

From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing;](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Monday, May 05, 2008 1:58:35 PM
Attachments:



Home Zip Code: 97209
Work Zip Code: 97214

Person:

Person commutes in the travel area via:
Car or Truck

1. In Support of the following bridge options:
Replacement Bridge
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland
3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:
Lincoln Terminus: Unsure
Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Unsure
Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Unsure
Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Unsure

Contact Information:

First Name:
Last Name:
Title:
E-Mail:
Address:

,

Comments:

I know it's too late for new proposals, but part of this just came to me. Sorry. Ignore it if you want to.

I don't like any of the current proposals. If the existing bridges have to be replaced because of structural reasons, fine, do it, and don't repeat the design errors that exist now. Specifically, the curves, the hill, the entrances and exits too close together, the impression that the lanes are narrow, the drawspan.

Build a new bridge (or pair of bridges) with four lanes, each as wide as the lanes leading to it, plus left and right shoulders in each direction. One separate right-of-way for bikes and pedestrians, wherever it works best (east side, west side, or in the center, as on the Glen Jackson bridge. Left lane for carpools and/or buses, if this justifies itself (New Jersey uses bus-only lanes really successfully through the Lincoln Tunnel). No light rail -- I do believe in it, but there is no route north of the bridge that has dense enough residency to justify service. People will not ride a bus to a train. And the Vancouverites hate light rail. Bus route design is flexible; light rail route design is not. I realize this makes the Expo line a lightly-travelled dead-end. Tri-Met shouldn't have built it unless the crossing was a sure thing.

To avoid a hill, note that the Vancouver bank is relatively steep -- the abutment would be between 7th and 11th Streets. The Oregon side has room for a longer, gradual grade.

To avoid the "closed-in" feeling that makes drivers slow down because they think lanes are narrow, build a top-deck bridge, like the Glen Jackson and the Abernathy.

To avoid the curves, either have a curving bridge (but no sharper a curve than is found on the Glen Jackson), or a straight bridge with the north landing about 100 feet east of the current landing. In the latter case, there would have to be a curve at the south end. Actually, a continuation of the existing curve south of Marine Drive would work. Note that the new bridge(s) should be just far enough east of the existing northbound span so that construction is not impeded by proximity to the existing spans.

To avoid the ramps that are too close together, eliminate the Jantzen Beach exits. Wait! Read on! Have southbound traffic destined for Jantzen Beach exit at Marine Drive, turn right, and use a new bridge to Hayden Island. This bridge would be just west of the interchange. Low altitude (the sailboats that dock in that channel would have to go around the east end of the island), four lanes, short, cheap. Considering the existing road layout on Hayden Island, travel time might even be shortened. The I-5/Marine Drive/MLK interchange would have to be reworked somewhat. We're literally going in circles there now.

Make provision for reversible lanes. Install manually operated overhead signals for each lane. At each end of the structure, pave and stripe the median for crossover traffic (see the Delaware Memorial Bridges on I-95).

