



**From:** [ninja21@yahoo.com](mailto:ninja21@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC Submit Comments Page  
**Date:** Sunday, June 01, 2008 12:58:13 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

From: Josh Fisher  
 E-Mail: [ninja21@yahoo.com](mailto:ninja21@yahoo.com)  
 Comment or Question:

**P-0839-001**

The Columbia River Crossing Project is one of the worst projects I have heard of in a long time. Subsidizing more traffic in a transition time in our economy and political structure is a bad idea. Before building a bridge, you should take other option to the test first. Imagine the cars you can get off the road by expanding MAX to 164th and Downtown Vancouver then eventually connection 164th and Downtown Vancouver? Plus in our efforts to reduce carbon emissions does not make sense by putting more cars on the road. Also, the bridge allows for more cars downtown Portland, which does not have capacity for that. Let's look to our alternatives first before spending over 1 billion on a bridge that just does not make sense. The cost of gas alone might get more and more cars off the road. LISTEN TO THE VOICE OF CAUTION AS YOU MOVE FORWARD.

### **P-0839-001**

Please see the FEIS, Sections 2.6 and 2.7, for key findings supporting selection of the LPA, and for a description of the process followed to consider and evaluate a wide variety of alternatives and options. GHG emissions would be lower with the proposed project than without it (FEIS Section 3.19).

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.