



**From:** [davidlcarr@earthlink.net](mailto:davidlcarr@earthlink.net)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#);  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC Submit Comments Page  
**Date:** Sunday, June 01, 2008 11:53:58 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

From: David Carr

E-Mail: davidlcarr@earthlink.net

Comment or Question:

Some comments:

- 1) The biggest issue with the I-5 bridge is rush hour traffic (75-77% of traffic goes south in the morning, and 60-68% will go north in the evening.) And yet (while I admittedly have not read everything) I have not seen any proposal that discusses lanes that switch directions in rush hour.
- 2) The supplemental identifies 4 lanes each way + mass transit. If you instead have a bi-directional rush hour lane (for 2-person HOV, trucks and buses), you could have 5 lanes each way during rush hour, and 3 the other way. That is a 63/37 split, much closer to the actual traffic split than 4 lanes each way. Same number of lanes, much better traffic flow.
- 3) I believe that if the supplemental and replacement projects cost nearly the same (about \$3B each), we should absolutely do the supplemental project, if nothing else to give us better options to divert traffic when accidents or construction occurs.
- 4) From the numbers I've seen, rapid transit is less than 10% of the trips, even forecasted to 2030. Yet the \$1B price tag for light rail is 25% of the \$4B total cost. It seems to me that if we have a HOV/bus lane, that should provide nearly equivalent service for mass transit while saving 25% of the cost (or, being able to afford a third bi-directional HOV lane, or a better bike path, or...)