

From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Sunday, June 22, 2008 12:17:30 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97202
 Work Zip Code: none

Person:
 Other - use bridge a couple times/month

Person commutes in the travel area via:
 Car or Truck

- P-1159-001**
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: No Opinion
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

First Name:
 Last Name:
 Title:
 E-Mail:
 Address:

,

Comments:

P-1159-001

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.

- P-1159-002** | I live in SE Portland, but I deal nearly every day with the congestion caused by the fatal decision made so long ago on the route of I-5. I spend my time working around the freeway mess which backs up at times as far as Wilsonville and affects trips I make to Salem!!! So the emphasis on having hearings focused on the immediate area @ the bridge is understandable, but a horribly short sighted view of the impact of this project.
- P-1159-003** | #1 The I-5 Bridge project should IMMEDIATELY focus on congestion based tolling for managing traffic flow and to generate funds. The established neighborhoods of northern Oregon are bearing the brunt of commuters living in Wa...we get the traffic snarls, the pollution, the noise, the inability to just move from point A to B sanely.
- P-1159-004** | #2 No study in existence supports more than a temporary relief in congestion by simply building more lanes. SO DON'T DO IT. Get MAX over the river ASAP...if the "Couves" don't want to use it then let them pay the bill with tolls for the problems they create.
- P-1159-005** | #3 Improve the rail bridge so it can handle more rail shipments so work can progress on demolishing dams on the lower Snake to save the last wild runs of Salmon in this drainage. Increased rail transport of wheat and other products will be a necessity...so BUILD THE INFRASTRUCTURE NOW.
- P-1159-006** | #4 Use a percentage of tolls to fund pollution monitoring and mitigation in the most impacted neighborhoods...this is a HUGE HEALTH ISSUE for those living within a quarter mile of the freeway as PSU studies have demonstrated.

P-1159-002

Over the course of the CRC project, the project team analyzed a variety of geographic areas. The boundaries of these areas were designed to meet specific purposes, such as analyzing the impacts of project alternatives. The boundaries of the Bridge Influence Area (BIA) were developed by the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership as a way of defining the problems to be addressed, and determining how effectively project components and alternatives met the project's Purpose and Need. The project area extends from approximately Columbia Boulevard in the south to SR 500 in the north, along the I-5 corridor. This did not, however, limit the extent to which impacts were evaluated or limit consideration of potential transportation improvements. As shown on Exhibit 2.7-1, five other corridors were evaluated during this screening process, located from 2 to 3 miles downstream to 10 to 12 miles upstream of the project area.

P-1159-003

Modeling has indicated that tolling I-5 without making the improvements that are part of the CRC project would not meet the project's Purpose and Need. This does not mean that some form of tolling prior to constructing CRC couldn't be implemented. The ultimate decision on any tolling options will be made by both the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions.

P-1159-004

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-1159-005

According to the Feasibility of Diverting Truck Freight to Rail in the Columbia River Corridor Technical Memorandum produced by CRC project staff in April 2006, trains cannot move smaller loads as cost-effectively as trucks and may even be more costly for shipping distances under 500 miles. This is a key point, as the average trip distance by truck in the Portland/Vancouver region is 199 miles. While there are certainly some commodities that could shift from truck to rail in the region, it is probably a very minimal amount, probably not part of a consistent and regular shipment schedule, and would not significantly ease congestion along I-5 in the project area.

Additionally, the Vancouver-Portland region is the "last mile" for 85 percent of the freight traveling in the region. That is, goods are produced, assembled, and/or delivered within the region, and the overwhelming majority of the local shippers and customers are not

located on a rail spur or within a rail/intermodal terminal. Even if there was a targeted effort to use railroads more frequently, the goods would need to travel by truck on regional roads and freeways to arrive at rail terminals. In fact, most of the goods produced or received from the rail system must drive those goods by truck to or from the rail lines; and, increased rail service would likely lead to greater use of trucks for this very reason.

P-1159-006

The DEIS and FEIS analyses of impacts to air quality, noise, electromagnetic fields, and other factors that can affect human health, are based on comparing the project's impacts to specific standards that have been established to protect public health. Ensuring the project will meet or better these standards is used as a method to determine whether the project will have an adverse effect on human health. The criteria used in the DEIS and the FEIS are based on government regulatory standards where they have been established (such as for criteria air pollutants). Where regulatory standards do not exist, then the criteria are based on government agency guidelines or thresholds established by public health and safety professionals.

Modeling conducted for the DEIS and FEIS indicate that air emissions from I-5 traffic will be significantly lower by 2030 than they are today, and will be well below established regulatory standards designed to protect human health (see Section 3.10 of the DEIS and Section 3.10 of the FEIS). Noise impacts from I-5 traffic, with the mitigation proposed for the CRC project, will also be substantially lower than today. Noise from the light rail can be mitigated below FTA's noise impact criteria as well (see Section 3.11 of the DEIS and Section 3.11 of the FEIS).

The DEIS did not explicitly evaluate potential effects on physical activity or obesity. However, the DEIS and FEIS both discuss how the project could affect the surrounding urban form that would increase

opportunities for physical activity, including: improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities crossing the river; improved connections between existing and new bike and pedestrian paths and across I-5; the LRT extension and transit stations that support increased pedestrian-oriented development; improved sidewalks in Vancouver; and new pedestrian and bicycle connections crossing I-5. The project would also reduce daily hours of congestion on I-5 compared to the No-Build and provide greatly improved transit service, both of which decrease the amount of time travelers spend in cars, thus further promoting physical activity.