

**From:** [Wdelellis@wmconnect.com](mailto:Wdelellis@wmconnect.com)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Bridge and mass transportation  
**Date:** Thursday, June 05, 2008 4:29:12 PM  
**Attachments:**

**P-0912-001** There are many of us noticing that although the hearings and meetings are going on, it appears the decision in favor of a new replacement bridge and light rail has already been made by the bureaucrats and elected officials.

It seems that any time someone disagrees with the "official stance" of new replacement bridge and light rail, it is because that taxpayer is uninformed and has not read enough literature and justification put out by the CRC and its associated agencies and governments. He/she is encouraged to bring himself up to date.

It appears this is another situation like the State of Oregon's locating the new prison in the Wilsonville area. The Governor announced the new location about 4 days before the last public hearing. Gives one a great desire to get involved, doesn't it.

Walter Ellis  
 Vancouver



### **P-0912-001**

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. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) and Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS explain how the project's Sponsoring Agencies 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, such as a possible third transportation corridor across the Columbia River, alternative transit modes, and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and found that alternatives that do not include improvements to the existing I-5 facility generally do not 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 I-5. Traffic modeling showed that even significant investment in improving transit options in the corridor or building a third corridor was not enough to alleviate future traffic demand and existing safety hazards on I-5. It is important to note that transit and river crossing components were not eliminated simply because they could not accommodate future vehicular trips. For example, both light rail and tolling help to decrease vehicular demand. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS for more discussion on the screening process used to develop project alternatives.