



From: stargazer98661@yahoo.com
To: [Draft EIS Feedback](#);
CC:
Subject: DEIS Document Viewer Feedback
Date: Wednesday, May 28, 2008 9:00:51 AM
Attachments:

From:
 Zip Code: 98661
 Address: 54th Ave & SR500
 City: Vancouver
 State: WA
 E-Mail: stargazer98661@yahoo.com
 Section: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
 Page: i

Comment or Question:

- P-0637-001** | Whichever proposal is adopted there a couple things to keep in mind from a Clark County resident's point of view.
- P-0637-002** | Mass transit options are extremely limited. I can not afford to spend 1 3/4 hours each way on the bus just to get from Vancouver Mall to inner NE Portland to go to work. Just from the expo center to work (4.8 miles) the tri-met fair planner quotes a 49 minute trip that includes 6 minutes of walking. I've planned it out and it would make my commute and work time nearly 13 hours per day to leave my car at home. Trying to force commuters to overcrowded mass transit is unreasonable. I have to have my car for work each day. Most people who can take mass transit do. I can not and it bothers me that although I provide a vital service to the Portland community I am a target to be penalized.
- P-0637-003** | I work in Oregon and I pay Oregon taxes. For Oregon to cite a strain on your budget, consider the strain on the taxpayers who live in Washington, yet foot the Oregon taxpayer bill.
- P-0637-004** | To put a toll on I-5 would simply switch massive amounts of traffic to an already taxed I-205 and reduce the ability for commerce even further, yet again raising prices for consumers.
- P-0637-005** | It took nearly 30 years of bickering between the states for I-205 to be built and by the time it was built it was obvious that it was undersized. That was 16 years ago.

P-0637-001

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

P-0637-002

Travel times vary by time of day, direction of travel and travel mode. Travel times improve for transit in the LPA compared to the 2030 No-Build Alternative. More specifically, the LPA:

- Improves transit travel times region-wide,
- Improves transit travel times relative to automobile travel times, and
- Improves reliability of transit travel times.

The in-vehicle and total transit travel times for all of the origin and destination pairs that were studied would improve with the LPA, compared to the 2030 No-Build Alternative, with savings ranging from 3 to 24 minutes in the southbound direction during the morning peak period. For example, with the LPA a transit trip between Downtown Vancouver and Hayden Island would save a total of 3 minutes, while a trip between Clark College and Pioneer Square would save 24 minutes. During the afternoon/evening peak period in the northbound direction, travel time savings would range from 5 to 28 minutes. For example, a transit trip between Hayden Island and Vancouver would save an estimated 5 minutes, while a trip between Pioneer Square and Clark College would save 28 minutes (dropping from 72 minutes with the No Build Alternative to 44 minutes with the LPA). Transit reliability between major origins and destinations is higher due to the availability of light rail that travels in an exclusive guideway.

For more information, please see FEIS Chapter 3 (Section 3.1).

- P-0637-005** | Why does the commission find it necessary to continue spending taxpayer money to research something that everyone knows is badly needed to support our NW economy? Why does the commuter have to be penalized for wanting to contribute to their community by holding meaningful, living wage jobs? They are stifled by the commissions continuous delay of this project.
- P-0637-006** | I think its wonderful when a commuter can make mass transit or bicycles part of their commute. Not everyone can. Many commuters already carpool, leave early to reduce congestion, work flexible schedules as employer allow, and yet we are faced with waiting another 10 years before indecisive government officials make a decision that they KNOW is inevitable.
- P-0637-007** | Build the bridge! In fact build two...put another from Camas to Gresham!

P-0637-003

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

P-0637-004

Traffic modeling indicates that tolling I-5, but not I-205, would divert some traffic to I-205 although most trips would remain on I-5. However, under existing conditions, trips already divert to I-205 and would continue to do so under No-Build because of the unreliability of, and congestion in, the I-5 corridor. With the CRC improvements to I-5, many of those diverted trips would shift to I-5 because it would be a shorter and more reliable trip than I-205. Tolling the I-5 crossing causes some trips to shift to I-205 in order to avoid the toll. The net difference in the number of trips crossing on I-205 is only slightly higher with the CRC project than without it.

With few exceptions, federal statutes do not permit tolling of an existing interstate highway without associated improvements. FHWA does have pilot programs that allow state departments of transportation to apply for the approval to toll a facility. The project sponsors are not proposing to toll the I-205 crossing as part of the CRC project. It is possible that a toll could be placed on the I-205 crossing in the future separate from the CRC project. Section 3.1 of the DEIS and FEIS discusses the effects of the project on traffic levels in the I-5 and I-205 corridors.

In addition, tolling prior to or during construction can be used to manage demand and begin collecting the revenue. This is not currently proposed but could be implemented if approved.

P-0637-005

It is important that a project, such as CRC, provide ample opportunity for input from a diverse constituency of stakeholders and jurisdictions, and that it follow a process that complies with all federal, state and local legal

requirements. The project sponsors intent is to progress at a deliberate pace to ensure that we meet public interests, meet the transportation needs, address the quality of local communities and the environment, and be financially and fiscally responsible. Following publication of the FEIS, there will be a record of decision. If that decision is to move forward with one of the build alternatives, then the sponsors will progress into final engineering, finance plan implementation, and then construction.

P-0637-006

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

P-0637-007

Two design options are included in the FEIS for the North Portland Harbor Bridges. The preferred option, LPA Option A, includes local vehicular access between Marine Drive and Hayden Island on a local multimodal bridge. This new structure would include two lanes of arterial traffic, light rail transit, and a multi-use path for bicyclists and pedestrians.

LPA Option B does not include auto lanes on the local multimodal bridge, but instead provides direct access between Marine Drive and the island with collector-distributor lanes adjacent to I-5. Option B 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.