



From: davidlcarr@earthlink.net
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC Submit Comments Page
Date: Sunday, June 01, 2008 11:53:58 AM
Attachments:

From: David Carr
 E-Mail: davidlcarr@earthlink.net
 Comment or Question:

Some comments:

- P-0838-001** 1) The biggest issue with the I-5 bridge is rush hour traffic (75-77% of traffic goes south in the morning, and 60-68% will go north in the evening.) And yet (while I admittedly have not read everything) I have not seen any proposal that discusses lanes that switch directions in rush hour.
- 2) The supplemental identifies 4 lanes each way + mass transit. If you instead have a bi-directional rush hour lane (for 2-person HOV, trucks and buses), you could have 5 lanes each way during rush hour, and 3 the other way. That is a 63/37 split, much closer to the actual traffic split than 4 lanes each way. Same number of lanes, much better traffic flow.
- P-0838-002** 3) I believe that if the supplemental and replacement projects cost nearly the same (about \$3B each), we should absolutely do the supplemental project, if nothing else to give us better options to divert traffic when accidents or construction occurs.
- P-0838-003** 4) From the numbers I've seen, rapid transit is less than 10% of the trips, even forecasted to 2030. Yet the \$1B price tag for light rail is 25% of the \$4B total cost. It seems to me that if we have a HOV/bus lane, that should provide nearly equivalent service for mass transit while saving 25% of the cost (or, being able to afford a third bi-directional HOV lane, or a better bike path, or...)

P-0838-001

Reversible lanes, like those on Interstate 5 in Seattle, require added lanes and barriers compared to regular highways. This increased width could have greater impacts on right of way in downtown Vancouver. Reversible lanes also perform better as part of a larger, regional system; they would not relieve congestion significantly in CRC's five-mile project area.

P-0838-002

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.

P-0838-003

High occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes work when they are part of a network, and could potentially be a useful tool in the CRC area if employed as part of a regional plan. The 5-mile CRC project by itself is too short in length to provide the true benefits of HOV lanes, but should the region adopt and develop a HOV system, lanes within the bridge influence area could potentially be designated as part of the network.

The CRC project team has looked at HOV lanes and freight lanes, which are typically located on the inside freeway lane next to the barrier, as part of its technical analysis. Because about 70 percent of the vehicles enter and/or exit I-5 within the 5-mile study area, access to and from a HOV lane or freight lane could create traffic operational problems by increasing lane changes (for example, HOVs entering the freeway and needing to merge all the way to the inside lane). The results of this analysis are described in more detail in Section 3.1 of the DEIS.