

**From:** [Becky Archibald](#)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing; Columbia River Crossing;](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comments draft DEIS  
**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2008 5:28:01 PM  
**Attachments:**

- 
- P-0510-001** | I strongly disagree with a light rail option be added to the bridge component. Problems with bottle necks are in Oregon and complicate travel in both the North and South I-5 interstate.
- P-0510-002** | The studies do not propose any new interconnected arterial routes.
- P-0510-003** | Cost will range to be in the 60 million dollar arena with only one lane to be added for about one mile of roadway. This does not make wise use of our tax dollars. Better use would be to increase bus service and dedicate one lane to this and the HOV.
- P-0510-004** | We can not afford more taxes during an already depressed economy. Sound fiscal financing and planning is needed here and I do not see a firm plan in place to pay for this.  
 Becky Archibald  
 1220 NE 129 Ave  
 Vancouver, Wa. 98684



### **P-0510-001**

Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected light rail to Clark College as the project's preferred transit mode. These sponsor agencies, which include the Vancouver City Council, Portland City Council, C-TRAN Board, TriMet Board, RTC Board and Metro Council considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force (a broad group of stakeholders representative of the range of interests affected by the project - see the DEIS Public Involvement Appendix for more information regarding the CRC Task Force) before voting on the LPA.

As illustrated in the DEIS, and summarized in Exhibit 29 (page S-33) of the Executive Summary, light rail would better serve transit riders than bus rapid transit (BRT) within the CRC project area. Light rail would carry more passengers across the river during the PM peak, result in more people choosing to take transit, faster travel times through the project area, fewer potential noise impacts, and lower costs per incremental rider than BRT. Additionally, light rail is more likely to attract desirable development on Hayden Island and in downtown Vancouver, which is consistent with local land use plans.

### **P-0510-002**

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River, and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why a third corridor, arterial crossing of the Columbia River, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the

Purpose and Need. For a general description of the screening process see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS. It should be noted that every proposal received from the public was considered, and many of the proposals that were dropped from further consideration included elements that helped shape the alternatives in the DEIS.

#### **P-0510-003**

The Columbia River Crossing project includes the replacement of the existing I-5 bridge over the Columbia River, improvements at seven interchanges over five miles of I-5, and the extension of light rail from Portland to Vancouver. The projected cost to construct this large and complex project are presented in Chapter 4 of the FEIS, and are estimated in year of expenditure dollars to account for inflation. The estimated cost to construct this project could be covered by a variety of sources. While a small portion of this cost is expected to be covered by local and state funds, federal funds and toll revenues are expected to cover the majority of the capital costs.

Regarding the use of buses versus light rail, see discussion above. Regarding high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, they work when they are part of a network, and could potentially be a useful tool in the CRC area if employed as part of a regional plan. The five-mile CRC project by itself is too short in length to provide the true benefits of HOV lanes, but should the region adopt and develop an HOV system, lanes within the bridge influence area could potentially be striped as part of the network.

#### **P-0510-004**

Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA. This discussion provides an updated assessment of likely funding sources for this project, though it is not common practice to receive funding commitments prior to completion of the alternative selection process. As described in the FEIS, project funding is expected to come from a variety

of local, state, and federal sources, with federal funding and tolls providing substantial revenue for the construction. As Oregon and Washington businesses and residents will benefit from the project's multi-modal improvements, both states have been identified as contributors to the project. As jurisdictions on both sides of the river seek to encourage non-auto travel, tolls are not anticipated for bikes, pedestrians, and transit users. Lastly, CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects and purposes would remain dedicated to those projects and purposes.