

**From:** [Blaine DeLancey](#)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Crossing options  
**Date:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 3:01:56 PM  
**Attachments:**

- 
- P-0911-001** I am a supporter of Metro President Bragdon's proposal to erect a Bus/light rail bridge both pedestrian and bicycle access, and to leave the current automotive bridges as they are, with the addition of tolls at peak hours, or all of the time. IT is
- P-0911-002** vitally important to both the region and the planet that we take measures to reduce the number of car trips and total level of Vehicle Miles Traveled in the region, and an expanded freeway will do just the opposite. In every case in which an attempt has been made to build roads to reduce congestion the final upshot has been the same or greater degree of congestion, with a larger number of VMT and a greater amount of pollution being produced. There is not any reason at all to think that
- P-0911-003** expanding the automotive sections of the bridge will result in anything other than increases in congestion and pollution, which is a step in the opposite direction from what is needed.



### **P-0911-001**

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.

**P-0911-002**

The CRC project is considering more than two dozen TDM/TSM strategies to include in the project. The project team will continue to support regional efforts aimed at reducing travel demand and improving system efficiency, including introducing variable tolling and adding high capacity transit.

WSDOT has a very successful, and state-mandated, commute trip reduction program, which will provide CRC with access to state contacts and best practices for working with employers. Many other region-wide programs and strategies will be outside the control of the state transportation departments, though ODOT and WSDOT will continue to support activities aimed at reducing travel demand.

Additionally, the combined effects of tolling, congestion pricing, light rail, and regional TDM programs has resulted in projections for fewer year 2035 river crossings than if the project were not completed. Please refer to Section 3.1 of the FEIS for greater detail on regional VMT.

**P-0911-003**

The analyses for the DEIS and FEIS have shown that the LPA would reduce congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce total emissions for other air pollutants compared to existing conditions. It would result in an increase in two pollutants in one sub-area relative to the No-Build Alternative, but would reduce other pollutants in that sub-area and all other project sub-areas. See the air quality section (3.10) of the FEIS for more information on emissions.