


**From:** [marlowe.kulley@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:marlowe.kulley@ci.portland.or.us)   
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 14, 2008 10:20:56 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97210  
 Work Zip Code: 97209

Person:  
 Lives in the project area  
 Works in the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:  
 Bicycle

- P-0147-001**
1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
 Supplemental Bridge
  2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:  
 Bus Rapid Transit 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: Marlowe  
 Last Name: Kulley  
 Title: Sustainability Advisor  
 E-Mail: [marlowe.kulley@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:marlowe.kulley@ci.portland.or.us)  
 Address:  
 ,

- P-0147-002** | Comments:  
 I believe none of these options provide a solution that is sufficient given the impending

### **P-0147-001**

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-0147-002**

Traffic forecasts reported in the DEIS and used to inform decisions on a locally preferred alternative were derived from adopted regional employment and population forecasts and state-of-the-art modeling and evaluation conducted by Metro, RTC and the project team, and reviewed by all project sponsor agencies as well as FTA and FHWA. In addition, an independent panel of traffic modeling experts was convened in October 2008 to review the modeling methods and findings. These experts concluded that the project's approach to estimating future travel

**P-0147-002** | climate risks, oil prices and population increases.

**P-0147-003** | I strongly urge all parties involved to consider a single new bridge that will only add additional travel for public transportation (light rail or BRT), freight lines, and bike/pedestrian traffic.

We DO NOT NEED additional single-occupancy vehicle capacity in the I-5 corridor, tolls or no tolls.

Thank you.

demand was reasonable and that it relied on accepted practices employed in metropolitan regions throughout the country. These findings are summarized in the "Columbia River Crossing Travel Demand Model Review Report" (November 25, 2008). This independent review confirmed the approach CRC modeling used to address multiple variables that can affect travel demand, including gasoline prices, tolling, travel demand measures and induced development.

**P-0147-003**

A supplemental bridge that only includes improvements for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians does not meet the CRC project's Purpose and Need. As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the project's Purpose and Need "was developed by relying on previous planning studies, solicitation of public input, and coordination with stakeholder groups."

In addition to calling for improved bicycle, pedestrian and transit connectivity, the Purpose and Need also specifically states the need for improving highway freight mobility, travel safety and traffic operations, and the structural integrity of the existing bridges. These later needs would not be met by a supplemental bridge alternative that only provides for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians.