



From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing;](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Thursday, May 29, 2008 6:11:44 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97206

Work Zip Code: 97201

Person:

Other - pass through the project area and pay taxes that should go to better projects

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:

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: Yes

Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Yes

Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:

First Name: Martha

Last Name: Richards

Title:

E-Mail:

Address: 6906 SE 48th Ave

Portland, OR 97206

Comments:

Rising gas prices, the war in the mideast, worsening environmental conditions, and other

related issues that we are now facing all suggest that we should be spending our transportation money on facilities that reduce reliance on the private automobile, not facilitate it.

As a result, the CRC range of options is deeply flawed. Because we know that most of the traffic on the bridge is Clark County commuters going to and from the Portland Metro area, if we focus on changing commuting behavior, we can significantly (and, yes, I do mean to use the word "significantly" and I do understand its legal ramifications) reduce congestion. First, implement tolling on the existing bridges to make drive-alone trips less appealing. Second, build effective high-capacity transit to facilitate the WA to OR commute. Third, improve the bike/ped connection to provide a range of transportation options. Because the proposed bridge design would induce new trips, I cannot support that option. This is no time to be encouraging people to drive more.

Not only will the new bridge create new trips, the proposed bicycle/pedestrian bridge design is inadequate and short-sighted. The motor vehicle lanes have been designed to accommodate future traffic volumes, but the bike/ped facility is only designed for today's bike/ped volumes. I understand that it is designed to AASHTO guidelines, but it is important to recognize that those guidelines do not consider capacity issues. That is, they assume that there will only be a few people out on a path at any given time, and do not provide any guidance for accommodating high volumes of cyclists or pedestrians. Portland's many bike/ped paths designed to AASHTO guidelines get maxed out during peak periods. It is simply short-sighted to assume that peak hour bike/ped volumes would be so low that the planned path will be sufficient.

Finally, there's a nearby railroad bridge. If the freight community is so determined to improve freight capacity, let them lean on the railroad to improve that bridge.

This is our chance to re-think our region's priorities. I for one believe that it is time to take responsibility for our actions, and to spend our transportation dollars on projects that will improve our environment, reduce our reliance on foreign oil, and make the area a pleasant place to live. A CRC that DECREASES motor vehicle usage and increases transit and bike/ped usage is the only one that I will support.