

From: [Randal O'Toole](#)
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Questions about DEIS
Date: Friday, May 30, 2008 2:28:08 PM
Attachments:

Hello,



- P-0828-001** | I have some questions about the DEIS for the Columbia River Crossing that I hope you can answer so I can put together my comments.
- P-0828-002** | 1. Vehicle Hours of Delay: Page 1-2 of the traffic technical report says "Vehicle-hours of delay on truck routes in the Portland-Vancouver area are projected to increase by more than 90 percent over the next 25 years." Vehicle-hours of delay is an extremely important measure of congestion. Did you calculate vehicle-hours of delay in 2030 for each of the alternatives? If so, what were the results?
- P-0828-003** | 2. Energy: The energy technical report says that alternatives 2 and 3 use the least energy for three reasons: 1. "reduced travel demand"; 2. "diversion of personal vehicle trips to public transit with the provision of high-capacity transit"; and 3. "higher operating speeds across the I-5 and I-205 bridge crossings, which results in improved fuel efficiency." Do you have a breakdown of how much each of these three factors contributes to energy savings? Also, what accounts for the "reduced travel demand" in alternatives 2 and 3?
- P-0828-004** | 3. Financial Costs: Looking at the costs of the river crossings in exhibit 4.2-5, why does the Lincoln transit terminus add \$90 million to the cost of the highway portion of the river crossing over the Mill Plain transit terminus? Why does light rail add \$90 million to the cost of the highway portion of the river crossing over BRT?
- P-0828-005** | 4. Daily Transit Bridge Usage: What is the projected daily transit trips (rides) across the bridge under the various alternatives? Exhibit 15 of the transit technical report gives mode split during peak hours but not daily. Exhibit 16 gives mode split daily by market

P-0828-001

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

P-0828-002

Vehicle Hours of Delay, in the region, have not been calculated for all of the alternatives. However, this analysis has been completed for the corridor. Please refer to the DEIS and FEIS, Section 3.1, for this and other metrics of transportation performance.

P-0828-003

The individual components of the alternatives were not modeled separately. The reduced travel demand is actually reduced auto trips across the river. The model predicts that some discretionary trips across the river will not be made because of the toll.

P-0828-004

The financial analysis was complex as many components of the project, such as a stacked highway/ transit bridge, actually serve more than one mode. The project alternatives and transit alignments that you are asking about have not been included in the LPA. Light rail has been selected by all sponsoring agencies as the preferred transit mode. It has, as you know, higher capital costs than Bus Rapid Transit. However, the operation costs are lower and light rail's ability to encourage private development is higher. Compared with the DEIS, the Finance Chapter of the FEIS provides much more detail about the financing for the LPA, and has included the development of more accurate estimates and plans.

P-0828-005

Please see Appendix A of the Transit Technical Report for the daily transit traffic of the alternatives.

P-0828-005

but not total. I would like total daily transit traffic.

5. LRT vs. BRT: Why is LRT projected to attract 33 percent more riders than BRT?

Thank you for your help.

Randal O'Toole

--

26344 SW Metolius Meadows Drive
Camp Sherman, Oregon 97730
541-595-1460
541-460-3644 cell

Ridership numbers were consistently higher for LRT for myriad reasons including the following: LRT would carry more passengers across the river during the PM peak, LRT would result in more people choosing to take transit, LRT has faster travel times through the project area LRT offers a one seat ride from Vancouver to the Portland CBD,