



**From:** [richard@hamje.net](mailto:richard@hamje.net)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#);  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC Submit Comments Page  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 20, 2008 7:27:23 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

From: Richard Hamje  
E-Mail: richard@hamje.net  
Comment or Question:

I have recently been seeing conflicting data on bridge crossings. The CRC projects very high future demand for crossings, while ACTUAL crossing counts have been declining since 2006.

It seems that CRC has unstated assumptions about the future which are very questionable: gasoline prices remain low and stable for the next 20 years; residential expansion in Clark County continues at its record pace of 2005, not its lower historical pace; Portland never imposes restrictions or tolls on vehicle access to the city core; that no cultural stigma becomes associated with unnecessary driving. Any or all of these assumptions could easily prove to be wrong (the first two already are) and skew the resulting demand for crossings significantly lower.

I have not seen a convincing argument as to why the I-205 crossing is not suitable for I-5 truck traffic. I have no numbers, but I suspect that the majority of trucks bound for points south of Portland use I-205 today. If correct, this means that the I-5 truck traffic is local, and thus that the I-5 crossing is NOT imposing a large cost on interstate commerce as implied by CRC.

Finally, a new bridge will encourage more driving, and more suburban sprawl in Washington. We should not be spending gigantic sums to encourage behavior that is clearly not in our long-term interest.

For these reasons, I believe that the only reasonable alternative for CRC is the No-Build option. If Clark County wants to separately fund a transit crossing to the benefit of its residents, this would be a good thing for the region. Otherwise, the money could be better spent elsewhere.

Richard Hamje  
Beaverton, OR

