


From: [Donna Matrazzo](#) 
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC: [Dylan Rivera](#); [Robert Liberty](#); info@clfuture.org; [Steve Bleiler](#);
Subject: *** Detected as Spam *** No Columbia Crossing bridge and bold, better mass transit alternatives
Date: Friday, May 02, 2008 8:03:19 AM
Attachments:

To: Columbia River Crossing:

P-0024-001 | I vote for no new bridge.

P-0024-002 | I also feel that the five options presented do not show a thoughtful analysis and projection of no new bridge combined with a host of enthusiastic, creative, broadly supported measures to decrease auto traffic, which is mainly caused by commuters at rush hours.

For example, a combo of ...

P-0024-003 |

- Boldly turn one whole lane of the current bridge in each direction into a combo bus/light rail line for moving lots of people quickly.
- Even more boldly turn a second lane into a carpool lane and leave only one lane for one-person vehicles during rush hours. Make one-person vehicles during rush hours as undesirable as possible.
- Better park and ride alternatives
- A big commuting car-pooling campaign
- A toll to encourage other forms of transit
- A toll based on vehicle length to encourage small cars that take up less room on the highway and pollute less.
- Strengthen the existing bridge enough to add a bike-pedestrian lane on each side, like the Marquam Bridge added a lane.

P-0024-004 | A new bridge will cause more pollution and different bottleneck problems as the bridge users before and after the bridge attempt to squeeze into the I-5 lanes.

P-0024-005 | Don't give the Vancouver light-rail-rejecting 'burbites a new bridge and do give them other options and ultimately the increasing high cost of gas and other options will cause them to wake up and alter commuting habits.

Sincerely,

Donna Matrazzo

P-0024-001

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-0024-002

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

Check out my gorgeous and portfolio-filled website at www.donnamatrazzo.com

Donna Matrazzo
 The Writing Works
 Compelling Stories on Complex Topics
 19300 NW Sauvie Island Rd.
 Portland OR 97231
 (503) 621-3049

 Powered by Green Mountain Energy
 100% of electricity from renewables -- wind, geothermal, biomass
 Cost is approximately 10% additional, an average \$7/month
www.portlandgeneral.com

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-0024-003

TSM/TDM projects, by themselves, would not solve the many problems identified in the Project purpose and need, including seismic vulnerability, poor bicycle and pedestrian facilities and connections, poor transit mobility, and substandard highway design features. However, the CRC project has considered a variety of TSM/TDM measures to complement the infrastructure improvements. See Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a description of the TSM/TDM measures currently proposed as part of this project.

P-0024-004

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) completed Phase I construction of the I-5 Delta Park widening project in fall 2010. Phase I of the project involved widening I-5 and lengthening the entrance and exit ramps at Victory Boulevard and Columbia Boulevard. Phase II involves improving local streets and will begin when funding is secured. Phase I of the Delta Park project widened the current 2-lane segment of southbound I-5 to 3 lanes. There are currently no immediate plans to widen I-5 south of Delta Park. Neither the CRC project nor the Delta Park projects are intended to address the southbound traffic congestion that currently exists near the I-5/I-405 split. However, traffic analyses show the congestion at the split will not be worsened because of the Columbia River Crossing project. The main reason is that fewer cars are expected to cross the river with a project in 2030 than without a project. This is due to the provision of improved transit service and tolling.

Beyond the CRC and Delta Park projects, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Final Strategic Plan recommended a comprehensive list of modal actions relating to: additional transit capacity and service; additional rail capacity; land use and land use accord; transportation demand/system management; environmental justice; additional elements and strategies (such as new river crossings); and financing. RTC and Metro are tasked with initiating recommendations as part of their regional transportation planning role. Examples of current efforts include RTC's evaluation of future high-capacity transit in Clark County, and evaluation of needs for future river crossings. Regional planners have investigated solutions to existing bottlenecks at the I-5 connections with I-405 and I-84. ODOT is responsible for conducting ongoing studies to identify other congestion problems on I-5 in Oregon that may need to be addressed in the future.

P-0024-005

Thank you for taking the time to submit your comments on the I-5 CRC DEIS.