



**From:** [NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2008 9:27:25 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97217  
 Work Zip Code: 97217

Person:

Lives in the project area  
 Works in the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle  
 Bus  
 Walk  
 Other - Max (as far as it goes)

**P-1020-001**

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: Yes  
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Yes  
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes  
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:

First Name:  
 Last Name:  
 Title:  
 E-Mail:  
 Address:

**P-1020-001**

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.

## Comments:

- P-1020-002** 1.) Do not destroy the old bridge; work with it, enhance it, add another bridge if necessary. Wanton destruction is wasteful, unethical and unnecessary.
- P-1020-003** 2.) Focus on trains, not buses. Buses are for small towns and we are a decent sized city, for God sakes, and growing all the time. People do not like to ride buses, but they do like to take trains. Trains are a more fuel-efficient way to move humans, and they are a "classier" way to travel. "Bus rapid transit" is foolish; it is a bad compromise stemming from those who are too cheap to pay for rail. The C-tran buses at commuter hours are completely packed, and one can watch a continuous stream of them exiting downtown Portland after work. Isn't it completely obvious that a train should be replacing them? I know that feeder routes in Clark County will be required, but this should be a solution, not a problem. What are we waiting for---gas to be \$10 a gallon?
- P-1020-004** 3.) Bicycle and pedestrian access is extremely important. A continuous dedicated off-road path needs to be created so that a cyclist (or person walking) need not navigate a difficult piecemeal serpentine route from North Portland through Jansen Beach, etc., as is currently the case.
- P-1020-005** 4.) Personal car traffic is of lowest importance. Your projected figures must be re-assessed in light of exorbitant fuel costs. People are actually driving less (finally!). Rampant car travel is unsustainable, and you should not be planning our future as if we live in the 1950's. Please have the guts and vision to do the right thing! A bridge toll is an excellent tool to further deter unnecessary driving and also close the gap of market inefficiency ("user pays" principle). In fact, the problem of congestion can be addressed by a toll system NOW without any new bridge being built. The new bridge should be built strictly for trains, bicycles, and humans on foot (and perhaps horses, etc---who knows? We may need to return to our roots in the future.) Have you noticed what the city of London has done with tolls and the amazing results they have achieved? Please, I'm asking you to think big, outside of your own lives as bureaucrats who drive everywhere. The world cannot sustain your lifestyle! Car-centric planning is outmoded, elitist and just darn silly at this point.
- P-1020-007**
- P-1020-008** 5.) Has anyone considered building for FREIGHT trains as well as passenger rail? In the future, it is likely that we will rely more heavily on rail to transport goods, as it is more efficient than truck travel. Wouldn't it be fantastic when, decades from now, while we are in the throes of a real train renaissance, we are able to say that Oregon and Washington were smart enough to anticipate this and build for it? Perhaps that other bridge---the train trestle to the west of I-5---is enough, I don't know, but has anyone actually looked at rail freight as part of the whole picture?

**P-1020-002**

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-1020-003**

Please refer to response to comment P-1020-001.

**P-1020-009** | Portland is renowned for its planning and livability. Please try to live up to the reputation, rather than just coasting on the successes of the past and allowing us to receive false praise!

**P-1020-004**

The new 16-foot wide multi-use path would extend to the Marine Drive interchange, connecting to the Expo Center light rail station and the light rail bridge over North Portland Harbor. These new trails would provide safer and more direct bicycle and pedestrian connections than the circuitous paths that exist in and through the Marine Drive interchange today.

**P-1020-005**

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-1020-006**

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. This does not mean that some form of tolling prior to constructing CRC couldn't be implemented. The ultimate decision on any

tolling options will be made by both the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions.

**P-1020-007**

A supplemental bridge that only includes improvements for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians does not meet the CRC project's Purpose and Need. As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the project's Purpose and Need "was developed by relying on previous planning studies, solicitation of public input, and coordination with stakeholder groups."

In addition to calling for improved bicycle, pedestrian and transit connectivity, the Purpose and Need also specifically states the need for improving highway freight mobility, travel safety and traffic operations, and the structural integrity of the existing bridges. These later needs would not be met by a supplemental bridge alternative that only provides for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians.

**P-1020-008**

According to the Feasibility of Diverting Truck Freight to Rail in the Columbia River Corridor Technical Memorandum produced by CRC project staff in April 2006, trains cannot move smaller loads as cost-effectively as trucks and may even be more costly for shipping distances under 500 miles. This is a key point, as the average trip distance by truck in the Portland/Vancouver region is 199 miles. While there are certainly some commodities that could shift from truck to rail in the region, it is probably a very minimal amount, probably not part of a consistent and regular shipment schedule, and would not significantly ease congestion along I-5 in the project area.

Additionally, the Vancouver-Portland region is the "last mile" for 85 percent of the freight traveling in the region. That is, goods are produced, assembled, and/or delivered within the region, and the overwhelming majority of the local shippers and customers are not

located on a rail spur or within a rail/intermodal terminal. Even if there was a targeted effort to use railroads more frequently, the goods would need to travel by truck on regional roads and freeways to arrive at rail terminals. In fact, most of the goods produced or received from the rail system must drive those goods by truck to or from the rail lines; and, increased rail service would likely lead to greater use of trucks for this very reason.

**P-1020-009**

Thank you. We consider this project to be part of the great planning success of the area. This project includes congestion pricing, light rail, sophisticated protections for endangered species, and a world class bike and pedestrian facility.