

From: [Brian Moentenich](#)
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comments
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 2:36:35 PM
Attachments:

Gentlemen,

I have attended a presentation of the CRC analysis about 6 months ago & read the periodic updates as well as media coverage. I have serious concerns about the projected auto traffic growth in the region. I do not think anyone can predict with much certainty what will be the impact of \$4, 5\$ or 6\$ per gallon gasoline. It not only affects car owners but bus & truck traffic as well. Our whole economy may change drastically. We may see serious declines in auto, bus & truck traffic – not increases. Has this really been analyzed & studied?



The other problem of the analysis I have is the assumption that the ability of the existing bridges to withstand future major seismic events must be increased if we keep it open. There are many structures which were built to less stringent standards which are not being torn down and replaced or seismically upgraded. The tradeoff is that we do accept more risk. But how much more? Is the cost worth it? This option (not seismically upgrading the existing bridge) isn't on the table – or maybe it was but now it isn't. Why is that?

I'm a big believer in light rail and have and use an annual MAX pass. Although Clark County residents haven't supported running MAX to Vancouver, they might with \$6/gallon gas. A simple light rail/bike bridge to the west of the existing bridges might go a long way toward serving the region's needs – especially if auto & truck traffic decrease through the imposition of tolls and/or higher cost gas.

Brian Moentenich
Gresham, OR