



From: [Campbell, Pat](#)
To: [Brent Carpenter](#);
CC: [Pollard, Royce](#); [Leavitt, Tim](#); [Columbia River Crossing](#);
[Harris, Jeanne](#); [Jollota, Pat](#); [Smith, Larry](#); [Stewart, Jeanne](#);
Subject: RE: Support a Climate Smart Columbia River Crossing
Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2008 10:03:29 AM
Attachments:

Thanks Brent. What if we took care of the heavy rail upgrade need as well with that one bridge option?

From: Brent Carpenter [mailto:dbc@clark.edu]
 Sent: Tue 5/27/2008 9:22 PM
 To: Campbell, Pat
 Subject: Re: Support a Climate Smart Columbia River Crossing

Pat,

P-0550-001 | I have two specific suggestions. First, build a bridge exclusively for light rail, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Second, toll drivers.

Thanks,
 Brent

On May 27, 2008, at 12:03 PM, Campbell, Pat wrote:

**Thank you for your form letter. Anything specific?
 Sincerely,
 Pat Campbell, Vancouver City Council**

P-0550-001

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.