

TO: Rob DeGraff, Doug Ficco
CC: Kris Strickler, Dean Lookingbill, Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman
FROM: Mark Turpel
DATE: November 19, 2004

SUBJECT: Working Paper 6.2 - Identification and Threshold Analysis of Truck Only Lanes

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest I-5 Columbia River Crossing Partnership document entitled: " Identification and Threshold Analysis of Truck Only Lanes" - Working Paper 6.2.

I have not been able to review these comments with Andy Cotugno or Richard Brandman, so I cannot represent that the following comments reflect our Department or the Agency's position. However, I would hope that the comments are helpful in Project progress.

My comments are as follows:

General Observation. While your conclusion does not find truck only lanes feasible for the bridge influence area, I'm sure that you and others would like to see if there is some means of improving freight mobility in the area. While it may not be the task of the I-5 Columbia River Crossing to solve the region's or two state's trucking impediments, I-5 is clearly a critical facility and the ultimate design of the road portion of the Crossing could include or preclude methods of improving truck movement. It would be very useful, perhaps once the new freight data collection and analysis is completed, to see if there are other truck mobility methods which might be included in the I-5 Columbia River Crossing Project.

[Agree. We are confident the DEIS process will require an evaluation of opportunities to enhance freight and goods movements within the BIA.](#)

Page 3 - Existing Truck Data within the BIA. The data that you discuss on page 3 and illustrate in Figures 1 and 2 on page 4, and in Table 1 on page 5 is not within the BIA. As noted further in the report (page 6), the Minnesota ATR is located near "...Swan Island access just outside the BIA."

[Comment noted. We did attempt to qualify the statement by saying existing truck data was "from area traffic recorders" but can go back and add that the data wasn't within the BIA.](#)

Page 4 - Figures 1 and 2. The traffic direction appears to be reversed. That is, Figure 1 appears to be southbound traffic and Figure 2 appears to be northbound. In addition, suggest that these figures be labeled something like "Hourly Traffic Volumes on I-5 at

the Going Street/Swan Island Interchange". This would be much clearer than the ATR name that may confuse some readers.

Agree. Figures will be reversed.

(Regarding the above, I don't think that if the truck data is from a location slightly outside the BIA or the traffic direction is reversed changes the conclusion, only that the paper should accurately report the facts.)

Agree.

Page - A-4 I-5 truck lane near Barbur Blvd. This local example seems more like a climbing lane, the category described above. It doesn't have the characteristics of interchange bypass lanes (freeway to freeway interchange or major arterial interchange), the category in which it is described.

We did not view the Barbur Blvd. truck lane as a climbing lane. We feel it was signed to create a by-pass to separate trucks from non-truck traffic.

Page - A-6, Interstate 81 example, last paragraph, third sentence. The data in this sentence does not seem correct. It ends "...but now contains 20 to 4% trucks." Is this 20% to 40% trucks?

Yes, it should have been 20% - 40% trucks.

Again, thanks for the opportunity to comment.