

From: evand@pacifier.com
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Sunday, June 29, 2008 9:49:39 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97201

Work Zip Code: 97077

Person:

Other - Travel through the project area for recreation

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle



1. In Support of the following bridge options:

Replacement Bridge

Do Nothing

2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:

Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland

3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:

Lincoln Terminus: Yes

Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Yes

Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Unsure

Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Unsure

Contact Information:

First Name: Evan

Last Name: Dickinson

Title:

E-Mail: evand@pacifier.com

Address: 1441 SW Clay #105

Portland, OR 97201

Comments:

I'm concerned that the bike facilities provided in the CRC won't connect well to the bike

infrastructure in Portland. While I applaud, and support, the CRC's goals of providing good bike infrastructure in the CRC project area, I worry that the existing substandard bike connections between the expo center and Interstate Avenue will keep cyclists from using the bikeways. Getting from the expo center to the corner of Interstate and Victory is very problematic. And traveling Interstate between Victory and Columbia is also daunting, even though there are bike lanes. Although this area is outside the CRC area, improvements are needed to help the CRC become a success. PDOT and/or ODOT should commit to improvements in this area to complement the CRC.

I'm also wondering what steps will be taken to ensure that the tolling remains in place. Although needed to fund the project and to manage VMT and sprawl, tolling will be unpopular. I'd expect that as soon as tolling is introduced, some people will advocate for the end of tolling. For example, the Building Industry Association of Washington, a powerful group that opposes government actions that limit construction, would have strong financial motivations to end tolling (either through the legislatures or ballot measures), as that would increase sprawl. Such a change would be financially crippling, but voters in Oregon and Washington have a history of passing fiscally irresponsible ballot measures. A tolling agreement should contain safeguards to guarantee that tolling extends through the financing period.

I'm also curious about the pricing strategy for tolling. There are supplemental benefits to tolling, such as reductions in congestion and pollution. Will the toll pricing strategy formally consider those benefits? It should. It's easy to imagine a pricing strategy that focuses only on maximizing revenue, and does so by setting a relatively low price and tolling a relatively large number of vehicles. That would not do enough to manage congestion and avoid pollution. Additionally, the benefits from reduced pollution would be diminished by tolling I-5 but not I-205, as people would drive farther to avoid the toll. Both bridges should be tolled.