



**From:** [theta444@yahoo.com](mailto:theta444@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 27, 2008 4:53:56 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97203  
 Work Zip Code: 97204

Person:

Lives in the project area  
 Commutes through the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle  
 Bus  
 Car or Truck  
 Walk

**P-0475-001**

1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
 Supplemental Bridge  
 Do Nothing
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:  
 Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland  
 Light Rail 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: Esther  
 Last Name: Harlow  
 Title:  
 E-Mail: [theta444@yahoo.com](mailto:theta444@yahoo.com)

**P-0475-001**

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.

Address: 9317 n. Charleston  
Portland, or 97203

Comments:

- P-0475-002** It is too bad the NOrth Portland peninsula is not included in your "Project Area" map, because the I-5 is a gauntlet of sorts for people who live on the peninsula. If we are coming to or from downtown, southwest, northeast, southeast or inner North Portland, during commute times but also at other times, we basically have to deal with the traffic not only on I-5 itself but on overflow on arterials. For instance, when I am coming home by bike or bus, I come across the Steel or Broadway bridge, and there is usually traffic trying to get onto I-5 backed up throughout the Rose Quarter-which I have to get through, to get to NOrth Portland. Then I either have to go under I-5 or over it to get into NOrth Portland, and usually roads across it are backed up because they have on and off ramps (Going St., Rosa Parks blvd., Lombard St.)
- P-0475-003** I grew up in the Bay Area, CA. I am only 28 but for some years of my life I commuted AN HOUR each way, 40 miles, but usually an hour and a half in the afternoon- at 3pm. It only took an hour in the morning because we left at 6am. At 7am, it doubled the trip to 2 hours until 9 or 10 in the morning. Why? Because the public transportation system was INADEQUATE!
- P-0475-004** I would like to use a simile for the situation: If you need to mix a cup of beans into a cup of water, and the water container only holds a cup and a half, you do not increase the size of the funnel that you are using to put the beans into the container of water, because it will overflow with water AND beans. You reduce the amount of beans you are putting into the water! (Or get a larger container, but that's not possible :)) The bridge is the funnel, the beans are people coming across the bridge, and the container is Portland. There are TOO MANY SOV'S coming into and out of Portland!!! There needs to be better options. Increasing SOV capacity will not fix the problem, it will only reduce traffic temporarily and ENCOURAGE MORE PEOPLE TO DRIVE. We need light rail between Vancouver and Portland; toll fees, both to discourage SOVs and to raise revenue in a time of shrinking gas taxes; better buses, so that people have more options than light rail; rideshare parking lots on both ends of the bridge; and better bike lanes, so people have more commuting options who are willing to do so. that will help people do multi-modal trips (for instance, someone could bike across the bridge, then get on a fast Trimet route to their destination; etc.) There should also be signs on both sides of the river for many miles, showing how long/far traffic is backed up. That will enable people to plan their routes better or decide to go at an alternate time. If you are going to supplement the existing bridge, add only a bridge that allows carpools, buses, light rail, bikes and pedestrians. Use tolls to patrol the carpool lane. keep SOVs on the bridge that is backed up and let them learn to find an alternate means. There are many!

**P-0475-002**

Over the course of the CRC project, the project team analyzed a variety of geographic areas. The boundaries of these areas were designed to meet specific purposes, such as analyzing the impacts of project alternatives. The boundaries of the project area, also called the Bridge Influence Area (BIA), were selected as a way of determining how effectively project components and alternatives met the project's Purpose and Need. The project area extends from approximately Columbia Boulevard in the south to SR 500 in the north, along the I-5 corridor. This did not, however, limit the extent to which impacts were evaluated. In general, by reducing congestion on I-5, and improving travel time reliability on the highway, traffic will be less likely to divert onto local streets. Therefore the project is expected to largely reduce cut-through traffic on local streets and potentially increase livability in areas adjacent to the I-5 improvements of CRC. This, and other effects on local streets, are described in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIS.

**P-0475-003**

Thank you for taking the time to submit your comments on the I-5 CRC DEIS.

**P-0475-004**

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.