

From: MICHAELCAMPBELL@YAHOO.COM
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Friday, June 27, 2008 3:42:45 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97210

Work Zip Code: 97210

Person:

Lives in the project area

Works in the project area



Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle

Car or Truck

Walk

Other - light rail and street car

1. In Support of the following bridge options:

Supplemental Bridge

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: MICHAEL

Last Name: CAMPBELL

Title: DIRECTOR OF SALES AND MARKETING

E-Mail: MICHAELCAMPBELL@YAHOO.COM

Address: 530 NW 23RD AVE #408

PORTLAND, OR 97210

Comments:

I believe this organization is jumping to a 20th century solution for a 21st century problem. 1) We need to use less oil. Building more roads will create more traffic, more auto emissions, more greenhouse gases. If we are serious about dealing with global climate change, we must match our actions to our intentions. Building more roads is an answer from the past, not the future. 2) The current congestion, while serious, is caused primarily by one-way commuters living in Washington (lower housing prices) and working and shopping in Oregon (higher wages, no sales tax). The solution proposed is a bridge paid for 50/50 by Oregon and Washington, when 90% of the personal benefits flow to Washington. This is wrong. Other than at peak rush hours (and even then, only one way), there is no congestion. 3) Another source of the current traffic and congestion is trucking. For the short term, we can enforce and strengthen existing regulations to move more truck traffic to I-205. In the long term, we must move more freight by rail -- a solution that uses less gas and helps save the planet. Far more than 50% of the benefits from a new bridge go to the trucking industry, yet the funding for the project is coming from taxes on residents, not businesses. Here's a suggestion: put electronic (no-stop) tolls for trucks only (type tolls) on I-5, with none on I-205. Watch the current congestion melt away. 4) A third source of the current congestion is business-related automobile traffic in the Vancouver (BC) to Eugene corridor, primarily Seattle-to-Portland. Improving high-speed Amtrak service in this corridor would eliminate many car trips, and also oil-wasting flights. But improving Amtrak is not an option I have seen discussed in the many articles about a new bridge. In business, time is money. Make it faster and easier to take the train than drive or fly, and cars will get off the road. Finally, designing any new structure while the height limitations caused by Pearson Field are still in place is foolish. This landing strip is an anachronism, located next to a National Historic Site. Although historic, it should not limit our vision of a new crossing. What would the Golden Gate look like if it had been designed around this restriction? In conclusion, I believe the rush to a new bridge is a mistake, not carefully thought out, being pushed heavily by business interests who have much to gain, ignoring ordinary citizens driving less each day because of the pain of high gas prices.