


From: [JAMES FARBER](#)
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: *** Detected as Spam *** CRC-Eis Comment
Date: Thursday, May 08, 2008 11:54:11 AM
Attachments:

Of the five alternatives I would go with bus mass transit in either a "replacement" or supplemental scenario but never light rail. The latter is capital intensive, totally inflexible without adding more capital intensity, as monumental as the Roman coliseum and viaducts and unable to take up even 10% of the current I-5 bridge load. And from my experience (not an expensive study) the I-5 Bridge is NOT the problem. The problem is the bottleneck and multitude of short on-off ramps south of the bridge and has been for the 30 years I have been in the NW. 

First of all proof has not been provided that the I-5 Bridge is a problem "important to our region and society". I would like to know: a. Who is pushing this and why? b. How did the OR Freeloaders get WA to provide the millions of dollars for studies that always include the light rail to meet OR's light rail vision already brought to the river bank along the I-5 and I-205 corridors. c. Why does OR get to name the bridges? d. How does OR get away with saying that light rail will be included or we will not approve any bridge???

OR screws WA every chance they get. I challenged one Oregonian reporter about Delta Park funnel being the problem not the bridge. His response was "Why should we care, it only affects WA residents not Oregonians". In other words we will illegally take your money (income tax) but we will not give you any of ours. Perhaps the millions spent studying CRCs might have been better spent bring jobs over to WA rather than moving people to OR. After all it would save your constituents both tax and, now especially, gas money.

Secondly, I have yet to see graphics showing the population

movements and trends over the past 30 years. The impression is that the Clark County trend is east ward and/or north ward. Am not sure about OR. Seems like their movement is more south and west while retaining the eastern direction toward Gresham as is. Where the traffic is coming from and where it needs to go strike me as extremely important considerations for any bridge work. I idea of simply getting across the river is not viable justification for more bridge work

Third, I have not seen a lot of consideration given to tiering, building one highway on top of what is already here. In the same amount of space the number of traffic lanes is automatically doubled. There are numerous examples of this around the country, one in Portland, a number of them in the SF area (Bay Bridge).

My comments as requested.
Jim Farber, Amboy, WA,