

From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Friday, May 09, 2008 5:36:22 PM
Attachments:



Home Zip Code: 98661
 Work Zip Code: 97296

Person:

Lives in the project area
 Commutes through the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bus
 Car or Truck

P-0120-001

1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 Replacement Bridge
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
 None
3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:
 Lincoln Terminus: No Opinion
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

First Name: Mary
 Last Name: Stewart
 Title:
 E-Mail:
 Address:

,

Comments:

P-0120-001

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-0120-002** | A freeway loop around the West side of the Portland and Vancouver area needs to be in the planning stage at this time including a third bridge crossing the Columbia R. at Woodland or Kalama.
- P-0120-003** | The North bound HOV lanes on I=5 have never worked and only create more congestion by limiting traffic to only two lanes. If this was really successful, other freeways out of Portland would have implementes HOV lanes.
- P-0120-004** | Light rail is not popular with Portlanders because it is much slower than the express buses which were eliminated when Light rail opened. Light rail doubled commute time causing a great inconvenience. Buses are a much better, more flexible and less costly option. I would never ride light rail.

P-0120-002

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 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.

P-0120-003

The CRC project does not include HOV lanes inside its five-mile project area. The CRC project team looked at HOV lanes and freight lanes, which are typically located on the inside freeway lane next to the barrier, as part of its technical analysis. Because about 70 percent of the vehicles enter and/or exit I-5 within the five-mile study area, access to and from a HOV lane or freight lane could create traffic operational problems by increasing lane changes (for example, HOVs entering the

freeway and needing to merge all the way to the inside lane). The results of this analysis is described in more detail in Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the DEIS. Regarding the existing HOV lanes located outside the project area, the CRC project does not propose any changes. These HOV lanes might effectively link to HOV lanes in the CRC area in the future, if employed as part of a larger regional plan. Should the region adopt and develop a larger HOV system, lanes within the bridge influence area could potentially be striped as part of that network.

P-0120-004

Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected light rail to Clark College as the project's preferred transit mode. These sponsor agencies, which include the Vancouver City Council, Portland City Council, C-TRAN Board, TriMet Board, RTC Board and Metro Council considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force (a broad group of stakeholders representative of the range of interests affected by the project - see the DEIS Public Involvement Appendix for more information regarding the CRC Task Force) before voting on the LPA.

As illustrated in the DEIS, and summarized in Exhibit 29 (page S-33) of the Executive Summary, light rail would better serve transit riders than bus rapid transit (BRT) within the CRC project area. Light rail would carry more passengers across the river during the PM peak, result in more people choosing to take transit, faster travel times through the project area, fewer potential noise impacts, and lower costs per incremental rider than BRT. Additionally, light rail is more likely to attract desirable development on Hayden Island and in downtown Vancouver, which is consistent with local land use plans.