From: doug_ollerenshaw@hotmail.com
To: Columbia River Crossing;
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Monday, May 26, 2008 2:34:46 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97209
Work Zip Code: 97209

Person:
Lives in the project area
Works in the project area
Commutes through the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:
Bicycle
Bus
Car or Truck
Walk

P-0711-001

1. In Support of the following bridge options:
Supplemental Bridge
Do Nothing

2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland

3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:
Lincoln Terminus: No Opinion
Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion
Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion
Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:
First Name: Douglas
Last Name: Ollerenshaw
Title:
E-Mail: doug_ollerenshaw@hotmail.com

P-0711-001

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: 1811 NW Couch St, #203
Portland, or 97209

Comments:

P-0711-002 Building a mega-bridge for the convenience of Clark County commuters is an intolerably huge mistake. All talk of freight mobility is a red herring; if not for the commuter traffic, freight movement would not be impaired.

P-0711-003 As Amy Ruiz at the Mercury and Nigel Jaqcuis of the Willamette Week both pointed out, the solution is to make the current bridges seismically sound and fix the on/off ramps in the vicinity. This smaller project should be paid for by tolls, which will also reduce the commuter traffic load. A parallel light rail/ped bridge would also be tolerable.

P-0711-004 It is irresponsible to have gone this far into the process without studying the viability of repairing the existing structures and controlling traffic flow through tolls.

P-0711-005 Shame on everyone involved in the CRC project!

P-0711-002

By 2030, the region's population is expected to increase by one million people. This increase will result in more people needing to travel between home, work, school, recreation, etc. In 2005, 135,000 vehicles crossed the Columbia River on the Interstate Bridge, which led to 4-6 hours of congestion each weekday. By 2030, 184,000 are predicted to cross the river, which would lead to 15 hours of daily congestion if no action is taken.

Congestion occurs when vehicle demand is greater than a transportation system's capacity. It results in slower speeds and increased travel times. CRC defines congestion as vehicles traveling less than 30 mph. The Columbia River Crossing project uses information gathered from Metro's nationally-recognized travel demand models to determine the project's effect on congestion. These models predict trip frequency, types or modes of transportation, destination, and time of day. Transportation planners use these models to analyze the effects of such factors as increased population and employment, transportation improvements, and new developments on the transportation system.

Based on the Metro model's past ability to predict transportation effects, the CRC project is confident in the data received from Metro and uses it to determine what impact the project will have on congestion. The improvements proposed by the project to the highway and seven interchanges will help better accommodate increased future vehicle traffic. New auxiliary lanes and longer on/off ramps will allow safer and more efficient merging and weaving to enter or exit the freeway. Narrow lanes and shoulders will be widened to current standards. Shoulders will be added where they are currently missing. All of these changes will improve the flow of traffic in the bottleneck area of the Interstate Bridge.

P-0711-003

As documented in the Panel Assessment of Interstate Bridges Seismic

Vulnerabilities Technical Report (2006), it was determined necessary for any CRC project alternatives that reused the existing I-5 bridges to also seismically retrofit those bridges. The DEIS analyzed a Supplemental River Crossing as a component of two out of the five alternatives studied.

A Supplemental River Crossing, which would retain and seismically retrofit the existing bridges for northbound traffic and add one new bridge to the west for southbound traffic, was not chosen as a part of the Locally Preferred Alternative by the local sponsor agencies. This decision was informed by the DEIS, which found, among other things, that the Supplemental River Crossing would not substantially improve congestion over No-Build, would maintain some substandard and unsafe design features, and would not be substantially cheaper to construct than a replacement river crossing, as originally believed. In addition, the Supplemental crossing could worsen marine navigation by retaining the existing piers, and adding a new set of structures in the water with the new bridge. The US Coast Guard informed the project in a letter dated January 26, 2006, that “retention of one of the existing bridges for travel off Interstate 5 would at best maintain the same degree of difficulty to vessels, especially downbound tows. For that reason I would also not recommend such a plan…”

Though the Supplemental River Crossing would improve the seismic safety of the existing bridges, these findings indicate that it did not meet the project's Purpose and Need as effectively as the Replacement River Crossing.

P-0711-004
Modeling has indicated that tolling I-5 without making the improvements that are part of the CRC project would not meet the project’s Purpose and Need.

P-0711-005

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