



From: [ROB BOI ME](#)
 To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
 CC:
 Subject: model results demonstrating reduction in rate of traffic growth
 Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2008 9:56:31 AM
 Attachments:

- P-0547-001** According to Gail Achterman, "modeling shows the project will actually reduce the total number of vehicles crossing the Columbia River in 2030, compared to not building the project."
- There's a lot of things I dislike about this statement:
- 1) First it is deceptive in that it implies that building the new bridge will actually reduce the amount of traffic, but it is in fact saying that the amount of traffic over the bridge will still increase with the new bridge, but the induced demand will be less than the induced demand with the no-build option. The word "reduce" in this case is actually being applied to "traffic increase" rather than to "traffic". However, to the casual reader, that's not how it appears. It is deceptive.
 - 2) A model, like statistics, can show anything you want depending upon the assumptions from which you are working. What assumptions were made that showed that the new bridge will reduce traffic increase in the future. It sure isn't intuitive to me. Unless of course, you're including the effect of light rail. Which leads to number (3):
 - 3) Basically the whole conversation is based on the assumption that the 3 options presented in the EIS are the only 3 options available. Which is obviously not an accident since the most economical and environment-friendly option has lots of detractors: build a light rail/bike/pedestrian bridge, and a bridge for local Hayden Island traffic, and put a toll on the existing bridge for cars with only one person in them. This is obviously the best option from a completely objective point of view, but there are so many self-interested parties that it doesn't even show up as an option in the EIS.
 - 4) Assuming the model is valid, Ms. Achterman doesn't give any numbers regarding how much the new bridge will reduce the traffic increase. Is it by 1% per year?, 0.5% per year?, 50% per year?
- P-0547-002**
- P-0547-003**

P-0547-001

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 LRT, 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).

The transportation models used to assess the alternatives are based on sound science, and have been used to accurately model the transportation system planning in the metro area for many years. In fact, records of past modeling efforts have been reviewed, and have revealed very accurate projections from as many as thirty years ago. An independent expert review panel was also pulled together to determine the merits of the modeling performed for the DEIS. The panel concluded that the correct models, assumptions, and methods have been used.

P-0547-002

Thank you for your comment. Significant work has gone into developing the CRC project, including an ongoing public involvement effort. The public involvement program includes numerous advisory groups to ensure the values and interests of the community are reflected in project decisions. These groups include representatives of public agencies, businesses, civic organizations, neighborhoods and freight, commuter and environmental groups. Feedback from the general public and advisory groups has been generally supportive of the project, including

Thanks for your time,
Rob Boime

Keep your kids safer online with Windows Live Family Safety. [Help protect your kids.](#)

support for the transit, bicycle, pedestrian, highway, interchange, and financing elements of the project. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the process used to develop project alternatives and select a Locally Preferred Alternative.

Regarding additional alternatives, 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. 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. 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 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. Also, travel demand modeling and traffic analysis demonstrated that alternatives with substantially more transit service and only minor highway capacity improvements, had only marginal differences in transit ridership and auto demand, but had substantially greater congestion, emissions, and highway safety problems.

P-0547-003

The DEIS evaluation found that the project, with a toll and LRT, would 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 Section 3.1).