



From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Monday, May 19, 2008 1:14:37 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97202
 Work Zip Code: 97209

Person:

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle
 Car or Truck

- P-0409-001**
1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 Supplemental Bridge
 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: Unsure
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Unsure
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

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

,

Comments:

- P-0409-002** I saw the proposed crossing for the first time today and felt as though I had been

P-0409-001

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-0409-002

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) 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

P-0409-002 transported back in time 40 years. The time for mega-highway construction is over. We need solutions to traffic and transportation which will be viable as energy prices go up. We need increased rail capacity. We need to find the most economical way to reduce congestion while funneling as much of our transportation money into mass-transit and transit-reduction strategies.

More bike access, more rail access, close some interchanges to speed through-traffic. Spend as little on road construction as you can so you have some money left over to build rail transit as fuel prices soar and Vancouver residents start demanding mass transit.

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. Also, travel demand modeling and traffic analysis demonstrated that alternatives with substantially more transit service and only minor highway capacity improvements, had only marginal differences in transit ridership and auto demand, but had substantially greater congestion, emissions, and highway safety problems.

Regarding oil prices, significant increases in prices can have both short term and long term effects on travel behavior. In the short term, the options for responding to rising gas prices are more limited, and include driving less and/or changing from driving to walking, biking or transit for at least some trips. During recent increases in gasoline prices transit use increased and off-peak highway travel decreased. Peak period highway travel changed little.

Over the long term, there are more options for adjusting to changes in gasoline prices, besides changing driving behavior. Technological advances and legislative mandates can increase fuel efficiency standards in the long term. In turn, as older vehicles wear out, more consumers can replace them with more fuel efficient vehicles. Automobile manufacturers are developing and will continue to develop new vehicle and engine technologies that require much less, or even no, petroleum-based fuels. This trend is already happening as evidenced by

the growing popularity of gasoline-electric hybrid and small electric vehicles.