



From: deedub@webtv.net
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC Submit Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2008 4:45:51 PM
Attachments:

From: Den Mark Wichar
 E-Mail: deedub@webtv.net
 Comment or Question:

P-1013-001 | I oppose the preferred plan. 1) Building a new bridge will only encourage more drivers.
P-1013-002 | 2) A rail bridge already exists for light rail. 3) The main reason for I-5 back-ups is
P-1013-003 | Portland's Delta Park squeeze, NOT the bridge. 4) There is no place on Main Street or
P-1013-004 | Broadway in Vancouver for light rail, no rational place, that is. 5) Better mass transit is
P-1013-005 | what's needed, not a new bridge.

P-1013-001

The proposed new add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges) are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area and are not designed to increase capacity generally on I-5. 68 to 75% of I-5 traffic enters and/or exits I-5 within the CRC project area, and these add/drop lanes provide space for this traffic to do so without disrupting cars and trucks traveling to destinations further north and south of the project area. The project does not propose to add lanes north or south of the project limits.

The DEIS evaluation found that the project, with a toll and light rail, would actually reduce the total daily volume of traffic using the I-5 and I-205 river crossings by approximately 3%. The FEIS analysis of the project has been updated to include an evaluation of how the CRC project would affect Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.1). Rather than inducing sprawl, the CRC project will likely reinforce the region's goals of concentrating development in regional centers, reinforcing existing corridors, and promoting transit and pedestrian friendly development and development patterns. In 2010, Metro ran the MetroScope model (an integrated land use and transportation model) to forecast growth associated with transportation improvements of a 12-lane river crossing and light rail to Clark College. The model showed only minimal changes in employment location and housing demand compared to the No-Build. For more information see FEIS Chapter 3, Section 3.4.

P-1013-002

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River,

and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why a third corridor, arterial crossing of the Columbia River, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need. For a general description of the screening process see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS. It should be noted that every proposal received from the public was considered, and many of the proposals that were dropped from further consideration included elements that helped shape the alternatives in the DEIS.

P-1013-003

The I-5 Delta Park improvement project was included in the analysis of the No-build alternative. Though the I-5 Delta Park project will provide some congestion relief in the project area during morning rush hour, it will not significantly meet the CRC project's objectives of improving travel safety and traffic operations on the Interstate 5 crossing's bridges and associated interchanges; improving connectivity, reliability, travel times and operations of public transportation modal alternatives in the BIA; improving highway freight mobility and addressing interstate travel and commerce needs in the BIA; and improving the Interstate 5 river crossing's structural integrity.

P-1013-004

Following the selection of the LPA in July of 2008, the CRC enlisted the help of community members - residents, business owners, transit-dependent populations and commuters - who had interest in light rail planning to form the Vancouver Working Group (VWG). The VWG met regularly to develop recommendations and provided feedback to the CRC project, the City of Vancouver and C-TRAN on transit alignments, proposed station locations and design, security and park and ride facilities in downtown Vancouver. Following approximately 5 months of coordination, in addition to public open houses and walking tours, the VWG recommended the Washington-Broadway Couplet through

downtown Vancouver to C-TRAN and City of Vancouver staff. Per the Vancouver Working Group Final Report (October 2009), this alignment was preferred largely because it spread the potential impacts and benefits across two streets, as opposed to concentrating them on a single street. This alignment was adopted as part of the LPA and is analyzed in the FEIS. For more information on the transit alignment decision-making process please see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS.

P-1013-005

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.