

**From:** [NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing;](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2008 7:34:17 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97217  
Work Zip Code: 97201-97225

Person:

Lives in the project area  
Works in the project area  
Owns a business in the project area  
Commutes through the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle  
Car or Truck  
Walk  
Other - Sailboat



1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
Do Nothing
  
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: Yes  
Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Yes  
Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes  
Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:

First Name: Conrad J.  
Last Name: Burke  
Title: Contractor

E-Mail:

Address: 635 North Blandena  
Portland, OR 97217

Comments:

This proposal makes no sense. It is based on fundamentally flawed assumptions from inherently biased interests.

### Trashing the Current Bridges is A Wasteful and Stupid Idea

Destroying the existing historic, visually pleasing (and perfectly good) bridges to build another hideous concrete mega-beast is just a terrible idea to begin with. Why would anyone other than a bridge-building contractor (or a slimy politician) even consider such a ludicrous proposal? I have crossed the existing spans a hundred times, and never once have I found the traffic to be excessive.

### 12-Lane Freeways Are Disgusting

The "preferred" plan to make the new spans 12 lanes wide is completely beguiling. Is the intent to eventually "upgrade" all of I-5 in Portland to 12 lanes for the convenience of suburban single-occupancy commuters? If not, why only this area? I-5 south of the city center is every bit as congested right now as the Columbia bridge. Anyone who has ever visited say, California, can tell you that having 12 lanes of traffic does nothing but produce 12 lanes of gridlock. And having one tiny section of 12-lane freeway will do nothing but move the congestion to the end of the 12-lane section - i.e., moving Vancouver's problem to North Portland.

If 12 lanes you must build, why must all of them be dedicated to single-car commuters? If facilitating inter-state commerce is a primary goal of this project, why no dedicated truck lanes? If easing traffic is a goal, why no dedicated HOV lanes? Even Los Angeles doesn't build 12-lane freeways without HOV lanes - are your planners even dumber than theirs?

### This Proposal Benefits Vancouver and Screws Portland

Clearly, destroying Portland's historic Columbia River bridge (sorry, it was not built to go to Vancouver) and building a new butt-ugly concrete traffic-jam deliverer to our side of the river will do virtually nothing for the Portlanders who will pay most of the cost. We will get vastly increased traffic throughout the metro area, especially in North and Northeast Portland where Washington drivers are already dreaded due to their refusal to follow any traffic laws or common sense. We will get vastly increased vehicle emissions, contributing to hundreds or thousands of us getting asthma or lung cancer, and dying early. And of course we will get an even-more jam-packed freeway, full to the

brim with single-occupancy commuters from the Vancouver area. I cannot even fathom why anyone who lives in Oregon would consider supporting this plan for one minute.

### This Project Undermines Oregon's Land-Use Laws

What is the purpose of preserving farm and forestland in Oregon if the same development can occur across the river, free from Oregon taxation? That is exactly what this project will enable, and very likely is intended to enable by its Washington backers. Northwest forest and farmland is Northwest forest and farmland, regardless of which side of the Columbia it exists on. As the citizens of Oregon recently affirmed by over 60% (M49), this is land that must be saved from sprawl. Yet Vancouver, Washougal, Camas, etc, are experiencing massive, sprawl-style growth precisely because their outlying areas are not subject to the same land-use restrictions that are in force in Oregon. The only problem, of course, is that there are no jobs in these Mcsuburbs, so the people who live there must somehow get across the Columbia - an increasingly daunting task. Hence this proposal, and our next point:

### The Assumption that the I-5 Bridge Will Get Three-Times More Congested Is Flat-Out Wrong, and You Know It

This project, and any public support it enjoys, is based entirely on the premise that "I-5 will be congested 20 hours a day in 2020". Catchy, but completely ridiculous.

For one, anyone who commutes on a regular basis through different parts of Portland could have told your master planners, I-5 south of Portland is far, far worse right now than north of the city. The only, repeat ONLY time it is backed up north of the I-405 is when it is jam-packed full of cars with Washington plates containing 1 person. This, essentially, is noted in the study: Clark county commuters are the reason I-5 backs up north of Portland. So the existing "problem" could be solved easily and cheaply.

The assumption that traffic on the portion of I-5 in question will grow exponentially over the next 20 years is clearly wrong: once the single-occupancy commuters coming over from Washington have to wait more than 3 hours to get to and leave Portland each day, NO ONE WILL MOVE TO CLARK COUNTY. Its that simple. You would have to be insane to believe that Clark County will continue to grow at its current rate if part of living there is sitting in gridlock traffic more than 6 hours per day. I challenge anyone to stand up in public and make that argument.

On top of that, gas prices show no sign of ever going down, or even slowing their march toward \$10 a gallon. How bright will we feel with a 12-lane, \$4.2 billion bridge with only 4-lanes worth of traffic?

## This Project Will Kill Polar Bears, and Poor People

As noted in the EIS, the preferred alternative will result in MORE CARBON EMISSIONS than any of the other options. That is a violation of Oregon law, and a violation of the conscience of anyone who cares about the vast and very real effects of climate change.

## Vancouverites Won't Use Light Rail if they Could Drive More Cheaply and Easily

Who the hell would? People move to Vancouver, and Clark County generally, to SAVE MONEY. The only way light rail to that area makes sense is if its made to be the best option for getting to Portland - a 12-lane freeway to Vancouver invites a whole lot of empty light-rail trains, just wasting more electricity.

## The Simple, No-Brainer Solution: Toll Single Occupancy Vehicles on the I-5 Bridge

There is no better way to solve the "problems" this proposal would address. Its very easy to understand, even for highway planners:

1. Single-occupancy vehicle drivers are causing the traffic on the I-5 bridge to back up in the morning, solely because of their selfishness.
2. Impose a stiff toll on SOVs on the bridge, and their numbers will drop dramatically.
3. Problem solved.
4. Bonuses: Less emissions through the metro. Less wear and tear on Portland's roads. Less traffic in the metro area. More bicycle-friendly streets in Portland, leading to still less traffic. \$4.2 billion less wasted on a completely unnecessary bridge project that only benefits 1/10 of the people who would pay for it. A clear bridge for interstate commerce. Money for light-rail and repairs to the existing bridges.