

**From:** [NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Sunday, June 29, 2008 4:42:01 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Home Zip Code: 97217

Work Zip Code:

Person:

Lives in the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle

Bus

Car or Truck

Walk

**P-0501-001**

1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
Replacement 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: Unsure  
Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Unsure  
Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes  
Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:

First Name:

Last Name:

Title:

E-Mail:

Address:

,

**P-0501-001**

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-0501-002** I have been to some of the Open Houses and seen the several designs for the CRC Project. Unfortunately, I could not attend a Public Hearing. Last week, I was very disappointed to hear the the 12 lane design is the current favorite. Building 12-car-lanes

**P-0501-003** will not solve or reduce the problems of the Interstate Bridge. At best, it will put them off for a few years.

## The Problems:

**P-0501-004** 1) The empty closet effect.  
As in a house, if you install an extra closet you will fill it up; usually with stuff you shouldn't really keep. The same applies to bridges. If you build a bridge for 12 lanes of cars, then 12 lanes of cars is what we will get and we will be right back in the situation we are now and likely in just a few years rather than decades.

The real goal of this project should be to move people and cargo efficiently, NOT cars.

**P-0501-005** 2) Bottleneck  
I-5 is 6 lanes between Portland and Vancouver except at Delta Park where it changes to 4 lanes over the Slough. This loss of 2 lanes causes a large bottleneck and construction to expand I-5 to 6 lanes has just started. However, the CRC Project wants to build a 12 lane bridge that feeds into 6 lanes at Delta Park. There's a failure of logic here: either a reduction of lanes does not cause a bottleneck, or the construction at Delta Park is unnecessary.

Reducing a 12 lane bridge to a 6 lane highway is counterproductive.

**P-0501-006** (Of course, we can see the writing on the wall. First, a 12 lane bridge and sometime later expand I-5 to 12 lanes. Again, this accomplishes the goal of moving cars, but not people. I propose you drive through Sacramento, CA someday to see why a too-many-lane highway is a bad idea.)

**P-0501-007** 3) A separate bridge  
There is no good reason to build a separate bridge for MAX from the Expo Center to Jantzen Beach. I am a resident of Jantzen Beach Moorage and was very disappointed to see plans to break up a successful community. A separate bridge won't slow down speeding boats (if that is the intent). It only adds problems including:

- extra building and maintenance costs,
- extra marine hazards for local marine businesses,
- truly painful legal and practical problems in condemning parts of Jantzen Beach Moorage, and
- separating bus traffic on I-5 from MAX making user transfers difficult and

**P-0501-002**

Thank you for participating in the public process and submitting your comments.

**P-0501-003**

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-0501-004**

The proposed new add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges) are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area and are not designed to increase capacity generally on I-5. 68 to 75% of I-5 traffic enters and/or exits I-5 within the CRC project area, and these add/drop lanes provide space for this traffic to do so without disrupting cars and trucks traveling to destinations further north and south of the project area. The project does not propose to add lanes north or south of the project limits.

The DEIS evaluation found that the project, with a toll and light rail, would actually reduce the total daily volume of traffic using the I-5 and I-205 river crossings by approximately 3%. The FEIS analysis of the project has been updated to include an evaluation of how the CRC project would affect Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.1). Rather than inducing sprawl, 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. In 2010, Metro ran the MetroScope model (an integrated land use and transportation model) to forecast growth associated with transportation improvements of a 12-lane river crossing and light rail to Clark College. The model showed only minimal changes in employment location and

**P-0501-007** | confusing.

An Idea:  
-----

**P-0501-008** | If you build it they will come.

The Hawthorne Bridge is a good example. It was redesigned to accommodate more walkers and bicyclists and is now almost overcrowded with them while car traffic has remained reasonable.

Instead of 12 lanes of cars, we need

- 1 lane for bicycles (1/2 lane in each direction)
- 1 lane for pedestrians (again 1/2 each way)
- 1 lane for rail (" ")
- 2 lanes for bus (also carpool during commute hours?)
- 6 lanes for cars

housing demand compared to the No-Build. For more information see FEIS Chapter 3, Section 3.4.

### **P-0501-005**

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-0501-006**

See discussion above regarding the purpose of the add/drop lanes.

**P-0501-007**

The Stacked/Transit Highway Bridge (STHB) option, which would allow transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians to travel beneath the highway bridge deck, was included as part of the LPA. The DEIS indicated that the two bridges required for this bridge option would put less bridge sub-structure in the Columbia River, likely resulting in less environmental impact. After publication of the DEIS, additional engineering studies were conducted that confirmed the feasibility of the STHB design.

The STHB is described in greater detail in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2) of the FEIS. Impacts associated with a STHB are discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

**P-0501-008**

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 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.