


**From:** [Brian Moentenich](#)   
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 27, 2008 2:36:35 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Gentlemen,

**P-0485-001** I have attended a presentation of the CRC analysis about 6 months ago & read the periodic updates as well as media coverage. I have serious concerns about the projected auto traffic growth in the region. I do not think anyone can predict with much certainty what will be the impact of \$4, 5\$ or 6\$ per gallon gasoline. It not only affects car owners but bus & truck traffic as well. Our whole economy may change drastically. We may see serious declines in auto, bus & truck traffic— not increases. Has this really been analyzed & studied?

**P-0485-002** The other problem of the analysis I have is the assumption that the ability of the existing bridges to withstand future major seismic events must be increased if we keep it open. There are many structures which were built to less stringent standards which are not being torn down and replaced or seismically upgraded. The tradeoff is that we do accept more risk. But how much more? Is the cost worth it? This option (not seismically upgrading the existing bridge) isn't on the table— or maybe it was but now it isn't. Why is that?

**P-0485-003** I'm a big believer in light rail and have and use an annual MAX pass. Although Clark County residents haven't supported running MAX to Vancouver, they might with \$6/ gallon gas. A simple light rail/ bike bridge to the west of the existing bridges might go a long way toward serving the region's needs— especially if auto & truck traffic decrease through the imposition of tolls and/ or higher cost gas.

Brian Moentenich  
 Gresham, OR

### **P-0485-001**

Significant increases in oil 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.

### **P-0485-002**

The I-5 bridges, like many older bridges in the region and nation, are not seismically sound and were never designed to survive a significant earthquake. In 1995, ODOT commissioned a study to look specifically at the lift spans of the I-5 bridges, which are considered the most vulnerable sections of the bridges. Vulnerabilities were found in the bearings, piles, piers, and lift span tower truss members. Both the northbound and southbound bridges have been identified as functionally obsolete bridges. This classification means they no longer meet the geometric and/ or load capacity criteria of the Interstate system. The fact that there are other bridges in the region that are seismically unsound does not diminish the importance of protecting the I-5 crossing from failure in the event of a significant earthquake.

**P-0485-003**

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.