

**From:** [steve.cook@bullivant.com](mailto:steve.cook@bullivant.com)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#);  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Thursday, May 29, 2008 11:41:41 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97205  
Work Zip Code: 97204



Person:

Person commutes in the travel area via:  
Car or Truck

1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
Supplemental Bridge  
Do Nothing
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:  
Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland  
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: Steve  
Last Name: Cook  
Title:  
E-Mail: [steve.cook@bullivant.com](mailto:steve.cook@bullivant.com)  
Address: 3134 SW Evergreen Lane  
Portland, or 97205

Comments:

I have serious reservations about what appear to be the leading proposals on the I-5

bridge project. In particular, I am very skeptical of any proposal that would increase traffic capacity on the bridge:

-- Increasing capacity would likely just encourage more traffic, which is the last thing we should be doing. From what I've seen the problem is largely caused by people who have chosen to live in one state and commute to the other state, and if we increase the capacity of the bridge we're likely to encourage more such commuting. That could simply lead to the new, wider bridge becoming clogged when, once again, commuter traffic grows until it slows traffic.

-- I also don't want to encourage driving due to its contribution to global warming and air pollution.

-- As an Oregonian I am opposed to anything that further encourages people with jobs in Oregon to live in Washington (taking some of their taxes with them). A bridge with more capacity would do that.

-- As someone who seldom drives this route, I am opposed to spending the kind of money I've heard rebuilding the bridge would require (\$4 billion plus). There are other things I would rather see my taxes go toward.

-- As someone who now and then drives this route, I'm willing to put up with the congestion when I do.

-- Therefore, I prefer either the "No Build" alternative, or a much more modest project which would simply repair/renovate the existing bridges so that they would be safer. The summaries of the other proposals don't appeal to me because they all appear to involve additional traffic lanes.

-- The only other thing I would support would adding a light rail only bridge to provide a light rail alternative to driving (while not increasing auto traffic capacity) or building a new bridge with three traffic lanes only (no additional traffic lanes) plus light rail. However, given Clark County's cool reaction to light rail so far, I'm not sure building a light rail bridge into Clark County would be a wise use of the dollars.

-- I agree with those who wonder whether rising gasoline prices are going to largely solve or reduce the congestion issue without building any new traffic lanes. It would be a shame to spend \$4 billion plus on a bigger bridge if it turned out that we would be driving less, and a bigger bridge would not be needed.

Therefore, I encourage the decision-makers to (1) slow down and not make a decision any time soon; (2) and reconsider what appear to be the leading alternatives.

-- Steve Cook

Portland, Oregon