

From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Monday, May 12, 2008 9:10:58 PM
Attachments:



Home Zip Code: 97202
 Work Zip Code: 97201

Person:
 Other - Live and work in the region.

P-0136-001 Person commutes in the travel area via:
 Car or Truck
 Other - What "other" is there?

1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 None

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: No Opinion
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:
 First Name: John
 Last Name: Reinhold
 Title:
 E-Mail:
 Address:
 ,

Comments:

P-0136-002 First and foremost, you do not have the correct options on your multiple choice list

P-0136-001

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-0136-002

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) and Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS explain how the project's Sponsoring Agencies 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, such as a possible third transportation corridor across the Columbia River, alternative transit

P-0136-002 | below. You have unfairly framed this as an "all or nothing" choice.

P-0136-003 | Second, there are significantly better ways that we can spend the greater than 4 billion dollars that the CRC will cost. Here is what I propose:

1. Seismic upgrades to the current I5 bridges over the Columbia.
2. Build a two or four lane local traffic only bridge between the Oregon mainland and Hayden Island, which carries cars, bikes, pedestrians, and light rail.
3. Remove the I5 exit ramps to Hayden Island for regular traffic use - keeping them accessible only to emergency vehicles.
4. Reconfigure the railroad bridge across the Columbia to better align the opening in the railroad bridge and the hump in the I5 bridge to drastically reduce the number of required bridge lifts.

P-0136-004 | And finally, in a time when drastic changes to our transportation patterns is going to be required (both economically and environmentally) a new higher capacity bridge is a mistake. We should spend the \$4 billion providing education system improvements and jobs and housing in Portland so that people don't feel they have to move to Vancouver.

P-0136-005 | We should be making it harder to commute long distances, not easier. We should be planning for a future without fossil fuels, for a future where the outlying areas have farms growing food instead of lawns wasting water.

P-0136-006 | The Columbia River Crossing project is the wrong way to spend our money, and the wrong way to plan for the future. I do NOT support the CRC as it is currently planned or presented.

modes, 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, and found that alternatives that do not include improvements to the existing I-5 facility generally do not 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 I-5. Traffic modeling showed that even significant investment in improving transit options in the corridor or building a third corridor was not enough to alleviate future traffic demand and existing safety hazards on I-5. It is important to note that transit and river crossing components were not eliminated simply because they could not accommodate future vehicular trips. For example, both light rail and tolling help to decrease vehicular demand. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the screening process used to develop project alternatives.

P-0136-003

The highway design associated with the LPA essentially provides an arterial-like crossing over the North Portland Harbor by providing a separate bridge structure, adjacent to the mainline, for an auxiliary lane that connects the Hayden Island and Marine Drive Interchanges. As described in Chapter 2 (page 2-24) of the DEIS, this auxiliary lane allows vehicles to travel between Hayden Island and the Oregon mainland without merging into mainline interstate traffic. This auxiliary lane provides that local connection. Arterial-only bridge options were studied in the early screening analysis and were found to fall far short of meeting the project's purpose and need, as outlined in the CRC Step A Screening Report and summarized in Chapter 2, Section 2.5 of the DEIS.

Eliminating bridge lifts would provide a safety improvement. Relocating the BNSF railroad bridge swing span could reduce the number of times the I-5 bridge would need to lift, but it would not eliminate the need for

bridge lifts. The I-5 bridge would still need to lift for regular monitoring and maintenance and for occasional taller vessels such as construction barges and high-mast recreational vessels. More importantly, simply moving the BNSF swing span, which is private property, would address almost none of the stated Purpose and Need for the proposed action as described in Chapter 1 (Section 1.3) of the DEIS.

P-0136-004

As the only continuous north-south Interstate on the West Coast connecting the Canadian and Mexican borders, I-5 is vital to the local, regional, and national economy. The I-5 crossing also provides the primary transportation link between Vancouver and Portland, and the only direct connection between the downtown areas of these cities. As described in the DEIS, serious problems face this important crossing, including growing congestion, impaired freight movement, limited public transit options, high auto accident rates, substandard bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and vulnerability to failure in an earthquake. The fact that other important issues face our communities does not diminish the importance of addressing the problems plaguing the I-5 crossing.

CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects would remain dedicated to those projects, and anticipates needing to find new funds to finance the project. Funding for the project will come from a variety of sources including federal grants that would not be available to other transportation projects in the region, State of Oregon, State of Washington, regional and local sources. In addition, it is assumed that the replacement bridge will be tolled. Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA.

P-0136-005

The LPA would accommodate a future scenario with limited fossil fuels.

Please see the discussion of peak oil in Chapter 3 (Section 3.19.12) of the FEIS.

P-0136-006

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