

From: [Paul Jeffery](#)
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Here"s my feedback
Date: Monday, June 23, 2008 9:32:32 PM
Attachments:

P-0098-001 Don't spend a dime of my money on this unnecessary bridge.

Stop building 20th century solutions to 21st century problems. Congestion has never been solved by adding more lanes, so why do you think it's going to happen now? While it would be a good idea to improve bike & pedestrian access on the bridge, and to put a light rail link from Portland to Vancouver, if even one extra lane of car capacity is added, the net effect to the area is a loss. Please save the \$4 + billion and spend it on the kind of transit infrastructure that will benefit our communities, not the trucking and construction industry. Stop this madness!

Paul Jeffery
503-701-8854



P-0098-001

The proposed new lanes are add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges), which are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area, and accommodate the 68 to 75% of traffic that enters and/or exits I-5 within two miles of the Columbia River. The add/drop lanes are primarily between Marine Drive/Hayden Island and SR 14/Mill Plain Blvd. All auxiliary lanes added within the project limits are subsequently dropped within the project limits. The project does not propose to add lanes north or south of the project limits.

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) explains how the project's Sponsoring Agencies generated ideas and 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, many of which were non-auto oriented options such as various transit modes and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently without any capital investment. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and found that in order for an alternative to meet the six "needs" included in the Purpose and Need (described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS), it had to provide at least some measure of capital improvements to I-5 in the project area. Alternatives that did not include such improvements in the highway generally did not adequately 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 the highway in this corridor. The DEIS evaluated alternatives with more demand management (higher toll) and increased transit service with less investment in highway infrastructure improvements (Alternatives 4 and 5). This analysis found

that a more balanced investment in highway and transit, as represented by Alternatives 2 and 3, performed best.