



From: [Marilyn Matteson](#)
To: [Draft EIS Feedback;](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment: Build a new truck-only bridge
Date: Monday, June 30, 2008 8:19:18 PM
Attachments:

June 30, 2008

- P-0753-001** | The Columbia River Crossing alternatives look at the past, not to the future. With gas predicted to cost \$5 a gallon, more people will be taking transit and working from home. This calls for creative thinking, especially with the lack of funding sources.
- P-0753-002** | Freight and delivery trucks need a new bypass bridge, which would speed freight traveling through the Portland/Vancouver area. Trucks needing to exit in Vancouver could use the existing auto bridges. The new freight-only bypass bridge could be designed to provide light rail, express bus, bike and pedestrian lanes. Tolls could be charged for freight and delivery trucks using the bridge, but other uses could be free to encourage their growth.
- The two existing bridges should be renovated for use by auto traffic, which may decline over time. A toll could be placed on these bridges to pay for their renovation and discourage their use.
- P-0753-003** | With any new bridge, please plan for environmental mitigation by planting trees, shrubs and other landscaping within the freeway impact zone. Provide 1 percent of the project cost for community and environmental enhancements. It is the least society can do for imposing new "improvements" like huge freeway bridges onto the land and river.
- P-0753-004** |

Marilyn Matteson
 Beaverton, OR 97007

P-0753-001

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-0753-002

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.

P-0753-003

As discussed in Chapter 3 (Sections 3.14, 3.15, and 3.16) of the FEIS, the CRC project will include mitigation, including revegetation and habitat restoration activities. However, final decisions regarding environmental mitigation projects will be determined in coordination with federal, state, and local regulatory agencies. Regarding landscaping specifically, the CRC project will include landscaping components, which will comply with relevant jurisdictional guidelines and requirements.

P-0753-004

The CRC project will not have a discrete and separate community enhancement fund, but community enhancements are a part of the project design. As engineering progresses, the project team will continue

to evaluate the best method to integrate community enhancements, where feasible, into the project design. We are working with surrounding communities to support their goals and provide enhancements as part of the overall project design rather than establish a separate account for activities separate from the project. See discussion in Section 1.2 of the FEIS.