

From: [Steve Citron](#)
To: [Columbia River Crossing;](#)
CC:
Subject: Feedback to CRC on DEIS
Date: Tuesday, July 01, 2008 10:20:04 PM
Attachments: [Feedback to CRC on DEIS.pdf](#)



Attached pdf file provides Feedback to CRC on DEIS

*** eSafe scanned this email for malicious content ***

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

Feedback
to the
Columbia River Crossing Project
on the
Draft EIS

by
Stephen J. Citron

All of my data comes from the CRC Traffic Technical Report using Exhibit 6-12 (2030 No-Build Southbound) and Exhibit 7-11 (2030 Replacement Bridge Southbound).

Consider the amount of stop and go congestion (0-10 mph) in the Bridge Influence Area (BIA) defined as from SR-500 ON to Columbia Blvd. ON in the period from 5 AM to 12 Noon.

Counting, note that the Replacement Bridge has 80 red boxes (0-10 mph) in the BIA and the No-Build Option has 37 red boxes in the BIA. Since each box represents 1/4 hour, the Replacement Bridge has 20 hours of stop and go congestion while the No-Build Option has 9 1/4 hours in the BIA.

Thus in the BIA, which was the primary focus of the project, the Replacement Bridge has more than twice the stop and go congestion of the No-Build Option.

With that in mind, in regard to Stop and Go congestion, you are being led to support a Replacement Bridge design that fails its most fundamental functional requirement Southbound into Portland. The CRC Purpose and Needs Statement notes that "Daily traffic demand over the I-5 crossing is projected to increase by 40% over the next 20 years with stop and go conditions increasing to at least 10 to 12 hours each day if no improvements are made."

The No-Build Option has roughly the Stop and Go congestion predicted in the Purpose and Needs Statement. The Replacement Bridge Option rather than improving the situation yields Stop and Go congestion 2X worse in the BIA.

This result is not meant to necessarily reflect my view that No-Build is the way to go, but rather that the design of the Replacement Bridge is flawed. Given the amount of money to be spent, it is not satisfactory to find increased Stop and Go congestion in the BIA when the goal was to reduce congestion.

Discussed above is Stop and Go congestion over the entire BIA. Consider now congestion at the Bridge itself. Using the same Exhibits as above one finds the following results corresponding to different definitions of congestion:

Congestion Definition	< 10 mph	< 20 mph	< 30 mph
No-Build Option	0 hr	1 hr	5 1/4 hr
Replacement Option	3 hr	3 hr	3 1/2 hr

Note that at the Bridge the No-Build Option has less congestion than the Replacement Bridge Option up to the point where going 20-30 mph is considered congestion.

Different jurisdictions have used various definitions of congestion. I have focused here on Stop and Go congestion (0-10 mph) because a) it is referenced in the CRC Purpose and Needs Statement and b) it is of critical importance with regard to freight mobility. Heavy trucks under Stop and Go conditions have very poor fuel economy and produce excessive emissions.

Steve Citron
360-891-7925