



**From:** [ROB BOIME](#)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing;](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** model results demonstrating reduction in rate of traffic growth  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 28, 2008 9:56:31 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

According to Gail Achterman, "modeling shows the project will actually reduce the total number of vehicles crossing the Columbia River in 2030, compared to not building the project."

There's a lot of things I dislike about this statement:

1) First it is deceptive in that it implies that building the new bridge will actually reduce the amount of traffic, but it is in fact saying that the amount of traffic over the bridge will still increase with the new bridge, but the induced demand will be less than the induced demand with the no-build option. The word "reduce" in this case is actually being applied to "traffic increase" rather than to "traffic". However, to the casual reader, that's not how it appears. It is deceptive.

2) A model, like statistics, can show anything you want depending upon the assumptions from which you are working. What assumptions were made that showed that the new bridge will reduce traffic increase in the future. It sure isn't intuitive to me. Unless of course, you're including the effect of light rail. Which leads to number (3):

3) Basically the whole conversation is based on the assumption that the 3 options presented in the EIS are the only 3 options available. Which is obviously not an accident since the most economical and environment-friendly option has lots of detractors: build a light rail/bike/pedestrian bridge, and a bridge for local Hayden Island traffic, and put a toll on the existing bridge for cars with only one person in them. This is obviously the best option from a completely objective point of view, but there are so many self-interested parties that it doesn't even show up as an option in the EIS.

4) Assuming the model is valid, Ms. Achterman doesn't give any numbers regarding how much the new bridge will reduce the traffic increase. Is it by 1% per year?, 0.5% per year?, 50% per year?

Thanks for your time,  
Rob Boime

---

Keep your kids safer online with Windows Live Family Safety. [Help protect your kids.](#)