


From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, May 06, 2008 11:42:33 AM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97214
 Work Zip Code: 97214

Person:
 Other - Portland resident

Person commutes in the travel area via:
 Car or Truck 

- P-0071-001**
1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 None
 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: Unsure
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:
 First Name:
 Last Name:
 Title:
 E-Mail:
 Address:

- P-0071-002**
- Comments:
 The five "options" do not offer enough variation and we are left choosing between a massive overgrown megaproject or nothing. Other alternatives should have included

P-0071-001

Preferences for specific alternatives or options, as expressed in comments received before and after the issuance of the DEIS, were shared with local sponsor agencies to inform decision making. Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected a replacement I-5 bridge with light rail to Clark College as the project's Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). These sponsor agencies, which include the Portland City Council, Vancouver City Council, TriMet Board, C-TRAN Board, Metro Council, RTC Board, considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force when voting on the LPA.

With the LPA, new bridges will replace the existing Interstate Bridges to carry I-5 traffic, light rail, pedestrians and bicyclists across the Columbia River. Light rail will extend from the Expo Center MAX Station in Portland to a station and park and ride at Clark College in Vancouver. Pedestrians and bicyclists would travel along a wider and safer path than exists today.

For a more detailed description of highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements associated with the LPA, see Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

P-0071-002

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) and Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS explain how the project's Sponsoring Agencies solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, and tribes for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, such as a possible third transportation corridor across the Columbia River, alternative transit

P-0071-002 incremental improvements: the seismic retrofitting option, the arterial bridges option, the congestion-pricing only option, the transit-only option, and a combination of demand management measures with vehicle capacity. The options proposed of a 12-lane-bridge or nothing is a deficient set of options. Regrettably, the best option left is the do-nothing option, because realistic alternative options were thrown away. It is apparent that the players involved wanted the 12-lane bridge from the start and this process was merely a formality. Now you should start over and do it right this time. Please don't throw more good money after bad.

modes, and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and found that alternatives that do not include improvements to the existing I-5 facility generally do not address the seismic vulnerability of the existing I-5 bridges, traffic congestion on I-5, or the existing safety problems caused by sub-standard design of I-5. Traffic modeling showed that even significant investment in improving transit options in the corridor or building a third corridor was not enough to alleviate future traffic demand and existing safety hazards on I-5. It is important to note that transit and river crossing components were not eliminated simply because they could not accommodate future vehicular trips. For example, both light rail and tolling help to decrease vehicular demand. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the screening process used to develop project alternatives.