

**From:** [heatherjeanb@earthlink.net](mailto:heatherjeanb@earthlink.net)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Saturday, May 31, 2008 9:20:47 AM  
**Attachments:**



Home Zip Code: 97202  
 Work Zip Code: 97201

**Person:**

Lives in the project area  
 Works in the project area

**Person commutes in the travel area via:**

Bicycle  
 Car or Truck

**P-0832-001**

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

**Contact Information:**

First Name: Heather  
 Last Name: Brunelle  
 Title:  
 E-Mail: [heatherjeanb@earthlink.net](mailto:heatherjeanb@earthlink.net)  
 Address: 1325 SE Rural St.  
 Portland, OR 97202

**P-0832-001**

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-0832-002** I reject all five of the alternatives presented in the Draft EIS because all five alternatives increase capacity for automobile traffic. Even the most conservative option presented in the Draft EIS creates capacity for a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled. These alternatives worsen rather than solve the traffic problems and are counter to efforts to reduce the environmental impacts (e.g., greenhouse gases and toxic pollutants) from vehicle traffic. The Draft EIS failed to consider more sustainable options for replacing the bridges. Again, I reject all five alternatives presented in the Draft EIS and urge you to instead consider alternatives that would reduce rather than increase vehicle traffic and the vehicle emissions.

**P-0832-003**

**P-0832-002**

See the FEIS Section 2.7 for a discussion of alternatives considered.  
See Section 3.4 for a discussion of induced growth.

**P-0832-003**

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.