-		
From:	donnadrummond(@juno.com	
To:	Draft EIS Feedback;	Ţ
CC:		
Subject:	I 5 crossing	
Date:	Tuesday, May 27, 2008 12:14:57 PM	
Attachments:		

P-0471-001 I am opposed to 12 land "solution" to the I-5 bridge proposal. There is no evidence that more lanes would alleviate congestion but such solutions have in the past been obsolete before the construction is completed. This could be another example of profligacy.
P-0471-002 Please use alternative, smaller solutions before committing to the extravagance. Thank you.

Donna Drummond 2221 SW First Ave. Apt. 1521 Portland OR 97201

02211

Get the perfect Gift Idea. Click Now. http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL2121/fc/ loyw6i3oE4e12loNYe4R2J5o2LeCezskvKUBGt2jT6mRDLbcHDJR5q/? count=1234567890 1 of 1

Following the selection of the LPA in July of 2008, the CRC Project Sponsors Council (PSC) was developed to provide recommendations to the project on a variety of issues, including the number of add/drop lanes over the river crossing. Over the course of several months, PSC was provided with operational characteristics and potential environmental impacts of 8-, 10-, and 12-lane options. In additional to the technical information, PSC received input from CRC advisory groups and reviewed public comment submitted to the project and obtained during two public Q&A sessions in January 2009 regarding the number of lanes decision, as well as hearings conducted by Portland City Council and by Metro Council. In August 2010, PSC voted unanimously to recommend 10 lanes for the replacement bridges.

The project will have five lanes in each direction on the bridge. However, two of these will serve as auxillary lanes providing additonal access for Port facilities, and short trips on and off of Hayden Island. This project is not providing additional capacity from the lower density areas along the perimeter of the Portland Metro area, or to north Vancouver.

P-0471-002

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an extensive 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. These options were evaluated for whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and the findings were

reviewed by project sponsors, the public, agencies, and other stakeholders. Alternatives that included only TDM/TSM strategies, or provided only transit improvements, would provide benefits, but could only address a very limited portion of the project's purpose and need. This extensive analysis 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 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) compared to the toll and transit service levels included in Alternatives 2 and 3. The additional service and higher toll provided only marginal reductions in I-5 vehicle volumes, and they came primarily at the cost of greater traffic diversion to I-205. This analysis found that a more balanced investment in highway and transit, as represented by Alternatives 2 and 3, performed considerably better on a broad set of criteria.