



**From:** [wkempfer@yahoo.com](mailto:wkempfer@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Friday, June 13, 2008 9:34:14 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97211  
 Work Zip Code: 97006

Person:

Person commutes in the travel area via:  
 Bicycle

- P-1077-001**
1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
 Supplemental Bridge
  2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:  
 Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland  
 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: Wes  
 Last Name: Kempfer  
 Title:  
 E-Mail: [wkempfer@yahoo.com](mailto:wkempfer@yahoo.com)  
 Address: 4101 NE Sumner St  
 Portland, OR 97211

- P-1077-002**
- Comments:  
 Why was there not a fuller range of options in the DEIS? It seems like the relatively middle-cost option of renovating the existing bridges (with no additional lane expansion),

### P-1077-001

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-1077-002

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an 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

- P-1077-002** adding tolls, and building a supplemental bridge for high-capacity transit, bikes, and pedestrians should have been included. That would be the option I would support. None
- P-1077-003** of the options actually included in the DEIS, including the no build option, are acceptable.
- P-1077-004** A supplemental BRT or light rail bridge, plus tolling on the existing renovated bridges would address problem of congestion in a more cost effective way and help meet our regional commitments to reduce GHG.

existing highway system more efficiently without any capital investment. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and 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 in the highway generally did not adequately address 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). This analysis found that a more balanced investment in highway and transit, as represented by Alternatives 2 and 3, performed best.

**P-1077-003**

Thank you for your comment. 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.

**P-1077-004**

The LPA includes light rail transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, a new highway toll, other TSM/TDM measures, as well as highway capacity and safety improvements. The induced growth analysis (summarized in the FEIS, Section 3.4 and detailed in the Indirect Effects Technical Report) indicates that the likelihood of substantial induced traffic and sprawl from the CRC project is very low. In fact, because of its location in an already urbanized area, the inclusion of new tolls that manage demand, the inclusion of new light rail, and the active regulation of growth management in the region, the CRC project will likely reinforce the region's goals of concentrating development in regional centers, reinforcing existing corridors, and promoting transit and pedestrian

friendly development and development patterns. The analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions indicates that GHG emissions from roadways would increase as population increases but that the LPA would be expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions compared to No-build (see FEIS Section 3.19.10 and the Energy Technical Report).