



P-0536-001 A myth seems to exist in the minds of many critics of this project who seemingly suggest the majority of the commuters from Clark County are only going to downtown Portland. This myth then propagates another myth that basically suggests that no increases in motor vehicle capacity are needed, and that extending Max into Vancouver, building more motorist subsidized bicycle infrastructure and charging variable tolls to motorists will solve the congestion problem. Well it is this combination of backward thinking that truly is a myth. Such a proposal only does economic harm and further separates the two sides of the river when the project should be bringing the two sides of the river closer together.

Any alternative transport infrastructure constructed must be shared with a bridge superstructure as that increases roadway capacity. Under NO circumstances should a separate bridge structure be constructed for just the chosen transit option, bicycles and/or pedestrians, with or without a new highway structure.

P-0536-002 Singling out motorists only for tolling is socialistic profiling based on choice of vehicle and therefore discriminatory. With the sky rocketing costs of motor fuels, NO outdated dictatorial and subsidized incentives are needed to promote alternative forms of transport. A real bridge in a reality check world necessitates an equitable cost sharing financing plan. Therefore "IF" tolling is implemented for any kind of motor vehicles, then the users of ALL modes of vehicular traffic MUST be required to pay a toll or a user charge. Transit passengers must be obligated to pay any proportionate local share of the transit infrastructure with a surcharge on transit fares – and instead of just providing lip service, freeloading bicyclists too must also pay their own way with a bridge toll to cover any local match monies spent on providing bicycle infrastructure. The CRC come clean, stop hiding the price tag for bicycle infrastructure and provide the taxpaying public with the authentic numbers of projected bicycle crossings so this toll can be calculated. .

P-0536-004 Moreover, the underlying problem with this project is that it has become governed by special interests and politically motivated so-called science with socialistic controls that involves planning for a surge in population growth while dismissing the reality check needs of overall transport infrastructure. Practical science says the world is overpopulated by humans. Therefore any regional planning efforts should begin by finding ways to reduce population growth instead of constraining roadways that does harm to the local economy and interstate commerce.

P-0536-005 And finally – in May I provided the CRC with six pages of testimony and diagrams in which I noted that none of the five alternatives currently on the table meet reality check objectives that should be a part of this process. My suggestion is a detailed compromise that adds new and combined infrastructure only where it is essential, and reuses many of the regional assets that are already in place. This compromise basically suggests constructing a new freeway bridge for all I-5 through traffic and reusing the existing historical bridges for slower local and interchange traffic, bicycles and pedestrians, and possibly transit. All I can say at this point is that if you have not read it thoroughly along with the other testimony submitted by the public, then you are not doing the job you have been appointed to do and should not be voting on any recommendation tonight. – Thank You

RECEIVED

JUN 24 2008

Columbia River Crossing

P-0536-001

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-0536-002

Details of the tolling system are still being refined as the project enters the final design stage. It is currently not anticipated that transit users, bicyclists or pedestrians will pay a toll. Additionally, certain toll discounts or waivers for other groups have been and will continue to be considered.

One of the benefits of the toll is that it encourages the use, the choice, of alternative modes including transit and cycling. Adopted plans at the local, regional, and state levels all encourage the use of these forms of transportation. These forms have environmental, financial, health, and other benefits.

P-0536-003

See response to P-0536-002, above.

P-0536-004

The CRC project has been provided with population projections that represent the best available estimates. We have no reason to believe

that policies will be enacted that would restrict people's ability to choose the community they want to live in or to restrict natural population growth.

P-0536-005

The CRC Task Force - composed of 39 leaders from a broad cross section of Washington and Oregon communities – was tasked with advising the CRC project team, including federal sponsors, and providing guidance and recommendations at key decision points over the course of nearly 3 ½ years. Public agencies, businesses, civic organizations, neighborhoods and freight, commuter and environmental groups were all represented on the Task Force. The Task Force voted to develop a supplemental bridge alternative, in an attempt to find an alternative to total bridge replacement that would still meet the project's purpose and need but at lower cost and with greater reliance on managing demand with higher tolls and more transit service. The two most promising supplemental alternatives were considered in the DEIS. Based on the detailed analysis that followed, the Task Force recommended, and all project sponsors agreed, that the replacement bridge with light rail was the locally preferred alternative.