

From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Sunday, June 29, 2008 4:42:01 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97217

Work Zip Code:

Person:

Lives in the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle

Bus

Car or Truck

Walk



1. In Support of the following bridge options:

Replacement 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: Unsure

Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Unsure

Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:

First Name:

Last Name:

Title:

E-Mail:

Address:

,

Comments:

I have been to some of the Open Houses and seen the several designs for the CRC Project. Unfortunately, I could not attend a Public Hearing. Last week, I was very disappointed to hear the the 12 lane design is the current favorite. Building 12-car-lanes will not solve or reduce the problems of the Interstate Bridge. At best, it will put them off for a few years.

The Problems:

1) The empty closet effect.

As in a house, if you install an extra closet you will fill it up; usually with stuff you shouldn't really keep. The same applies to bridges. If you build a bridge for 12 lanes of cars, then 12 lanes of cars is what we will get and we will be right back in the situation we are now and likely in just a few years rather than decades.

The real goal of this project should be to move people and cargo efficiently, NOT cars.

2) Bottleneck

I-5 is 6 lanes between Portland and Vancouver except at Delta Park where it changes to 4 lanes over the Slough. This loss of 2 lanes causes a large bottleneck and construction to expand I-5 to 6 lanes has just started. However, the CRC Project wants to build a 12 lane bridge that feeds into 6 lanes at Delta Park. There's a failure of logic here: either a reduction of lanes does not cause a bottleneck, or the construction at Delta Park is unnecessary.

Reducing a 12 lane bridge to a 6 lane highway is counterproductive.

(Of course, we can see the writing on the wall. First, a 12 lane bridge and sometime later expand I-5 to 12 lanes. Again, this accomplishes the goal of moving cars, but not people. I propose you drive through Sacramento, CA someday to see why a too-many-lane highway is a bad idea.)

3) A separate bridge

There is no good reason to build a separate bridge for MAX from the Expo Center to Jantzen Beach. I am a resident of Jantzen Beach Moorage and was very disappointed to see plans to break up a successful community. A separate bridge won't slow down speeding boats (if that is the intent). It only adds problems including:

- extra building and maintenance costs,
- extra marine hazards for local marine businesses,
- truly painful legal and practical problems in condemning parts of Jantzen Beach Moorage, and
- separating bus traffic on I-5 from MAX making user transfers difficult and

confusing.

An Idea:

If you build it they will come.

The Hawthorne Bridge is a good example. It was redesigned to accomodate more walkers and bicyclists and is now almost overcrowded with them while car traffic has remained reasonable.

Instead of 12 lanes of cars, we need

- 1 lane for bicycles (1/2 lane in each direction)
- 1 lane for pedestrians (again 1/2 each way)
- 1 lane for rail (" ")
- 2 lanes for bus (also carpool during commute hours?)
- 6 lanes for cars