

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR IBR COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP

Received between March 14, 2024 and May 9, 2024

Comment Received: 5/7/2024

From: Bob Ortblad

Email Subject: Community Advisory Group - Public Comment

Attachment Included: Yes

**Community Advisory Group** 

Public Comment for May 9, 2024 meeting.

Respectfully

Bob Ortblad MSCE, MBA

\*ADA compliant versions of the attachments can be made available upon request



Key events - Immersed Tunnel July 14, 2021 IBR's error-filled "Tunnel Concept Assessment" challenged

Dec. 5, 2022 Hayden Island public challenge

Feb. 8, 2023
US Coast Guard suggests tunnel evaluation
@USCGPacificNW

Sept. 8, 2023 IBR pleads "Idiot Defense" to avoid fraud









# February 8, 2023

08 February 2023

"Including only one alternative in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) introduces risk that no permittable alternative will be evaluated in the SEIS. It is my sincere hope that the SEIS will include evaluation of an alternative that meets the preliminary navigation clearance determination (PNCD) requirement of 178 feet."

M. W BOUBOULIS
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard
Thirteenth Coast Guard District

IBR ignoring

USCG warnings

17 June 2022

"Any proposed new bridge should have a vertical navigation clearance (VNC) of greater than or equal to that of the existing I-5 twin bridges of 178 feet or preferable, unlimited VNC, as well as a horizontal navigation clearance (HNC) as permitted during the final USACE 408 permit. There are alternative options to accomplish this VNC to include a tunnel or a high-level lift bridge or bascule bridge, which would provide an unlimited vertical clearance."

B. J. HARRIS
Chief, Waterways Management Branch
Coast Guard District Thirteen By direction of the District Commander
U.S. Coast Guard

From: Interstate Bridge Replacement Program Team support@comme ibject: Interstate Bridge Replacement Program Communication Response Date: September 8, 2023 at 2:12 PM



Thank you for reaching out to the Interstate Bridge Replacement (IBR) program and for sharing your questions about the Cross Section areas. We are responding back to address your specific questions but want to be clear that this does not change that the tunnel still does not best address the needs of the I-5 bridge and the

Our team of engineers uses a variety of software tools, such as InRoads that you referenced. We have investigated your inquiry and were able to confirm an issue with the model. Duplication occurred in the model where some excavation quantities were counted more than once. We are working on making the correction in the report and uploading an updated version.

However, upon reviewing what you provided, it appears your representative diagram and excavation calculations at 87+00 do not account the construction need for laying back slopes during excavation (and the resulting surface property impacts), or the alternative to have temporary structural walls which come with an extremely high cost. As you know, one of these options must be accounted for to prevent the sides of the trench from caving in during construction of an ITT.

We conduct continuous quality checks and assurances to catch any errors that may arise with third party software and appreciate you flagging this. Quantity errors like this are not uncommon during the development of conceptual work. In a situation where plans are being constructed, the increasing level of detail completed as work advances would address potential calculation errors before moving to future steps.

As we have extensively detailed and documented, a tunnel still results in out-ofdirection travel, cannot tie into existing connections, potentially causes safety concerns for active transportation, has significant environmental impacts, and has a higher estimated cost. While this error does result in a change in the quantity of excavation of material, it does not change the decision, reached with agency partners, not to pursue a tunnel as a solution for the I-5 corridor as the multiple factors considered remain true.

We appreciate your understanding.

Interstate Bridge Replacement program

Communications Team

September 8, 2023

# IBR pleads the "Idiot Defense" to avoid fraud

Inflated cubic-vards of excavation

8 million 400% IBR original IBR revision 4 million Correct about 2 million 100%



# Bob Ortblad @BOrtblad · Apr 29 CBAG, April 25, 2024

My public testimony: "The IBR and their consultants are guilty fraud or

stupidity."

Member response: "WOW"

Testimony:

https://youtube.com/watch?v=MpAJhytFDr0&t=1368s...

To disqualify a tunnel IBR inflated tunnel excavation by four times and pleaded the "Idiot Defense" of avoid fraud.

# "Idiot Defense"

Email Sept. 8, 2023 Interstate Bridge Replacement Program Team To: Bob Ortblad

Good afternoon,

Thank you for reaching out to the interstate Bridge Replacement (IBR) program and for sharing your questions about the Cross Section areas. We are responding back to address your specific questions but want to be clear that this does not change that the tunnel still does not best address the needs of the I-5 bridge and the corridor.

Our team of engineers uses a variety of software tools, such as inRoads that you referenced. We have investigated your inquiry and were able to confirm an issue with the model. Duplication occurred in the model where some excavation quantities were counted more than once. We are working on making the correction in the report and uploading an updated version.

However, upon reviewing what you provided, it appears your representative diagram and excalvation calculations at 87-00 do not account the construction need for laying back slopes during excavation (and the resulting surface property impacts), or the alternative to have temporary structural walls which come with an extremely high cost. As you know, one of these options must be accounted for to prevent the sides of the trench from caving in during construction of an ITT.

We conduct continuous quality checks and assurances to catch any errors that may arise with third party software and appreciate you fiagging this. Quantity errors like this are not uncommon during the development of conceptual work. In a situation where plans are being constructed, the increasing level of datall completed as work advances would address potential calculation errors before moving to future steps.

As we have extensively detailed and documented, a tunnel still results in out-of-direction travel, cannot tie into existing connections, potentially causes safety concerns for active transportation, has significant environmental impacts, and has a higher estimated cost. While this error does result in a change in the quantity of excavation of material, it does not change the decision, reached with agency partners, not to pursue a tunnel as a solution for the 1-5 conflor as the multiple fectors considered remain true.

We appreciate your understanding.

Sincerel

#### **Tunnel Concept Assessment**

Revision 2

Prepared by WSP USA and Parametrix Cost \$100,000

#### IBR's email explains their incompetence:

Translation:

"Our team of engineers uses a variety of software tools ... errors that may arise with third party software .."

We don't know how our software works.

"Duplication occurred in the model where some excavation quantities were counted more than once."  $\label{eq:control}$ 

We only doubled 4 million cubic yards to 8 million cubic yards.

"Quantity errors like this are not uncommon during the development of conceptual work."

We make errors all the time, no big deal.

"In a situation where plans are being constructed, the increasing level of detail completed as work advances would address potential calculation errors before moving to future steps."

We would have found the error in the distance future.

"While this error does result in a change in the quantity of excavation of material, it does not change the decision, reached.."

We are just going to ignore our massive error.



An Immersed Tunnel and "Reused Bridges" would enable a history field trip to Fort Vancouver on a "Bike Bus" or by TriMet.

@trimet @FTA\_DOT @BikePortland



. .



**Bob Ortblad** @BOrtblad · 4h

Great article in @CityObs by @Joe Cortright

https://cityobservatory.org/the-interstate-bridge-replacement-is-two-years-behind-schedule/...

"This two-year delay means the environmental review has taken twice as long as IBR promised.

Not to worry, because the consultants will continue billing, and their total costs are now more than \$200 million."



# The Columbian

I-5 bridge environmental impact statement delayed, again — this time until 2024

Administrator: 'We're still on time and on schedule at this point'

By William Sealong, Columbia staff write Published Colons 7, 2003, 6 Liber

### **Progress Report - Draft IBR Program Timeline**



. .



Bob Ortblad @BOrtblad · May 2

Residents should have a choice.

IBR team offers Hayden Island a massive, elevated freeway.

An Immersed Tunnel offers a Riverfront Park, puts much of I-5 below ground, less cost, faster to build, safer for people & fish, more earthquake resistant, and have less noise & pollution





### Karaman Baram | IbrProgram · May 2



Members of our team recently visited the Hayden Island Neighborhood Network (Hi-NooN) to meet with residents, share the investments being studied and answer questions about the program.



#### Bob Ortblad @BOrtblad · 23h

An Immersed Tunnel is safer than IBR's steep (4%) curved bridge that will often be wet or icy.

@RepMGP @SenMarkoLiias @BhattmobileT @GovTinaKotek @GovInslee









So many Americans have a personal connection to someone who has died on our roadways. It doesn't have to be this way. We have an opportunity to honor their lives by designing safer streets toward a future with zero roadway fatalities.



#### Bob Ortblad @BOrtblad · 23h

Hard to imagine the scale of IBR bridge designs.

Seattle's massive I-5 Ship Canal Bridge at 119' wide is a dwarf in comparison.

Double Level is 64' wider, +45%.

Single Level is 153' wider, +130%

An IBR bridge will be devastating to the Columbia River, Vancouver, & Hayden Island.





British Columbia is building an immersed tunnel under the Fraser River that is very similar to a possible I-5 Columbia River tunnel. It's less difficult to build a tunnel under Columbia's 27-foot barge channel than Fraser's 38-foot shipping channel. Link

engage.gov.bc.ca/fraserrivertun nel/tailding-the-taines/...



...



IBR plans to demolish homes & businesses and build 1,270 Park & Ride spaces near its freeway transit stations to serve commuters.

IBR is ignoring FTA's encouragement of dense urban development near transit stations.

@FTA\_DOT @MarkoLiias @RepMGP @VancouverUS @BhattmobileT





IBR preaches equity but plans a 10-acre concrete lid for Vancouver casting shadows, noise, and pollution.

The three richest cities in Washington have covered freeway parks.

An Immersed Tunnel will give Vancouver a 7-acre Riverfront Park.



https://www.usnews.com/news/health-news/articles/2024-03-17/in-new-orleans-residents-confront-a-toxic-highway?src=usn\_tw



New Orleans Toxic Highway

"Because kids are smart."

"I have never seen a child play here."

IBR is selling a massive, elevated freeway with bullshit graphic showing a covered park.

@EPAnorthwest @RepMGP @MarkoLiias see comment



\_



Baltimore built an 8-lane immersed tunnel to protect Fort McHenry. China just completed an 8-lane immersed tunnel.

Canada is building an 8-lane immersed tunnel.

An I-5 Columbia River 8-lane immersed tunnel is short, 2,700 feet, shallow 27-foot channel, less costly than a bridge.



...



Alternative not considered by IBR

No rebuild of 7 interchanges, saving billions.

Northbound bridge repurposed to shared path (like NYC High Line) connecting Hayden Island & Vancouver waterfront parks.

Southbound bridge repurposed for light rail, less costly ground level stations



..



China just completed an 8-lane immersed tunnel with 3.1 miles of steelshell immersed tubes.

An I-5 Columbia River immersed tunnel will need just 0.5 miles (6 each x 450 ft.) of immersed tubes that could be fabricated in local shipyards.

@USCGPacificNW @PortlandCorps @GovInslee





Local shipyards can fabricate steel-concrete-steel (SCS) Immersed Tunnel 400-foot segments, creating hundreds of local jobs. SCS is earthquake resistant, plus has the strength to span four lanes. Nippon Steel – Sandwich Tunnel

https://nipponsteel.com/en/tech/report/max/jult/9617.jult...



...



In 2011, CRC's bridge design had 95' navigation clearance.
USCG wanted much higher but was pressure to settle for 116'.
Increase of 21' gave the bridge a dangerous 4% grade.
IBR recycling CRC's 116' design but may not get USCG approval of less 178'

#### Immersed Tunnel unlimited

