, as fire, police and other emergency vehicles will find it more difficult to respond to urgent calls.</p>
	Air and Noise Pollution	<p>With construction on both the north and south sides of Riverpark, increased noise, dust, vehicle emissions and vibration will be inflicted upon the Riverpark residents, thus interfering with their comfort, use of outdoor spaces including decks, health, and the structural integrity of the Riverpark buildings. In that regard, Riverpark owners are already impacted by noise from the current bridge, which will be exacerbated by the construction activity on both sides in addition to noise resulting from the use of the temporary bridge.</p> <p>In conclusion, no "Temporary Detour Bride" should be constructed regardless of the bridge configuration ultimately chosen.</p> <p>While our clients have shown their willingness to cooperate in the effort to obtain an improved bridge and transportation system, they must protect their interests through an lawful means at their disposal. Although litigation is a last resort, our clients are prepared to proceed if necessary.</p> <p>We appreciate the considerations given to the opinions of the Riverpark community, and remain willing to provide any additional information or insight that is required and trust that nay subsequent legal action can be avoided.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
223	Douglas R. Allen	Received via Mail In (223_DouglasAllen.pdf)
	<p>Dear Chair Wheeler, Chair Peterson, and Councilor Liberty,</p> <p>From the news media, I gather that you are frustrated by the high cost of replacing the Sellwood Bridge at a time when spare money is scarce.</p> <p>I want to offer an alternative approach that will cost less but still do what needs to be done. A complete description is attached as a PDF file.</p> <p>I attended most of the Sellwood Bridge Citizen Task Force and Policy Advisory Group meetings for the Sellwood Bridge, and based on my years of involvement in transportation as a citizen activist, and based on my academic training in structural engineering, I have concluded that the process was deeply flawed, and failed to look at the most promising approach. I have written up my suggestions in the form of official comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, but on re-reading them, I felt that you three public officials might be in the best position to actually consider my recommendations, and push for further analysis.</p> <p>The essential feature of my recommendation is that by using an "orthotropic steel" deck, as was recently used to rehabilitate the Golden Gate Bridge, it will be cost-effective to repair, rather than replace the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about what I am recommending.</p>	
224	Pat Hainley	Received via Mail In (224_PatHainley.pdf)
	<p>Here are my comments on the DEIS for the Sellwood Bridge.</p> <p>Table 3.7-1 includes a statement that the Sellwood Riverfront Park has no major events. This would be news to the thousands of people who gather each Monday in July for the Riverfront Classics. This is of considerable importance should Alternative E be selected as the bridge would tower over the event and provide less than suitable accompaniment to the performers on stage as well as being a visual blight from both Spokane St. and the park itself.</p> <p>The report fails to identify the Sellwood Community Center as an historic structure that lies within a block of Tacoma Street.</p> <p>Table 3.7-1 refers to the Mayer Boys & Girls Club. Fred would probably like it if his name were properly spelled. Oops! That's right he's dead. OK. His foundation would like it spelled right.</p> <p>Although the DEIS does an admirable job of describing the current status of Tacoma Street, the Tacoma Main Street plan and the current cut through situation, it fails to address the history of the street and how poorly it functioned as a four lane thoroughfare for transit but how successfully it operated to split this neighborhood. To my mind only the Berlin Wall functioned as efficiently. Meanwhile it was the Main Street plan and the neighborhood's support of it that actually allowed for a greater volume of traffic to negotiate this corridor in a two lane configuration as opposed to a four lane.</p> <p>This points out in my mind the most glaring failure of the process. By limiting the scope of the project to 6th Street on the east end and 400 feet on either side of the westside terminus, the citizens task force was forced to deliberate as if what each each end of the bridge attached to was of little import. Thus on the east side you wind up with an access road adjacent to the Springwater corridor or an unworkable signalized intersection in order to provide a means to service Oaks Park. On the west end you get "solutions" that involve "parking" cars on a bridge.</p> <p>For whatever reason it appears that the interchange on the west side has taken on a life and cost of its own. Nevermind that it is not the problem for the morning commuter as they will find themselves queued up soon enough at either Taylors Ferry Road or somewhere along Macadam Avenue. And for the evening commuter there is not an interchange possible that will do anything except speed them to</p>	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>a slow motion dance along Tacoma Street. Why spend \$72 million dollars so that you can have two through lanes in each direction on Highway 43? For less than 1% of that amount you could solve a chunk of the evening commute problem. Just shut down the light at the mortuary at 4pm so that there are no signals between Taylors Ferry and Dunthorpe. It is amazing to me the amount of time and effort that has gone into that westside interchange just to find that nothing functions any better than what is already there.</p> <p>As for the east end, had the CTF had the chance they may have come up with something very elegant such as a bridge that flies over the existing alignment so that no residences or businesses are trashed, allows for 6th Street to be the access road for Oaks Park and eliminates 6th, 7th and 8th Streets as cut through access points to Tacoma. Guess we'll never find out.</p> <p>PS This does not have to be part of the DEIS commentary but I have to tell you how much the sellwoodbridge.org website stinks when it came to trying to make comments on the DEIS. Why should I have to register with another website (Vuzit) to be able to access the ability to make comments and then why should I have to do anything besides just returning to the sellwoodbridge.org website to then make my comments? I consider myself fairly tech savvy but I wasn't about to sit through a tutorial and learn another program just to basically send an email. But what ticks me off even more is when, evidently, your server sends me some cryptic note about being "read only" when I try to add your email address as a contact to the Yahoo account that I use when I am at home. I had to have John Fyre forward me an email he received from you in order to send this email by the deadline.</p>
225	Joel Fields, The UPS Store	<i>Received via Mail In (225_upsstoresellwoodbridge.doc)</i>
		<p>Thank you for accepting our comments on the Sellwood Bridge Project. As the owner of The UPS Store located just east of 13th Ave on Tacoma Street I have followed the planning process carefully, have a vested interest in the outcome, and have consistently stressed two points throughout the planning process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City of Portland Tacoma Main Street Plan and Metro's South Willamette Crossing Study both call for keeping Tacoma Street and the Sellwood Bridge at two traffic lanes. It makes no sense to have a larger capacity bridge for vehicular traffic when both ends of the bridge can't handle more. Pedestrian, transit and bicycle uses, however, should be encouraged and addressed. 2. The Sellwood Bridge is the only Willamette River crossing for many miles in either direction. As a result, any closure of the bridge will have a devastating impact to the business communities on both sides of the river over an extensive area. <p>After reviewing both the EIS Executive Summary, the complete EIS, and the Economic Technical Report I do have several concerns on the alternatives and some of the assumptions used in the reports:</p> <p>Bridge Closure:</p> <p>Only Alternatives B (with detour bridge, D and E provide for keeping the bridge open during construction. In my opinion this is a fatal flaw for the no-build and other alternatives.</p> <p>Bridge Cross-Sections:</p> <p>The cross-section used in Alternative E is not consistent with either the South Willamette Crossing Study or the Tacoma Main Street Plan. Of further concern, while the EIS on page 4-23 provides reassurance that the two extra lanes would be dedicated for transit only, it also states on page 4-24 that "wider basic bridge cross-sections (Alternatives C, D & E) would maintain the bridge's flexibility to address future transportation needs because they would provide opportunities for future rechannelization or reconfiguration of the bridge deck." Clearly, this portion of the EIS is contradictory, and the Alternative E cross-section should be dropped from consideration. All of the</p>

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>other cross-sections are substantially consistent with both adopted plans and are acceptable.</p> <p>Economic Impact of Bridge Closure:</p> <p>In reviewing the complete EIS I noted that the East Side Study Area was a very small portion of the greater Sellwood-Westmoreland community. The EIS defines the study area and then applies its economic impacts only on the “study area”- Section 3.6.1 on page 3.71 and notes that further analysis is available in the Economic Technical Report. I obtained that report and quickly discovered that indeed the East and West side study areas were very narrowly defined. The reasoning for this seems to be that since the new bridge will not add additional vehicular capacity there will be only narrow economic changes once an alternative is selected and the bridge is complete. This small study area is illustrated in Figure 4.1 of the Economic Technical Report and in the discussion on page 3-2. The problem is that this line of reasoning is in error when discussing the impacts of the bridge closure because there are no alternative routes across the river for 2.5 miles to the North and 8 miles to the south. This, by definition is a very broad impact area, but in the Technical Economic Report this is ignored because the initial study area is so narrowly defined.</p> <p>There are two questions regarding the economic impacts of the closure: 1) How big will the impacts be on the affected businesses, and 2) Over what area will the impacts occur? My opinion is that the Technical Economic Report answers the first question correctly as discussed in Table 5-1. Ranges of 15% to 35% declines in gross sales sound frightening, but probable. The second question is too narrowly defined in the study and the results are accordingly understated. On page 4-5 of the Economic report it states that there are 93 businesses in the economic study area employing 859 people. My question is what would those numbers be if the economic study area including all of Sellwood – Westmoreland?; or inner SE Portland from Holgate to upper Milwaukie?</p> <p>Alternatives that result in a closure of the bridge will be an unmitigated disaster for the business communities on both sides of the Willamette River far in excess of what the EIS and Technical Economic Report project. In my opinion, based upon my known customer base and my involvement with many of the community businesses, the bridge closure will cause economic disruptions that will extend for a mile or more North and South of the Sellwood Bridge on both sides of the River.</p> <p>I think the Technical Economic Report approach of establishing Tier 1 through Tier 3 businesses is correct; however the area covered should be much, much larger. Stars Antiques, Tilde, Spielworks, American at Heart, Caprial's Bistro, Haggis McBaggis, Springwater Grill, St. Maine, Justin & Burks, Tres Fabu, Hash, and many other specialty retailers and restaurants draw customers to Sellwood-Westmoreland from the entire Portland metro area. Of the limited list named above, only two are included in the reports established study area.</p> <p>In my personal experience at my The UPS Store I have neighborhood customers, pass-through customers, and customers who have discovered my services while visiting the Sellwood-Westmoreland shopping area. As a result approximately 20% of my customers are from a zip code that is not 97202.</p> <p>Finally, many of these businesses have already experienced one bridge closure when the Bybee overpass was rebuilt and remember the severe impacts of that smaller project. For the Bybee crossing alternative crossings of 99E and the railroad tracks were available on Holgate St. and Johnson Creek Rd. In the case of the Sellwood Bridge the alternative crossings of the Willamette River are 2 ½ miles and 8 miles away. This means, under a bridge closure that travel patterns will be widely disrupted over a very large area, with corresponding economic disruptions.</p> <p>My preferred alternative:</p> <p>My preferred alternative is either Alternative D or a reconfigured Alternative E with a reduced cross-section such as used in Alternatives B, C or D.</p>

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
226	Emily Roth, Portland, Parks & Recreation	Received via Mail In (226_SBDEI_Comments_122208_final.doc)
<p>The following are the comments from the City of Portland, Parks & Recreation Department on the November 2008 Draft EIS for the Sellwood Bridge and draft Section 4(f) Evaluation. If you have questions about any of PP&R's comments, please contact Ms. Gregg Everhart at 505-823-6009 or by email: pkgregg@ci.portland.or.us.</p>		
<p>General Comments</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portland Parks & Recreation is the proper name for the bureau. Please make consistent throughout the document. • Remove “Undeveloped” from all descriptions of natural area lands. Natural area land is managed for its natural resource functions and values and PP&R does not consider these lands undeveloped. • PP&R is not a typical ROW land owner. PP&R lands are managed for multiple functions and values including active and passive recreation, habitat for wildlife and fish, views, and environmental education. The Draft EIS states that PP&R will be paid cash for the project ROW within parks based on fair market value of the land. PP&R does not consider this appropriate payment. The functions and values of each park must be evaluated and PP&R compensated based on the impacts to these values in additional park land or enhancements that will replace the impacted functions and values, plus the payment for the ROW. • Westside Riparian habitat along the Willamette River has been greatly reduced within the City of Portland. First priority is to avoid impacts to this habitat type. Any unavoidable impacts must be mitigated with in-kind replacement. • Alternatives should avoid or minimize additional fragmentation to wildlife corridors along the river and between the riparian and upland forests. • If proposed crossing location into Willamette Moorage Park is not changed, then include a fish friendly crossing such as a bridge over the Stephens Creek. • Change “non-programmed” to “passive” recreation for all natural area parks or the natural area of a hybrid park. • Global warming should be addressed in the EIS, not just in Cumulative Effects. FHWA does not have any formal standards but the State of California has done some interesting work for SEQA compliance that could be used in the EIS evaluation. 		
<p>Willamette Moorage Park/Stephens Creek</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All alternatives show impacts to Willamette Moorage Park with the proposed relocated Willamette Moorage Park and Macadam Bay Club entrance. The draft EIS does not evaluate other alternatives to this entrance. • PP&R suggests that creating a roadway with a bridge crossing of Stephens Creek in the proposed Trolley ROW, on the west side of the rail track, that goes from the present entrance to SW Miles Street be evaluated as a possible alternative. This would eliminate the impacts to Willamette Moorage Park and the recently constructed Stephens Creek Fish Enhancement Project and keep open the possibility of additional creek restoration work upstream in the future. • If the proposed crossing location into Willamette Moorage Park is not changed, then include a fish friendly crossing such as a bridge over Stephens Creek. 		
<p>Chapter 2.3.2 Construction Methods Common to All Build Alternatives</p>		

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land-Based Construction – Construction Storage and Fabrication Areas: 0.5 to 1.0-ac. site will be needed near the proposed bridge construction and 5.0 to 8.0-acre site outside the project area. PP&R understands that the sites will be selected based on land availability during construction. Our preference is for sites not immediately adjacent to PP&R property.
	Chapter 3. 2 Bicyclists and Pedestrians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures 3.2-2, 3.2-4, 3.2-6, 3.2-8, 3.2-10: West-side diagrams should show the bike/pedestrian facility to which the new construction will connect (cemetery road); East-side diagram should show the existing Springwater Corridor. This will clarify the length of on-street connection needed to reach off-street trail; please confirm whether or not the stairway between SWC and SE Spokane will be replaced. Alternative C: Please note the reduced amount of vertical distance that pedestrians and cyclists have to travel in this option. A flatter route should be more attractive to all human-powered users. Are profiles available for the bike/pedestrian route of each alternative? (Mitigation) Mitigate the lack of “eyes on the street,” noise, pigeon droppings by hanging the bike/pedestrian shared path to side of bridge. It could alternate as proposed by Arun Jain, City of Portland, Planning Department or remain on one side. Table 3.2-6: the east intersection in this option would impact bicyclists and pedestrians by adding more traffic to the bicycle boulevard on SE Spokane. It is a key access point for pedestrians and cyclists using Springwater Corridor and Sellwood Riverfront Park (Mitigation) Do not build the east-side under-crossing Table 3.2-7 and 3.208: “Signalized intersection improves bicyclist and pedestrian crossing of SE Tacoma Street” unless it is a vehicle signal. Adding vehicles would make cycling more dangerous on SE Spokane as well. (Mitigation) Either do not signalize the east-side intersection or make it bicycle and pedestrian only (subject to PDOT recommendation). 3.2.5 Summary of Alternatives by Differentiating Bicyclist and Pedestrian Impact – revise per comments above. Add a table that documents the vertical climb from trail on both east and west to high point of bridge (or note length of ramps) [see attached spreadsheet]. For instance, for Alternative B the spiral ramp would contain three loops to get bikes/pedestrians up or down the 1000 feet length needed to ascend or descend from the bridge. This will most likely be a commuting and recreation barrier for most users.
	Section 3.3 - Right of Way and Relocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-49 – Impacts and Mitigation Common to all Built Alternatives: Access to Macadam Bay Club. The draft EIS only evaluates one alternative for relocating the existing access road. Willamette Shoreline Trolley and Future Streetcar - The draft EIS does not evaluate any alternatives other than moving of the trolley ROW into Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage natural area parks. (Mitigation) Proposed Alternative for Macadam Bay Moorage Access: Creation of a roadway with a bridge crossing of Stephens Creek in the proposed Trolley ROW, on the west side of the rail track, that goes from the present entrance to SW Miles Street to be evaluated as a possible alternative.

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Streetcar/Trail Alternatives: • Reduce length of double track through the park natural areas (Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage). Establish streetcar ROW in center of Hwy 43. Design multimodal Greenway Trail within existing streetcar ROW, not in the natural area.
	3.9 Parks and Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General comment: The scale of maps with aerial photo base and no existing edge of pavement makes it difficult to analyze impacts to natural areas in Powers Marine Park and Willamette Moorage. Although overall acreage is importance, width of the riparian buffer is also significant. PP&R overlaid our west-side natural area parks over Alternatives A-E West IC drawings to evaluate impacts. • Sellwood Riverfront Park (3-107) – include that the park is used for summer concerts and movies. • Powers Marine Park (3-108) – include that the City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) completed a capital improvement project in the park in 2007. Large woody debris was placed below the ordinary high water line to increase the habitat value for fish. Also, invasive plant species have been removed and native species planted. Ongoing revegetation work is currently funded by BES and PP&R through 2010. • Willamette Moorage Park (3-108) please change “hiking” trail to “shared-use” trail. • Willamette Moorage Park, first column, last paragraph (3-108) – include: the project also included riparian enhancement, removal of invasive and planting native species. • Springwater Corridor Trail (3-108) please add “downtown Portland to” after “connecting” in second sentence of second paragraph • Willamette Greenway Trail (East Bank; 3-109) Add second sentence in second paragraph: ...SE Umatilla Street. There is a two-block gap and trail continues between SE Tenino and SE Linn. • Table 3.9-1 (3-110) as noted elsewhere, remove “undeveloped” • Table 3.9-1 (3-110): Area; Functions Impacted column does not address the functions and values of the park that are impacted by each alternative. The EIS needs to address the riverine and riparian functions impacted by the land conversion. • Table 3.9-2 (3-110): Area; Functions Impacted column does not adequately address the impacts to the functions and values of the riverine and riparian habitats impacted by the build alternatives. All alternatives convert approximately 20% or greater area of the park to transportation uses. This will have a large impact on the functions and values of the natural area. • 3.9.3 Direct Impacts, Mitigation, Alternative Specific Mitigation (3-110) – revise per suggestions elsewhere for no reduction park/natural area acreage. Evaluate potential of any land taken from business or residential displacement to be re-used as park/natural area under bridge. • Mitigation Coordination at Local Parks call out box (3-111) – the projects have been completed, update box. • 3.9.3 Bullet for Powers Marine Park (3-111) – the proposed mitigation is not appropriate as the invasive species have been removed from the park and the tree canopy is intact. A fish enhancement project has been completed at the park. Unsure what a river bank stabilization

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>project would look like at this location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.9.3 Bullet for Oaks Pioneer Park (3-11) – include economic impacts to SMILE for temporary reductions in revenues from church rentals during bridge construction. • Sellwood Riverfront Park, Alternative A (3-112) – placement of the bridge will increase noise in the park, adversely impacting summer concert and movie programs. • Sellwood Riverfront Park, Alternative A and E (3-112) – The pedestrian/bike alignment will result in removal of some of the existing black cottonwood riparian forest on the riverbank at the west edge of the park. • Willamette Moorage Park (3-112): update mitigation for the park as the Stephens Creek Fish Enhancement Project is complete, including riparian plantings. • 3.9.3 add last bullet before 3.9.4 Summary (3-114): (or where appropriate) that indicates the Willamette Greenway Trail (SE Spokane Street Section) would be impacted by east end interchanges on Alternative C, D, E) with appropriate mitigation being either existing east end intersection or bike/pedestrian only signal [this is park and recreational impact as greenway trail connection to Springwater, WG along river and Sellwood Riverfront park] • Table 3.9-3 cont. Summary of Alternatives by Differentiating Park and Recreation Impact, Willamette Greenway Trail (SE Spokane Street Section): replace “None” on C, D, E with “East-end interchange adds vehicles to SE Spokane” • (Mitigation 3.9 Parks and Recreation) purchase that replaces the functions and values lost, not just cash payment. • Mitigation Measure for Specific Alternatives (Sellwood Riverfront Park) add “Contribute funds for completion of Springwater Sellwood Gap (Alternative A) • Mitigation Measure for Specific Alternatives (Powers Marine Park) add “Redevelop Staff Jennings as natural area” (Alternative C) OR • Mitigation reduction (Powers Marine Park) reduce need for mitigation by changing west intersection from trumpet (or roundabout) • Mitigation for impacts to Westside Riparian Habitat must be in-kind replacement. • ‘Daylight’ and restore the existing perennial creeks that are piped through Powers Marine Park. Bridge all trail/ROW creek crossings. • Remove culverts beneath Hwy 43. Replace with structures that allow passage for fish & wildlife. • Remove culvert beneath railroad ROW and construct a bridge crossing at Stephens Creek adjacent to Willamette Moorage Park. • Regrade, revegetate and restore Stephens Creek between Macadam Blvd. and recently completed Stephens Creek Fish Enhancement Project. • Acquire bluff and riverbank lands adjacent to existing Willamette Greenway Trail (East Bank) ROW. Control invasives and revegetate with oak woodland species. • Oaks Pioneer Park – revegetate with native oak woodland species. • Oaks Pioneer Park – Compensate SMILE for any revenue reductions from church rentals during construction. • Sellwood Riverfront Park, Alternative A – noise mitigation should include a noise barrier on the bridge.

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sellwood Riverfront Park, Alternative A – mitigation should include planting additional large native trees. Sellwood Riverfront Park, Alternative A - Remove riprap, control invasives, layback slope and increase width of existing riparian woodlands on west edge of park. Sellwood Riverfront Park, Alternative A - Remove 2 acres of the invasive species black locust (<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>) in north and east sides of park and revegetate with native oak woodland species.
	Section 3.11 – Visual Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 3.11-1 Summary of Alternatives by Differentiating Visual Resources Impact: Significant east-side visual change? A – change to “yes” as second bridge will make a visual impact.
	Section 3.16 – Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment - BES and PP&R have already started revegetation work at Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage Parks and have sufficient funding to continue invasive plant removal and native revegetation through 2010. In addition, fish enhancement projects have been completed at each park. Therefore, these stated mitigation measures are not appropriate. General Comment: the quality and quantity of riparian habitat along the west side of the Willamette River at Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage Parks may be underestimated in the site assessment components of the DEIS. The parks’ riverine wetlands are dominated by Pacific willow with black cottonwood and Columbia River willow growing on the edges. These willow (<i>Salix</i> spp.) vegetation communities have limited distribution within the City limits. The Oregon Natural Heritage Program has identified Pacific willow shrub swamps as a medium priority ecosystem types for conservation in the Willamette Valley. Although both sites have reed canary grass in the understory, they also still contain patches of native stinging nettle and scattered native shrubs. All alignment alternatives will convert natural area parks to transportation uses. This will result in a loss of functional habitat, vegetation cover, increase impervious surface, and fragmentation of the remaining riparian corridor. Plant Communities and Noxious Weeds (3-164 & 3-165): Please provide plant surveys and wetland delineation information. Where is the location of the proposed impact to the Westside riparian habitat? [see section 3.16.3] 3.16.3 Build Alternatives Section Direct Impacts (3-165-167): Update this section to reflect current revegetation work at Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage Parks by the City.
	Section 3.17 – Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update this section as the Stephens Creek Fish Enhancement Project has been completed. The creek banks have been laid back and restored. The hydraulic connectivity between the floodplain of Stephens Creek and the Willamette River has been restored. Also, invasive vegetation has been removed and native species planted within the riparian zone.
	Section 3.18 – Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update this section to reflect current revegetation work at Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage Parks by the City. Include bald eagle, Cooper’s hawk, red-tail hawk and osprey as potentially affected avian species within the project areas on both the east bank and west bank of the river. Amphibian surveys are currently underway at Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage natural area parks.

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deer scat has been observed at Powers Marine Park. • Recent sightings of a roosting pair of peregrines on the under structure of the Sellwood Bridge at the east bank. • Update the Wildlife Summary call out box. • (Mitigation) Wildlife passage culverts underneath HWY 43 to allow a connection between uplands and the river.
	3.19 Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise Summary • (Mitigation) PP&R will need to give input on final determination of reasonableness and feasibility during final design of the project.
	3.23 Relationship of Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No edits suggested but note that “Mitigation planned...” (near end of fifth paragraph) will likely be completed as noted above and below. So PP&R is more interested in the use of right-of-way used during construction being returned to park or recreational use, as noted in following sentence.
	3.25 Cumulative Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.25.1 Past and Present Actions – 1996 (3-200) Springwater Corridor Trail east of SE McLoughlin opened in 1996; the segment of Springwater on the Willamette that passes under the Sellwood Bridge opened in 2003; add 2007 Willamette River Water Trail established, water trail guide published. • 3.25.2 Foreseeable Actions – revise bullet 8: ...SE Umatilla Street and SE 19th Avenue at SE Ochoco Street [avoids confusion with only going to SE Ochoco and SE 13th Ave]; revise bullet 15 by adding Sellwood Riverfront Park • 3.25.4 Parks and Recreation • 3-206: the portion of Springwater in the study area opened in 2003. • 3-206, first paragraph. This paragraph does not make sense in light of the proposed impacts to the parks from proposed project. How does this address cumulative effects of the proposed project and other projects such as the trolley on the investments/improvements the City of Portland has already completed to improve the ecological health of these parks? • First bullet (3-206) – the paragraphs describing the west side parks does not adequately address cumulative impacts to the area. Both Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage are natural area parks that are managed primarily for their natural area values with limited passive recreation. The potential 30 percent decrease in parkland and tree canopy and increase in impervious surfaces would adversely impact the fish and wildlife functions of the parks. Also increased visibility and use often adversely impacts wildlife use so increasing the recreation use may not be beneficial to the park. This section needs to address the adverse effects from this project and the proposed trolley on the wildlife functions. PP&R does not manage these parks as hybrid parks like Sellwood Riverfront Park and it is not intending to change the management for this or other projects. (Sellwood Riverfront Park is managed as a hybrid park where the developed portion is managed for active recreation such as the dog off leash area, picnicking, movies, etc.) • Third bullet: add Sellwood Riverfront Park in list for on-going restoration. Add missing bullet that notes that paddling and motorized boating is increasing • 3.25.4 Visual Resources – The retaining wall and rock cuts...could [instead of “would”]

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>soften since it not entirely certain that vegetation will succeed, particularly with 30 – 80’ high cuts/walls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.25.4 Vegetation • 1st bullet – Off site mitigation for removal of trees within the project areas does not address degradation to the riparian forest within the project area. This section is not addressing cumulative impacts to the riparian system along this side of the river. • 2nd bullet – disagree that magnitude of impact is small when already narrow width of riparian habitat is further decreased. How was 150 acres of Westside Riparian vegetation calculated and where is the vicinity this is mentioned? • 3rd bullet - How does vegetation in the right of way improve wildlife habitat? What species are targeted for this habitat type? Cite studies that show similar right of way plantings that provide habitat and supports native wildlife. • 4th bullet – the project will impact vegetation restoration completed by the City of Portland. This project will adversely impact these restoration projects within the project area. Needs to be addressed in the cumulative effects. • The accumulated impact of walls, wider travel lanes, and new driveways makes a substantial impact on connectivity. This needs to be addressed. • 3.25.4 Wetlands • Add Stephens Creek to list of locations • The City has not restored wetlands at Ross Island. The City has removed invasive species on 44-acres that is City owned and managed. • 3.25.4 Air Quality • 2nd bullet on climate change – does not adequately address the congestion that will be created by an undersized bridge or interchange and the impacts of increased traffic on OR 43 on greenhouse gas emissions within the City of Portland. <p>Chapter 4. Comparison of Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 4.2-3 Bicyclist and Pedestrian Elements by Build Alternative • Safety Concerns (row six) for Alternative C could be mitigated by having separate deck below but to side of vehicles. • Link to Springwater Corridor (row 8) for Alternatives D & E – must use side streets with increased vehicle traffic • Add a row that documents the vertical climb from trail on both east and west to high point of bridge (or note length of ramps) [see attached spreadsheet]. • Tables 4.2-8 and 9 • For Powers Marine and Willamette Moorage parks include the percent of the park impacted by the project, not just the number of acres. • Include functions, values and activities impacted by the alternatives. • (Mitigation) PP&R vehicle access to Powers Marine Park will be from the improved Greenway Trail to avoid additional impacts to the natural area park. • Table 4.2-9 Alternative-specific Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties – Add Willamette Greenway (Spokane Street) – it has impacts for C, D, and E unless east interchanges modified. [This is similar to inclusion of Sellwood Bridge Recreational Trail.]

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 4.3-2 East-side connection - Add existing and proposed Springwater Corridor to diagram so impacts of traffic on bicyclists is more apparent. • Table 4.4-2 Summary of Impacts by Alternative - PP&R understands that relative significance of each property is considered but the EIS needs to include summary of activities, functions and values are impacted by each alternative. It is not as simplistic as number of sites and acreage. • Willamette Moorage Park (4-33) – delete significant. The amount of acreage that would be impacted is significant for all alternatives if percent is used instead of acres. • (Mitigation) Avoid impacts by taking the bike loop out of the natural area. • 4-33, 2nd bullet – separate Oaks Pioneer Park from Willamette Moorage and Powers Marine Parks. The natural area parks on the west side of the river are significant natural area parks providing intact riparian vegetation, listed fish habitat and wildlife functions. <p>Chapter 4 – Comparison of Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 4-33 Willamette Moorage Park: All alternatives will significantly impact the natural area. Remove “significantly “ from the third line and just state that there are less impact from these alternatives. • Page 4-34 Factor 4 second bullet – Separate Oaks Pioneer Park from Willamette Moorage Park and Powers Marine Park. The later two parks are managed for their natural area functions. They provide significant fish and wildlife functions and riparian habitat along the Willamette River that is in short supply in this area. Fish enhancement projects have been completed at each natural area. <p>Section 4(f)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DEIS and Section 4(f) documents do not discuss any roadway access alternatives to adversely impacting Willamette Moorage Park. This needs to be disclosed before a de minimis determination can be made. • See all previous comments on the DEIS sections and incorporate where appropriate. • 4(f)-69, Factor 3 and 4 box, third bullet – at both Willamette Moorage and Powers Marine Parks the City of Portland has completed capital investment projects that significantly increased the habitat value of the parks and needs to be protected from adverse impacts to wildlife. 	
227	Erin Janssens, Portland Fire & Rescue	<i>Received via Mail In (227_ErinJanssens.pdf)</i>
	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sellwood bridge EIS. Below are concerns Portland Fire & Rescue has with the EIS and the bridge proposals. Unfortunately, the EIS understates the impact of the current bridge on emergency response, as well as the options identified. Below are issues of the current problems, with desired characteristics following.</p> <p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presently, use by Fire apparatus is greatly limited. While ambulances can utilize the bridge, Fire Engines may use the bridge for emergency response only, with speed restricted to 15mph. Given the state of the bridge, this is still taking a chance, and only permitted during emergency response. Other Fire apparatus, including Fire Trucks (necessary at all residential and commercial type fires) as well as Heavy Squads and Water Tenders, are unable to use the bridge at any time, due to weight restrictions. This limits not only emergency operations, but also effective day to day operations requiring movement of companies. • This means significantly longer response times for multiple unit responses, including 	

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>residential fires, commercial fires, major gas incidents, hazardous materials incidents, and any type of specialty rescue in SE or SW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the above, emergency response times are greatly increased (longer response times negatively affects citizens safety, firefighter safety, property loss, and impact to the environment). • This also negatively impacts emergency response on single unit responses when companies in neighboring areas need to cover for first-in Fire apparatus that are already assigned, affecting the safety issues outlined above, as well as response reliability. <p>Ideal/desired characteristics of an improved Sellwood Bridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New bridge or rehabilitated bridge is preferred over No build option (existing conditions) • Limit closures as much as possible. From an emergency response perspective, ideally, we would like the bridge to be kept open, exercising alternatives (D and E). It is preferable that closures during construction are limited, in exchange for a fully operational bridge in the future. • Ideal/desirable curb to curb cross section for emergency vehicles would be 2 lanes in each direction, or 48 ft, plus bike lanes on both sides with sidewalk(s) for pedestrians. <p>This configuration allows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic to provide right of way to emergency vehicles - minimizes high risk accidents on the bridge by separating different types of traffic (vehicular, bicycles, pedestrians) - during an accident on the bridge, ensures higher likelihood of emergency access from either direction - increases maneuverability and reduces risk of accidents due to less congestion - accommodates for increasing density <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36 ft curb to curb would be a minimum to maneuver an emergency vehicle in mixed traffic. • Due to limited access and water supply issues, request several FDC's to provide water supply on the bridge for response to vehicle fires, hazardous materials or traffic accidents involving pin-ins (high risk/potential of fire during extrication). <p>Please let me know if you have any further questions.</p>
246	Jennifer Goodridge, Portland Bureau of Environmental Services	<p><i>Received via Mail In (246_FW__Sellwood_Bridge_DEIS.msg)</i></p> <p>BES supports the need for replacing the Sellwood bridge and we understand that there are multiple interests to be balanced in the selection of the preferred alternative. We have prepared specific comments on the DEIS report (see attached file). In addition to those comments on the report text, we also offer the following general comments as feedback on the selection of bridge alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimize in-water structures. We strongly support alternative bridge designs that minimize the number of temporary as well as permanent in-water structures such as piers. It is well documented that non-native fish use the areas surrounding in-water structures to prey on small salmonids and other native fish. In-water structures also result in encroachment in the floodway (ordinary high water level) and adversely impact benthic habitat. We therefore recommend against a separate pedestrian/bike bridge or a detour bridge (during construction). 2. Minimize impacts in the Stephens Creek confluence habitat area. The City of Portland has just completed a \$1 million habitat enhancement project in the confluence area of Stephens Creek

TABLE J-1
Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>and all bridge alternatives include revised access to Macadam Bay Club/Willamette Moorage. This revised access includes road construction and Greenway trail modifications within the project area, resulting in 0.1 acre of wetland impact. We support consideration of fish passage improvements at Stephens Creek confluence area as part of mitigation for habitat loss resulting from bridge construction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Minimize impacts to Parklands. In addition to the Stephens Creek Natural Area, we support bridge alternatives that minimize impacts to Powers Marine Park. 4. Minimize forest and riparian habitat impacts. We prefer a bridge intersection on the west end that minimizes overall loss of trees and specifically minimizes the loss of riparian vegetation. To the extent that tree canopy must be removed to accommodate bridge design, we support designs that place a priority on protection of riparian areas. The integrity of the riparian corridor is a priority consideration for us. 5. Ensure adequate mitigation for habitat impacts. We realize that it is premature to identify specific mitigation actions related to bridge impacts until a preferred alternative is chosen and construction design is further advanced. We will strongly support mitigation concepts and sites that improve fish passage and provide benefits to riparian areas. 6. Reports should include graphics that demonstrate the impacts of the alternative bridge designs. Impacts are typically depicted in a hatch pattern overlay on maps that depict existing resources such as the ordinary high water, wetlands, forested areas, and land ownership boundaries. During the selection of the final alternative, please demonstrate how the bridge design avoids and minimizes environmental impacts. When the impacts are clearly mapped and identified, this helps select appropriate mitigation measures to ensure functional replacement for permanent, temporary, indirect, and cumulative impacts.
247	Cherri Warnke, Portland Water Bureau	<p><i>Received via Mail In (247_DEIS_Review_Comments_16Dec08.xls)</i></p>
		<p>I have reviewed the five bridge alternatives, and have perused the DEIS document. I am enclosing a spreadsheet listing my comments regarding the impact each alternative could have on the existing water facilities, as well as concerns the Portland Water Bureau (PWB) has with some other issues discussed in the DEIS.</p> <p>Other PWB staff are also reviewing the DEIS, and may submit their comments under separate cover.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the different options and provide input on behalf of the PWB. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please feel free to contact me.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Relocation of the Willamette Shoreline Trolley further east could impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line, and vault for the 30" water meter currently located at the west end of SW Sellwood Ferry Rd. 2 The following ten comments list potential West-side Interchange impacts of Alternative A. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2a Depending upon the resulting grade cuts, excavation for the proposed underpass access to Staff Jennings and Powers Marine Park could impact the existing 24" DI water main where it is crossed on the east side of OR 43. 2b Support structures for the northbound bridge on-ramp, and interchange roundabout could impact the existing 24" DI water main located along the east side of OR 43, depending upon their placement overtop of or adjacent to the water main. 2c It appears the fire hydrant located just north of the existing bridge structure and west of the south bound off-ramp lane, would end up located within the travel lane of the newly aligned northbound lane of OR 43.

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
2d		Support structures for the southbound off-ramp could impact the existing water service for 8421 SW Macadam Ave depending upon their placement overtop of or adjacent to that water service line.
2e		The required fill and retaining walls for the access road to the proposed underpass to Staff Jennings, could negatively impact the existing water service for 8421 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
2f		Support structures for the northbound bridge off-ramp could impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line and the vault for the existing 30" water meter located at the west end of SW Sellwood Ferry Rd, and/or the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line extending north along the access road for Staff Jennings. Any required fill and retaining wall to support the northbound bridge off-ramp could also negatively impact the 36" Steel water main.
2g		The fill, retaining wall and bridge structure required for the realignment of the Willamette Shoreline Trolley tracks could negatively impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Line, and/or the existing 30" meter located in SW Sellwood Ferry Rd. The 30" Steel water line would need to be cased where it crosses under the realigned trolley tracks. The new trolley track location may also require relocation of the existing 30" meter.
2h		It appears the existing fire hydrant currently located on the east side of OR 43 north of the access road to Staff Jennings would end up located in the travel lane of the proposed northbound bridge off-ramp.
2i		The required fill and retaining wall for the north end of the northbound off-ramp could negatively impact the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Line located along the east side of OR 43.
2j		The required fill and retaining wall for the proposed relocated Willamette Moorage Park and Macadam Bay Club entrance could negatively impact the existing 2" domestic service for 7720 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
3		The following two comments list potential impacts of the separate Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge in Alternative A.
3a		The placement of bridge support structures for the separate Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge could negatively impact the existing 16" CI water main on the west side of OR 43, and the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line on the east side of OR 43 if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to those water mains.
3b		The placement of bridge support structures for the separate Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge could negatively impact the existing 4" DI water main located west of SE Oaks Park Way, and the domestic and irrigation services to Sellwood Park, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to this water main and those water services.
4		The following 11 comments list potential West-side Interchange impacts of Alternative B.
4a		Depending upon the resulting grade cuts, excavation for the proposed underpass access to Staff Jennings and Powers Marine Park could impact the existing 24" DI water main where it is crossed on the east side of OR 43.
4b		The required fill and retaining walls for the access road to the proposed underpass to Staff Jennings, could negatively impact the existing water service for 8421 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
4c		Support structures for the southbound off-ramp could impact the existing water service for 8421 SW Macadam Ave depending upon their placement overtop of or adjacent to that water service line.
4d		Support structures for the northbound bridge on-ramp, and interchange roundabout could

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		impact the existing 24" DI water main located along the east side of OR 43, depending upon their placement overtop of or adjacent to the water main.
4e		It appears the fire hydrant located just north of the existing bridge structure and west of the south bound off-ramp lane, will be end up within the travel lane of the newly aligned north bound lane of OR 43.
4f		Support structures for the northbound bridge off-ramp could impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line, and the vault for the existing 30" water meter located at the west end of SW Sellwood Ferry Rd, and/or the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line extending north along the access road for Staff Jennings. Any required fill and retaining wall to support the northbound bridge off-ramp could also negatively impact the 36" Steel water main.
4g		The fill, retaining wall and bridge structure required for the realignment of the Willamette Shoreline Trolley tracks could negatively impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Line, and/or the existing 30" meter located in SW Sellwood Ferry Rd. The 30" Steel water line would need to be cased where it crosses under the realigned trolley tracks. The new trolley track location may also require relocation of the existing 30" meter.
4h		The existing fire hydrant currently located on the east side of OR 43 north of the access road to Staff Jennings may be located in the travel lane of the east side of the northbound bridge off-ramp.
4i		The support structures for the bike/pedestrian spiral ramps to the Willamette Greenway Trail will impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water main.
4j		The required fill and retaining wall for the north end of the northbound off-ramp could negatively impact the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line located along the east side of OR 43.
4k		The required fill and retaining wall for the proposed relocated Willamette Moorage Park and Macadam Bay Club entrance could negatively impact the existing 2" domestic service for 7720 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
5		The proposed temporary Detour Bridge appears to be located directly overtop of the submerged 30" CI Southeast Supply Water Line. Although the river crossing portion of the Southeast Supply Water Line is buried approximately five feet under the river bottom, if the Detour Bridge is built in the proposed location, the Portland Water Bureau (PWB) would be required to re-install this main at a different location and abandon the existing line. Relocation of this pipeline would not only require a lengthy permit approval process, but would also add significant cost to the Sellwood Bridge Project.
6		The following 13 comments list potential West-side Interchange impacts of Alternative C.
6a		Any grade cuts required to install the proposed Bike/Pedestrian underpass south of the west side interchange which will cross the existing 24" DI water main located along the east side of OR 43 may impact the water line and require it to be lowered.
6b		Support structures for the elevated trumpet interchange could impact the existing 24" DI water main located along the east side of OR 43, if they are placed on top of, or adjacent to the water line.
6c		It appears the fire hydrant located just north of the existing bridge structure and west of the existing south bound off-ramp lane, could be impacted by support structures for the proposed elevated trumpet interchange. It also appears that the present location of the hydrant barrel may end up in either the south bound OR 43 on-ramp or off-ramp.
6d		Support structures for the southbound bridge off-ramp along the north side of the trumpet interchange could impact the existing 24" DI and 16" CI water mains, as well as the water service

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		connections for 8240 and 8260 SW Macadam Ave (Staff Jennings), if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to these water facilities.
6e		Support structures for the east side of the southbound bridge off-ramp will impact the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
6f		It appears the existing fire hydrant currently located on the east side of OR 43 north of the access road to Staff Jennings would need to be relocated so that it is accessible from the newly aligned OR 43.
6g		Depending upon where the southbound lane feeding the eastbound on-ramp to the bridge changes from an on grade travel lane to the elevated on-ramp structure, the support structures for the elevated on-ramp could impact the existing 16" CI water main if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
6h		Support structures for the northbound bridge off-ramp could impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line in SW Sellwood Ferry Rd if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
6i		The required fill and retaining wall for the north end of the northbound off-ramp could negatively impact the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line located along the east side of OR 43.
6j		The required fill and retaining wall for the east side of OR 43 north of this proposed Sellwood Bridge alignment could negatively impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line and/or the existing 30" meter in SW Sellwood Ferry Rd.
6k		Support structures for the proposed Willamette Shoreline Trolley bridge could negatively impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line. Any at grade crossing with the trolley by this 30" Steel water line would need to be cased where it crosses under the realigned trolley tracks.
6l		Support structures for the northbound Bike/Pedestrian bridge off-ramp could impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line in SW Sellwood Ferry Rd if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
6m		The required fill and retaining wall for the proposed relocated Willamette Moorage Park and Macadam Bay Club entrance could negatively impact the existing 2" domestic service for 7720 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
7		The following two comments list potential East-side impacts of Alternative C.
7a		The proposed lowering of SE Grand Ave could expose the existing 6" CI main which crosses the intersection of SE Tacoma St and SE Grand Ave. This section of water line may need to be lowered to accommodate the required cuts in the finish grade of SE Grand Ave.
7b		Support structures for the west side of the East-side connection Bike/Pedestrian spiral ramp to the lower deck of the bridge may impact the existing 6" DI main located in a 30' easement west of SE Oaks Park Way extended, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
8		The following 10 comments list potential West-side Interchange impacts of Alternative D.
8a		Depending upon the resulting grade cuts, excavation for the proposed underpass access to Staff Jennings and Powers Marine Park could impact the existing 24" DI water main where it is crossed on the east side of OR 43.
8b		The required fill and retaining walls for the access road to the proposed underpass to Staff Jennings, could negatively impact the existing water service for 8421 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
8c		Support structures for the northbound on-ramp to the bridge could impact the existing 24" CI

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		water main located along the east side of OR 43, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
8d		It appears the fire hydrant located just north of the existing bridge structure and west of the existing south bound off-ramp lane, could be impacted by support structures for the proposed upper level for the west-side interchange. It also appears that the present location of the hydrant barrel may end up in the north bound lane of the realigned OR 43.
8e		Any required fill, retaining wall, and support structures for the northbound bridge off-ramp and far north merge lane could impact the existing 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line located on the east side of OR 43 if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
8f		It appears the hydrant barrel of the existing fire hydrant currently located on the east side of OR 43 north of the access road to Staff Jennings will end up in the northbound off-ramp merging lane to OR 43, and would need to be relocated.
8g		The existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line located at the west end of SW Sellwood Ferry Rd could be impacted if cuts in the existing grade are required to connect the proposed underpass access to Staff Jennings with SW Sellwood Ferry Rd.
8h		The fill, retaining wall and bridge structure for realignment of the Willamette Shoreline Trolley tracks could negatively impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line, and/or the existing 30" water meter located in SW Sellwood Ferry Rd. The 30" Steel water line would need to be cased where it crosses under any at grade crossing of the realigned trolley tracks. The new trolley track location may also require relocation of the existing 30" meter.
8i		Support structures for the bike/pedestrian spiral ramp to the Willamette Greenway Trail on the north side of the Sellwood Bridge will impact the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water main.
8j		The required fill and retaining wall for the proposed relocated Willamette Moorage Park and Macadam Bay Club entrance could negatively impact the existing 2" domestic service for 7720 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
9		The following four comments list potential East-side impacts of Alternative D.
9a		Support structures for the SE Tacoma St bridge structure may impact the existing 6" DI main installed in a 30' wide easement parallel to and south of the southline of SE Tacoma St and west of SE Oaks Park Way extended.
9b		The existing two fire hydrants currently located on the south side of SE Tacoma St west of SE Oaks Park Way extended may be impacted by support structures for the SE Tacoma St bridge structure, or may no longer be accessible to fire emergency vehicles due to the widening of SE Tacoma St at that location, and may require relocation.
9c		If the SE Tacoma St roadway will be widened at the east end of the bridge structure, the existing fire hydrant on the north side of SE Tacoma St east of SE Grand Ave, may need to be relocated to remain outside of the travel roadway.
9d		Support structures at the east end of the bridge structure may impact the existing 6" CI water main in SE Tacoma St crossing SE Grand Ave if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water main.
10		The following nine comments list potential West-side Interchange impacts of Alternative E.
10a		Depending upon the resulting grade cuts, excavation for the proposed underpass access to Staff Jennings and Powers Marine Park could impact the existing 24" DI water main where it is crossed on the east side of OR 43.
10b		The required fill and retaining walls for the access road to the proposed underpass to Staff

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		Jennings, could negatively impact the existing water service for 8421 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
I0c		Support structures for the northbound bridge on-ramp could impact the existing 24" DI water main currently located on the east side of OR 43, the fire hydrant located just north of the existing bridge structure and west of the existing south bound off-ramp lane, and the existing water service connections for 8240 and 8260 SW Macadam Ave (Staff Jennings), if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to these water facilities.
I0d		It appears that the present location of the hydrant barrel of the fire hydrant located just north of the existing bridge structure and west of the existing south bound off-ramp lane, may end up in between the northbound travel lane of OR 43, and the northbound bridge on-ramp, which may make it inaccessible to emergency vehicles.
I0e		Support structures for the northbound bridge off-ramp, including any fill and retaining wall required at the north side of the upper interchange, could negatively impact the existing 36" Steel Southeast Water Supply Line currently located in the access road to Staff Jennings if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to that water line.
I0f		Support structures for the upper level of the westside interchange could impact the existing 16" CI and 36" Steel Southeast Water Supply Line water mains, currently located in the northbound lane of OR 43 and in the access road to Staff Jennings respectively, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to these water facilities.
I0g		Support structures for the upper level of the westside interchange could impact the hydrant run for the existing fire hydrant currently located on the east side of OR 43 north of the access road to Staff Jennings. It also appears that the hydrant barrel will end up underneath the northbound bridge off-ramp, which may make it inaccessible to emergency vehicles.
I0h		Depending upon where the northbound off-ramp no longer requires support structures as it parallels and merges with OR 43, any required support structures, including any required fill and retaining walls, could impact the existing 16" CI and 36" Steel Southeast Water Supply Line water mains, currently located in the northbound lane of OR 43, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to these water mains.
I0i		The required fill and retaining wall for the proposed relocated Willamette Moorage Park and Macadam Bay Club entrance could negatively impact the existing 2" domestic service for 7720 SW Macadam Ave. That service line will need to be sleeved underneath any retaining wall structures.
I1		The following four comments list potential East-side impacts of Alternative E.
I1a		Support structures for the East-side bridge could impact the existing 4" DI water main located west of SE Oaks Park Way north of SE Spokane St, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to this water main.
I1b		Support structures for the East-side bridge could impact the existing 6" CI water main and 36" Southeast Supply Water Line located in SE Spokane St between SE Grand Ave and SE Oaks Park Way, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to these water lines.
I1c		Support structures for the East-side bridge could impact the existing fire hydrant currently located on the south side of SE Spokane St at 82' west of the westline of SE Grand Ave, if they are installed overtop of or adjacent to this water facility.
I1d		Depending upon any required support structures, or depth of excavation required to complete the East-side connection with SE Tacoma St, the existing 6" CI water main in SE Tacoma St could be impacted if support structures are installed overtop of or adjacent to this water lines, or if the water main has less than 2' of cover at any point during roadway reconstruction.

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
12		Both the use of bridge structures or standard fill could negatively impact existing water facilities depending upon whether they are installed overtop of or adjacent to an existing water main, water service line or fire hydrant, and depending upon the depth of the proposed standard fill.
13		A PWB crew would need to be on site during any blasting activity along the west bank hillside to monitor the status and safety of the existing 24" DI and 16" CI water mains, and 36" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line.
14		A PWB crew would need to be on site during any drilling or pile driving activity for the bridge foundation in the Willamette River in order to monitor the status and safety of the submerged 30" CI Southeast Supply Water Line.
15		The PWB would like to be kept in the information loop regarding where temporary roadway and retaining walls will be required during construction of the new west-side interchange to determine what, if any, impact they will have on the existing water facilities, and what mitigation work will be needed to maintain the existing water system facilities.
16		The proposed location of the temporary detour bridge will be directly overtop of the submerged 30" CI Southeast Supply Water Line. Although the river crossing portion of the Southeast Supply Water Line is buried approximately five feet under the river bottom, if the Detour Bridge is built in the proposed location, the PWB would be required to re-install this main at a different location and abandon the existing line. Relocation of this pipeline would not only require a lengthy permit approval process, but would also add significant cost to the Sellwood Bridge Project.
17		The PWB would like to be kept in the information loop regarding any required temporary false-work and/or temporary widening of OR 43 in order to determine what, if any, impacts these temporary installations will have on the submerged 30" CI Southeast Supply Water Line, and the two existing fire hydrant currently located just north of the existing bridge structure and west of the existing south bound off-ramp lane, and on the east side of OR 43 north of the access road to Staff Jennings, respectively.
18		The PWB would like to be kept in the information loop regarding any required temporary false-work in order to determine what, if any, impacts these temporary installations will have on the submerged 30" CI Southeast Supply Water Line.
19		Depending upon where a street car station will be located at the west end interchange area of the Sellwood Bridge, that structure could significantly impact the existing water main located in the north bound lanes of OR 43, and/or the existing 30" Steel Southeast Supply Water Line located at the west end of SW Sellwood Ferry Rd and in the access road to Staff Jennings.
20		380 SE Tacoma St, the Sellwood Building, is identified as an East-side impact displaced building in Figure 3.3-3, Figure 3.3-4, Figure 3.3-5, Figure 3.3-6, and Figure 3.3-7, but there is no commentary offered regarding this displaced building.
21		In the second sentence of the second bulleted item in the first column of this page, the size of one of the existing water lines parallel to OR 43 is listed as 32 inches. The correct number is "36" inches.
22		In the "Mitigation" paragraph, it is stated that "Impacted Utilities would be replaced, reconstructed, or realigned." It should also be stated that the Sellwood Bridge Project will bear the cost for all required public water facility relocation and mitigation.
23		The PWB would be interested in seeing a breakdown of the estimated costs listed by impacted utility. For example, what percentage of the \$2.87 million estimated for utility relocation in Alternative A is identified as being required for water system mitigation?
24		The PWB is concerned about the potential for damage to the existing 24" DI water main, 16" CI water main and 36" steel Southeast Supply Water Line as a result of cut-and-fill slope activity, the

TABLE J-1

Text of the Comments Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

ID ^a	Name	How Comment was Received
		<p>installation of retaining walls and other structures within the existing Sellwood Slide area. Destabilization of the soil supporting these water facilities could result in pipe failure. The PWB would like to be kept in the information loop as the exact cut requirements are identified and slide mitigation is developed.</p> <p>25 The PWB wants to participate in the review of proposed water system mitigation as the preferred alternative design progresses and as more detailed design information becomes available.</p>

^a The numbering system used for the individuals begins with 48 because the identification numbers could not be reset after the initial 47 “practice” items were entered into (and deleted from) the software database. Other numeric gaps relate to data entry errors.