



From: [Rob Potestio](#)  
 To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
 CC:  
 Subject: Robert Liberty  
 Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2008 8:59:37 AM  
 Attachments:

**P-0629-001** Robert Liberty raises a good point: Does the project meet the needs?

Everybody knows from years of research that adding more lanes to a freeway increases traffic. So, if a new bridge is built where does all that traffic go?

Certainly Mayor Pollard wants a new bridge, just as Mayor Katz wanted a tram. It puts a signature on their period of history. But, does the project fit the needs?

The tram might. But, a new larger capacity bridge won't.

**P-0629-002** If you want to really do something, build a light rail bridge with bike lanes and connect it to the Train Station in downtown Vancouver. Connect the (dots) trains, eventually to the Portland Intl. Airport.

Then, you really have something that will work for the next century.

Robert Potestio

## P-0629-001

The project's Purpose and Need is based on extensive analysis of the existing transportation problems in the I-5 CRC corridor, and reflects extensive feedback from the public and stakeholder groups. The Purpose and Need focuses largely on metrics that do not inherently require substantial, or exclusive, increases in highway capacity. Ongoing analysis has demonstrated that the Purpose and Need is best met by a multimodal alternative that improves highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and adds tolling to the highway river crossing.

Regarding the number of lanes, 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. These technical evaluation criteria included, but were not limited to, traffic safety, congestion, traffic diversion onto local streets and I-205, regional vehicle miles travelled, transit ridership, regional economic impact, effects to neighborhoods, and protected species and habitats. In addition to the technical information, PSC received input from CRC advisory groups and reviewed public comments submitted to the project. On August 9, 2010 the PSC voted to recommend that the replacement bridges be constructed with 10 lanes and full shoulders. For more information regarding the number of lanes decision making process, see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS.

The proposed new lanes are add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges) and are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area, and accommodate the 68 to 75% of traffic that enters and/or exits I-5 within two miles of the Columbia River. The two directional add/drop lanes are primarily between Marine Drive/Hayden Island and SR 14/Mill Plain Blvd.

The project does not propose to add lanes north or south of the project limits.

**P-0629-002**

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.