

From: red@worldaccessnet.com
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Monday, June 09, 2008 2:26:40 AM
Attachments:



Home Zip Code: 98661
 Work Zip Code:

Person:
 Lives in the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:
 Car or Truck

1. In Support of the following bridge options:

P-1002-001 2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
 Do Not Add HCT

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

Contact Information:
 First Name: R. V.
 Last Name: Warren
 Title:
 E-Mail: red@worldaccessnet.com
 Address: 6800 NE 58th Street
 Vancouver , WA 98661

P-1002-002 Comments:
 I have studied your report, looking through several of the transit reports in the supplement and have found it to be unconvincing in its stated purpose of relieving congestion, especially.

P-1002-001

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.

P-1002-002

Thank you for your comment. Regarding congestion, 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. With the LPA, there will be 3.5 to 5.5 hours of congestion.

- P-1002-002** Your own chart says that in 2030 you project almost as much congestion as we have now. For an investment of \$4 billion, this is unacceptable. Other sections of the report also show areas of questionable worth. This needs to go back to the drawing board with the suggestions you are now receiving. I also am exceedingly disturbed by these "nonbinding" decisions that are being made before the public's comment period has come to a close. This shows a disrespect for us in the community. No agency should be committing themselves to any position until this period has closed. Your scheduling is the problem there.
- P-1002-003** The options you give below are another unacceptable consideration. You are forcing people to commit to what they do not want. My option is to return to some of the previous considerations that were rejected some time ago, especially another bridge in another area.

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 m.p.h. 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. Regarding the project generally, significant work has gone into developing the CRC project, including an ongoing public involvement effort. The public involvement program includes numerous advisory groups to ensure the values and interests of the community are reflected in project decisions. These groups include representatives of public agencies, businesses, civic organizations, neighborhoods and freight, commuter and environmental groups. Feedback from the general public and advisory groups has been generally supportive of the project, including support for the transit, bicycle, pedestrian, highway, interchange, and financing elements of the project. See Chapter 2 of the

FEIS for more discussion on the process used to develop project alternatives and select a Locally Preferred Alternative.

P-1002-003

Evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) explains how the project's Sponsoring Agencies solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, tribes and other experts for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, such as new transportation corridors across the Columbia River, various transit modes, tolling, other demand management measures, and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need. Components that increased capacity or helped reduce travel demand without increasing capacity were advanced for further evaluation. See Appendix C of the DEIS for an explanation and the results from early screening processes. The DEIS analyzed the full range of reasonable alternatives, which included the four build alternatives, and variations on each based on their individual components and various options. The range varied from No-Build, to alternatives that provided varying levels of highway improvements, different high capacity transit modes, different transit alignments and termini, and different tolling options. Many other components and combinations were evaluated prior to beginning the DEIS, but were dropped when analyses and input indicated that they would not adequately meet the Purpose and Need. The comment form was designed to encourage feedback, including feedback on those alternatives that best met the project's Purpose and Need.