

From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 2:36:48 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97201

Work Zip Code:



Person:

Lives in the project area

Works in the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Car or Truck

1. In Support of the following bridge options:

Do Nothing

2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:

Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland

3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:

Lincoln Terminus: No Opinion

Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion

Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

First Name:

Last Name:

Title:

E-Mail:

Address:

,

Comments:

Adding more traffic lanes for commuters amounts to a gigantic taxpayer subsidy for

sprawl and therefore for land speculators, low efficiency development, global warming and all the other well documented ills caused by this welfare for developers. According to the press reports I've seen, the vast majority of the traffic over the bridge isn't commercial but rather commuters, many of whom got a break by buying cheap McMansions (whose prices don't reflect their true environmental costs) far away from where they work. They they expect the rest of us to subsidize their anti-social, anti-environment choices by paying for their climate-changing driving infrastructure. Meanwhile, those of us who pay more in order to live closer to where we work and reduce our impact on the planet get penalized by paying higher taxes to fund the anti-environmental infrastructure that makes their cheap mortgages possible. And in the end, as has been shown every time such capacity has been expanded, it'll all just fill up again, with no net gain in return for the huge taxpayer rip off.

The only way to stop sprawl is to make those who benefit from it pay the true cost -- either by sitting in traffic for hours or paying user fees. As people recognize the true costs of their decisions about where to live, that would discourage bad sprawl development and encourage good close in development.

We should save that limited money (this single project will consume most of the available funds for 20 years) and instead of subsidizing sprawl, use it to build and repair infrastructure that's higher in efficiency and lower in costs to the environment and the taxpayers -- light rail, bike paths, fixing potholes and building sidewalks in Portland.

According to opponents of a new bridge, the current bridge is structurally sound and could be made entirely safe with upgrades paid for by tolling it now. At a much, much lower cost, we could fix the ramps, put in a light rail and bike/ped connection (either added to or substituting for a current traffic lane or two), and force single-occupant vehicle drivers to carpool or take light rail. Then let Clark County pay to improve transit connections from the light rail station to Clark County neighborhoods. That, along with soaring gas prices, will reduce congestion substantially, obviating the need for an expensive new bridge that promotes the very kind of development and transportation that's killing the planet. If Clark County commuters don't like public transportation, fine -- but don't expect the rest of us to subsidize their anti environmental lifestyle with this massive boondoggle.