

1764

Community Livability .Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

No new freeway bridge, modify approach ramps. Light rail. Local bridge. Commuter rail-invest in freight trail infrastructure.

1765

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

Peak oil. Global warming. Commuter rail.

1766

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Light rail must be part of any new crossing.

1767

Community Livability .Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

Environment--fish, water quality. Getting people out of cars.

1768

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Yes, but do some of the ideas which are failed solve certain criteria better than the ideas remaining?

1769

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** Source: **Open House Survey**

What impacts/effects will the crossing have on downtown Vancouver? What impact/effect will the crossing have on downstream traffic? Does the crossing solve the (6) criteria when applied to the entire metro area.

1770

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Open House Survey**

What impacts will the crossing have on river and wildlife species? Light rail or street car connection would be a huge benefit to downtown Vancouver.

1771

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** Source: **Open House Survey**

AIA Vancouver is working with the City of Vancouver to re-introduce a streetcar system into the downtown area with potential to expand and increase the livability of our community. Connecting with the CRC projects is something we will need. I spoke directly with Bob Dethlefs and Gregg Snyder. Please contact us for coordination. Thank you. Don

1772

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Open House Survey**

In my opinion it is important to extend tri-mets yellow light rail line into Vancouver. Perhaps having it on Washington St. would be a good idea. Light rail works! 55,000 or so people cross the river to work M-Fri. Often after the #6 tri-met bus pulls out of Hayden Island, headed for downtown Portland, it is already over half full. This one fact makes a case for light rail. Much consideration needs to be given to pedestrians and bicyclists. We need to reduce our dependence on the automobile. Thanks for your time, Dave.

1773

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** Source: **Open House Survey**

I think you have done a good job of advancing ideas that make sense or improve crossing the Columbia. On transit I think it is important that it encourage people to use transit by being faster than driving in a car and be efficient and reliable. We need to get people out of their cars to reduce congestion and air pollution.

1774

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

I live in Clark County and commuted to Portland for 30 years. I think an important consideration that must be looked at by Clark County elected officials is encouraging job growth in Clark County. If we continue to focus on residential growth and remain a bedroom community to Portland, we will find it difficult to resolve the problems of crossing the Columbia River efficiently and safely.

1775

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

I'm questioning any alternative that includes a movable bridge solution. That's the problem we're trying to solve. Future generations would have to wonder, "What were they thinking? They had a chance to work around the "lift bridge" and all its problems and decided for it again. Why?"

1776

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

RC 11-with TR-5 makes most sense at this time. If RC-9 is used the existing bridges need retrofiting, none of this really help if the Haden Is bottle neck isn't fixed. Eventually two more crossing will be needed one at approx 192nd and one at RidgeField-(605)

1777

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

The exchange from 14 to new bridge will be a problem without making a loop North to enter the Bridge-May be a Loop South over the tracks would work better.

1778

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

Biking and walking tax incentives. Electronic toll bridge.

1779

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Do not discount ridership of different transit options. The posters seem to kill ideas before they get a hearing. Tell what is being done right now to alleviate congestion. If efforts were made to help drivers understand that merging requires movement some of the problem would be solved. Enforce the HOV in Oregon, make it cross the bridge. Reinstate the south bound HOW in Washington. Collect \$\$\$ from cheaters and use the money to get more improvements in the place.

1780

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Enumerate how you will encourage more people to use bicycles and transit. All of the transit proposals seem defeated at the outset. Do not discredit the potential for future inhabitants to use transit. If you do not believe in it how will you ever effect real change? No mention is made of the opportunity to limit population growth or discourage more people from putting pressure on all our infrastructure by their uncontrolled breeding. Consider proposing that the area limit growth. This does not necessarily mean discouraging economic growth.

1781

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

But, you must improve bicycle approach to the bridge from the sout east side. Currently, cyclists must come to a full stop, then look almost 180 degrees back over our left shoulder to check for oncoming traffic from the off ramp of I-5 and it is a nightmare and an accident waiting to happen.

1782

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

I particularly favor the local access bridge with SR 14 crossing on it and light rail, because this provides two additional ways to cross the river in the event an accident ties up either I-5 or I-205. Light rail should be added whichever alternative is selected, to provide additional bypass and reduce pollution. Bike lanes are also good, I bicycle across I-5 frequently. The tunnel idea and use of streetcars also have merit.

1783

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Avoid disturbing residential neighborhoods, historical districts.

1784

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Open House Survey**

The blue shirted aides were helpful and informative, good job.

1785

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** Source: **Open House Survey**

Give weight to the supplemental tunnel option. Put light rail on the existing bridge. It seems that the tunnel option just upstream is the best way to connect to Hwy 14 (underground) since elevation changes will be less of a problem.

1786

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** Source: **Open House Survey**

A resounding NO on light rail. There is no money coming for pedestrians over bridge riders-until they contribute discount them. How much has been spent on these meetings and materials the last 5 years?

1787

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** Source: **Open House Survey**

Start collecting toll now, to pay for the final decision. If light rail is one of the alternatives, where are they going to park cars using it? Any bridge that is built should be west of downtown City of Vancouver.

1788

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Open House Survey**

Can Dean Lookingbill

1789

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

Thank you for including bicycle/ped considerations in your planning.

1790

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

Congratulations for an excellent presentation!

1791

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Stop pushing light rail. It would need parking and there's no land for parking unless you take peoples homes. Make sure the residents here get to vote on it or are you afraid to?

1792

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

A 3rd Bridge downstream to take traffic away from 134th and the 2 bridges. I have been told that there is at least 3 million set aside for light rail and none for another bridge. That's what is pushing light rail-has been for a number of years. Put a toll on bridge.

1793

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Staff seems concern, but stops short of what's going to happen to "K" street in Vancouver, WA. You can't get a straight answer from know one. In 2000 I had to learn from the newspaper that I was going to loose my house along with 28 of my neighbors. You tried/tried dropping my tax base/my house by over \$20,000 in one year. So when that "time" came, my house wouldn't be worth as much!!! What other "BS" is coming next. These meetings don't mean much too me sense you can't get a straight answer! David Skagen, 2600 "K" St. Vancouver, WA, my "sign" says it all.

1794

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

I truly do think that an underground tunnel is going to be a good idea. A passage for pedestrians and another one for bikers.

1795

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

The safety of the people should be a highly considered concern.

1796

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

Make posters, maps, graphs, etc. more simple in the language department, please.

1797

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Limit immigration now!

1798

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

Increase emmigration. Pass a moratorium on growth.

1799

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

How feasible is a multi-level system...e.g., trucks on bottom, cars on top, and/or North on bottom and South on top? Austin, TX has stacked lanes.

1800

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Obviously cost. I favor strongly some form of a toll system. Those of us who use the bridges (I-5 and 205) should pay to do so. Frequent users could purchase toll cards that reduce the per-day rate. Low income users could buy toll cards at reduced rates. OR needs greater capacity from Downtown/Conv. area to/from the Columbia River. I also support toll roads/turnpikes.

1801

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Whatever is built, put enough lanes on it. The I-5 partnership failed at this. Tunnel is preferred option. However, push the vertical alignment standards to get it in and out quicker. Bring it out on the Oregon side to land on Jantzen Beach. It technically would block some of the river channel, but its influence would be minimal in this tidal area.

1802

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

This is already a major transportation corridor. The influence of this project is not going to degrade the environment and will probably enhance it over what is there now. The biggest factor is to get it built as soon as possible.

1803

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

I was on the 1995 I-5/Clark County Transportation Committee

1804

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Yes, the options should be narrowed, but let's continue the think-tank on new options. See below

1805

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Long term traffic solutions should recognize that future transportation will be determined by efficiency (energy efficiency). As commuter traffic will undoubtedly move more toward mass transit options, freight will continue to be a point-to-point transit in specialized vehicles. It is well known that vessel and rail transportation is more efficient, than truck transportation.

1806

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Vancouver has the opportunity and location (proximity to ocean, rail, and I-5 corridor) to become a major port city. Considering that one of the biggest obstacles to improving the port is the lack of a suitable I-5 connection. I think it is too early to rule out a more westerly river crossing, keeping access to the Port of Vancouver in mind. My personal proposal is as follows: Re-locate I-5 from between the Interstate Blvd area and the Main Street ramp in Vancouver. Move I-5 to the west side of downtown Vancouver. Extend SR-14 along the BNSF rail line into the port area. Extend SR-500 a little northward to re-connect with the new I-5. Next, use the existing Interstate bridges for surface-street traffic, light rail, buses, and bicycles. Re-connect the two historic areas of downtown Vancouver which were separated when the freeway was originally built. The entire economic impact on the prosperity of the whole area should be considered, not just the actual cost of the infrastructure. I have included a crude map of my thoughts on this. P.S. I have lived in Portland or Vancouver for the last 20+ years. I have a B.S. in C.E. from O.S.U. and I hold teaching credentials in advanced math and physics.

1807

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Yes, general approach of concepts, Now for some decisions and action

1808

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Parking for commuters using mass transit--where would they be located? What is the cost?

1809

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Proposal TR 3 looks good. Why not start truck freight traffic for non-rush hours-i.e. 6:30 PM to 6:00 AM-or permit use of H.O.V. lane during non-rush hour periods.

1810

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

1811

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

AORTA's critique of the Columbia River Crossing Draft Components Step A Screening Report. The report claims the the Non-Freeway Multi-Modal Columbia River Crossing (Figure 5-23) failed component screening questions Q.1, Q. 3, Q. 4 and Q.6, assumes "it is not feasible to raise the existing I-5 Bridges" and recommends dropping commuter rail from further consideration. We disagree. Following is our rebuttal.

1812

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

Non-Freeway Multi-Modal Columbia River Crossing. Question 1: Does the component increase vehicular capacity or decrease vehicle demand within the bridge influence area? Yes, the multi-modal bridge meets both of these requirements. The freeway bridges would gain another through lane each way because they would no longer have to accommodate the acceleration lanes from the northbound and southbound approach ramps. As long as the main stem of the freeway remains at six lanes, there will be no need for additional freeway lanes across the river. The multi-modal bridge will add three to five additional lanes across the river for local and southbound freeway access traffic. It also will carry light rail, which would significantly reduce vehicle demand. Out of direction travel is not a major issue. The local access provided Hayden Island would more than offset the additional few minutes that will be required to travel to and from I-5 north through the Marine Drive Interchange. Commuter rail, in concert with light rail would further reduce vehicle demand. See later comments regarding commuter rail.

1813

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

Question 3: Does the component improve freight mobility within the BIA? Yes. Local access and light rail improve freight mobility by providing desirable alternatives for commuters, thus reducing congestion for trucks. In addition, improvements to the freight rail infrastructure that are needed and planned within the bridge influence area will reduce rail freight congestion, thus reducing the demand on motor freight. The assumption expressed in the report that the rate of growth for motor freight will be faster than rail freight is probably inaccurate given increasing fuel costs and the government finally recognizing that investment in railroad infrastructure is in the public interest. For example, Oregon will invest \$100 million in the next few years on non-highway transportation infrastructure through the Connect Oregon Plan.

1814

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

1815

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Question 4: Does the component improve safety and decrease vulnerability to incidents within the BIA? Yes. In addition to reducing traffic demand it improves freeway geometry, reduces the number of closely spaced ramps and lengthens weave distances. The grade and vertical sight distance can be improved at the north end of the bridge by eliminating the lift span and raising the trusses. The tight southbound on ramp from downtown Vancouver and SR 14 is eliminated by routing this traffic over the multi-modal bridge in a separate auxiliary lane. Both Hayden Island ramps to and from I-5 north are eliminated providing longer, safer weaves on Hayden Island. Greater northbound capacity is provided from Marine Drive by adding another lane on the Portland Harbor Bridge. Shoulder standards required for new structures by the FHWA are not possible on the existing bridge structures, but these are not new structures. Shoulders on the Marquam Bridge do not meet current standards either and it should be noted that the cross section of a possible tunnel, illustrated in this report, shows substandard shoulders. The geometry of the freeway north of the bridge can be modified or speed standards reduced if sight lines don't meet 70MPH freeway standards in this segment.

1816

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Question 6: Does the component reduce seismic risk of the Columbia River Crossing? Yes. Eliminating the lift towers and the heavy counter weights greatly reduce the seismic risk. In addition, the piers could be further stabilized with additional peripheral piling and the trusses could be more securely anchored to the piers. We suspect the cost of seismic upgrading would be significant compared to the cost of a new bridge or tunnel. It is curious that in the report, this option (RC-22) failed this component but RC-7 through RC -13 that retained the existing bridges with their vulnerable towers passed with an "Unknown (insufficient information)" rating.

1817

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Feasibility of raising existing Bridges. Raising both of the bridges is feasible. The northbound bridge was raised to match the "hump" in the southbound bridge constructed in the 1950s. Although not explained in the report, we suspect the alleged reasons have to do with navigational clearances. Currently, most commercial river traffic forgoes the lift span in favor of the "hump" despite the need to make a 'S' turn maneuver between the highway and railroad bridges. It has been strongly recommended by the barge and rail companies that federal funds be invested in the railroad bridge by replacing the existing swing span with a wider lift span that would align with the "hump". This change may occur before the commencement of this highway project. If the long span (#5 on the attached diagram) could be raised high enough to meet the Coast Guard's clearance requirements for essential river traffic, the main channel could then be moved south and the lift spans decommissioned. The bridge raising option should not be eliminated prior to this determination. The Non-Freeway Multi-Modal Bridge we propose does not depend upon raising the existing bridges or eliminating the lift spans. However, if the lift spans are not eliminated, the new bridge would also need a lift span aligned with them.

1818

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

Commuter Rail. Commuter rail operating on existing regional rail tracks would greatly improve public transit service in the Bridge Influence Area. The stated claim that it would be infeasible to integrate with the existing bus and rail network is absurd. Throughout the world, commuter rail stations become hubs for local transit systems allowing seamless access to and from destinations far beyond the train stations with are not just park and ride lots. We acknowledge that commuter rail was not recommended in the "I-5 Rail Capacity Study" (Feb. 2003). This conclusion was based on a cursory commuter rail analysis done by ODOT of only one rather ambitious commuter rail scenario, which assumed that the freight rail infrastructure in the Influence Area would experience only modest incremental upgrades. A more conservative phased development of commuter rail, combined with a more aggressive freight rail infrastructure improvement plan, was never studied or vetted. For example, peak hour commuter rail service between Ridgfield and Union Station in the Amtrak corridor is feasible if combined with the incremental improvements and grade separation of the UPRR and BNSF rail lines at N. Portland Junction recommended in the Rail Capacity Report. Such rail infrastructure improvements are practical to accomplish within the time frame of the I-5 project, especially now that there is growing cooperation between the Class I railroads and state and local governments to share in the cost of rail improvements.

1819

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

I am strongly in support of mass transit as an integral part of this project. Here are my suggestions: 1. Do not be afraid of light rail. Its ability to connect communities is just what makes it special. 2. I believe having light rail in Vancouver would be very beneficial to this community. However, light rail is not a very fast way to travel long distances from point A to point B. Therefore, I suggest express buses (at least) as well. 3. Thank you for considering the needs of cyclists. As a bicyclist myself, I would be eternally grateful for a DIRECT BIKE PATH to Portland. (However, I understand this is not exactly your responsibility). 4. I associate tunnels with budget overruns (Big Dig). I believe I am not alone. That leaves the mid-level crossing as the only practical solution. 5. If we need a bypass, have it go way out west (splitting off of I-5 north of Salmon Creek) and joining on around 217-26 m Oregon. However, I don't think this should be part of this discussion I think it should be saved for later. 6. I hope that this project may assist in urban renewal in Vancouver. Light Rail provides high-capacity infrastructure critical to higher density. I believe that it will allow us to create a better community that thrives in its diversity and connection to Portland. (Portland is our greatest friend, Mr. Mayor, not a competitor). I urge the Columbia River Crossing team to keep the need for community development and critical social interaction that will allow us to create a first class community.

1820

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

I think further consideration needs to be given to specifically relieve congestion for freight hauling vehicles. In addition to using a restricted use lane to add a transit solution to this corridor, it maybe important to provide managed lanes to allow freight haulers access to a open lane unburdened by commuter traffic.

1821

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

The project developers should pay particular attention to the negative impacts to homeowners along this corridor. How will the landowners be asked to take the decisions arrived at on their backs, and how will they lose out on their property's usability and future value?

1822

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Transit recommendations tied to 19th century technology, we need to use 21st century technology.

1823

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

See attached (Attached to this comment form were two documents: 1. The Highway Differences, Suburb to Suburb Quicker. Prepared by Tad Winieck, Highway Transportation Research. 2. A Democratic Approach to Land Use and Transportation Planning for the Albuquerque Metro Retion. Primary Author: Ian Ford.

1824

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Yes. I just wanted to say that I think a modern system of toll collecting could be very fair and practical. In Boston, for example, cars get a computer chip which registers each time they pass a gate; Owner of car gets a bill every three months. One way or another we DO need to expect to pay for transportation improvements and I think most of public is coming to realize it.

1825

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

I think the above is a good list. Costs need to be considered throughout but cannot be the deciding point, except that education of public of need to pay needs to be emphasized. People buy a 20, 000 car and don't realize it is worthless without good roads & bicycles.

1826

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

No. I agree with all except that operation of Pearson Air Park should not affect decision. Close PAP if needed to improve transit.

1827

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

1) Absolutely do not cut more I-5 lanes into Vancouver neighborhoods. 2) Public transit consideration should be weighted over bridge styles and locations. Any solution without light rail or dedicated bus lanes will not work.

1828

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

As a whole the ideas seem to be well thought out. I would like to see a multi-level bridge rather than expanding lanes on I-5 (in Vancouver) since I live in our area near the bridge. In addition, I believe light rail is the way to go for transit options.

1829

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

1) noise, 2) Livability

1830

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Yes, but perhaps some of the failed options, like the ferry should only be looked at as a temporary option until the final solution is funded & built. Add design option (sub) to cap the I-5 in City center Vancouver and choose some ramps. There should be a separate option (short term). TDM + Travel Smart too + free C-Tran transfer)

1831

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

vehicle vibration and birds (poop& debris on bridge - poor maintenance); robustness of DATA, we need more sampling sites to establish a air quality baseline, one existing sampling point is not enough.; bridge grade and approach design for bicyclists and pedestrians cannot be too steep of isolated (scary); I-205 is too steep northbound & noisy.

1832

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

Ctran has lost 25% of its ridership (120K) in the last year since the fare hike and ending of free transfers. They are mismanaging public transit here and are contributing to the bridge congestion. I do not own a car and use transit frequently, but Trimet is much better (hours, headway, etc). perhaps reform of CTran (service only in Vancouver) is in order. As far as CRT service, please consider providing a 4 Track section to allow express trains up here. It will be a very long trip to Vancouver Mall to Downtown Portland. Please do the tunnel. Yes, it is more money, but it is a long term solution and will help downtown Vancouver redevelop vs a wider highway on a double deck viaduct. For any bridge, please make the path wider for bikes and pedestrians and allow for places to sit and not as you cross it (help the elderly).

1833

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

No. The I-5 trade corridor study resulted in agreement by all jurisdictions that I-5 should have no more than 3 through lanes. Rehab the existing bridge, remove the on-ramps that are too close, so there are 3 full effective lanes. Then add a multi-modal bridge for arterial auto traffic, light rail and figure out where high speed rail should go. Then coordinate with freight railroads to replace the railroad swing span and improve rail freight.

1834

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

Reduce energy and petroleum use, reduce CO2 emissions, provide effective local and high speed transit options, keep cost to a minimum. We can't pour all our transportation resources into one site. Think Cost-effective! Don't go for the 100% solution if 50 % or 80% can be done for 20-40 % of the cost.

1835

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

RC-22 needs to be reconsidered. Make it work. It obviously meets all the project criteria. To say it doesn't reflects a bias against cheap solutions. So what would it take to lift the existing spans? It was already done for the older spans. What is needed to make a south channel under the "hump" work? Can you leave the lift span in for special moves at 2:00 am, and have normal river traffic use the "hump"? Work with the Coast Guard to save money.

1836

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** **Source:** **Open House Survey**

RC-9 . Good. Light wail that could be incorporated into A 3 state system along I-5.

1837

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Seems to me you need to be thinking 40 or 50 years out instead of only 20. It may take 20 years to make any solution. At the very least, whatever the final solution is it should contain provisions for the next expansion.

1838

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

What about a bridge from Camas - Washougal to Troutdale. The tunnel idea seems good, but if should go around Jantzen Breach, creating a new corridor. Consider reversible express lanes.

1839

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Yes.

1840

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

Bike/Ped access from bridge into downtown Vancouver and beyond. I would like to see the project include a bike path along the I-5 corridor.

1841

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

No. No Lift bridges. Merely duplicated current problem. I feel that the western corridor crossing (RC 14) was the correct approach and the Arterial Corridor crossing would again be a vast improvement. I really feel that we need the Arterial plus the Western Highway (RC 16) all as bridges high enough to not need lifts.

1842

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:		<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** Source: **Open House Survey**

I agree with the proposal to ensure that the I-5 bridge meets seismic standards but not with proposals to enlarge or build more bridges. Not sure about the tunnel, but it seems like an expensive strategy. We need LIGHT RAIL!

1843

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:		<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** Source: **Open House Survey**

Weather. Atlanta has paved so much to accommodate what has been called the largest population growth in the history of the plant. That there are not 4 sever storms per year more than in the past.

1844

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:		<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Open House Survey**

If there is a group dedicated to light rail for transportation connectivity to Portland, I would appreciate contact information. This is the only solution I am willing to work for proactively.

1845

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:		<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** Source: **Open House Survey**

I like the proposal RC-9, Medium bridge Heights. I also favor a tunnel for light rail.

1846

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:		<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** Source: **Open House Survey**

Tunnel for light rail.

1847

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Yes. 1) Seems the mid-level bridges should be favored for more study. High level bridges impact air lanes at Pearson & PDX, therefore, drop from further consideration. Low level bridges require lift spans. 2) To reduce traffic, focus on a combination of mass transit options - both light rail through the greater metropolitan area and greatly expanded/enhance bus service. 3) include bike and pedestrian facilities and access in every scenario consideration.

1848

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Don't let the project get bogged down and delayed move ahead with deliberate speed so construction of new facilities can begin as soon as possible.

1849

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

No. Everyone here is stuck in the I-5 box with no mention of how to pay for these "Boston-dig" type project. Tolls? I prefer that the Columbia Crossing focused more on a western crossing from Vancouver to US 30 to move heavy industrial traffic away from I-5.

1850

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Impact on float home community. If home needs to be moved for bridge, where do you move them to?

1851

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

We were in Vancouver when second bridge was built. Tolls were collected and it worked well.

1852

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Yes. Is a two level bridge feasible? Consider rising fuel costs and how they may impact driving habits.

1853

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Consider costs and how we are going to pay for the new development.

1854

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Eliminate the lift. Keep in mind that 20 years or so later we will need a new bridge downriver into Washington County.

1855

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

1) Since existing bridge costs to maintain, operate and is not seismic upgradeable, consider replacement only. 2) Bridge should include light rail component. 3) Bridge should be designed for future expansion (more lanes). 4) Traffic lanes should separate through traffic from local traffic. 5) If toll booths - what impact on design? 6) Consider two-level design with lower deck for local traffic and upper deck for through traffic. 7) Remember the high point of bridge should be over the shipping lane (not over center of river). 8) If bridge spans over BHSF tracks, then area under ramp to bridge for connecting downtown Vancouver to FT Vancouver. 9) If bridge spans over BSNF tracks, then any direct connections to SR 14 may require spiral on /off ramps.

1856

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

10) Through suspension or stay-brace bridge would be beautiful, consider impact on Pearson Airfield and views. 11) Consider multi-level bridge, with transit, bicycle and pedestrian routes underneath for better views and safety. 12) Consider multi-level design, where lower level is reserved for additional future vehicular lanes - cause too hard to expand sideways or above. 13) Light rail on lower level would require less climb (4-5% grade) to high point of bridge. 14) Next presentation should focus on potential landing site and corrections. 15) Undertake a study of where bridge traffic originated and destinates - to determine feasibility of dedicated through-traffic lanes.

1857

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Yes. I would appreciate a better, more clear definition of movable bridge. Fair (amount) of the proposed alternatives are listed as movable, but it is not clear explained. Would this mean a floating structure similar to Seattle's 520 bridge? If so, would this structure raise or move when will, this be decided?

1858

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Public Statement - This is a chance to build an iconic structure that could be used to identify the area. This is one chance to show the world what we can do. I feel the selection of the a structure design should be weighted to include how unique a design is and how best it fits into the Northwest environment

1859

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

1) RC-1 & RC2 No because of movable component. 2) R-3 & RC 4 Yes. 3) RC-7, 8, 9 No., Because somewhere 8 lanes must split and that will extend the project N & South. Few will figure out new-old staging unless they travel routinely. This is a messy add-on fix. 4) No. RC-13 same "gotta select my lane 2 miles before the crossing" problem 5) RC-23. OK, but isn't it really time to nuke and pave these old bridges?

1860

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

1) TR-1 No. No inventive like fast bus to extract folks from their car. 2) TR-2 Yes. Because it extracts people from taking their car. 3) TR-3 through 6 See previous.

1861

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

I-5 TF studied transit options and recommended light rail - why redo this work? Tunnel Option w /retraining both bridges should include conversion of those bridges to arterials - local traffic and light rail.

1862

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

How can Portland's arterial network accommodate more vehicles? Focus resources on TDM & TSM that can improve existing conditions until capacity - transit & road - are added.

1863

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

I think they should keep the current I-5 bridge, and build a separate bridge next to the current bridge for additional auto traffic, light rail and bus and have additional walk and bike lanes on the additional bridge. Also they should have ferry service from Vancouver to downtown Portland. They should also have a commuter rail service from Vancouver Amtrak Station over the railroad bridge to the Portland Amtrak Station.

1864

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Part of the solution must include a bridge to Hayden Island from Portland other than I-5. The new crossing must include ample space for light rail and express dedicated bus lanes. Both light rail and bus transit must be frequent service.

1865

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Yes. Goals: 1) A true freeway solution along with local accesses 2) there must be rapid public transit - Vancouver must accept light rail. Both Ptld and Vanc. Must have throughway lane dedication - bus ways. 3) Ctran should wake-up and get on board (new mgmt, should be blessing and brought into the fold) as well as a new limited access freeway bridge. We favor a I-5 freeway corridor, a light rail, bus and separate Jantzen Beach bridge (existing).

1866

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

If and when you complete this project especially doing the "right thing" for the long haul, by building a true I-5 corridor Rover Crossing as well as 9 to 10 lane freeway approaches as things are now. You will have not solved congestion, but merely moved the "cork" to traffic flow a few miles south i.e. Rose Garden area , I-405 west side and a few miles north here to 139th St and 179th Street areas. Portland must make a freeway from N. Portland to Wilsonville, Clark County, clear to 179th exclusive. Don't do this halfway. Good traffic for the future will depend on more than just a new bridge

1867

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

This type of community meeting - show is great (cookies were good too!) The ability for general public to talk directly to knowledgeable people in the planning process was very good. As this project jells and actual construction begins, you should include engineers, project coordinators, construction managers, and site superintendants who can provide direct, knowledgeable information "the good, bad and the ugly" as it goes, Phase out or low key the civic partisan slack, political agendas and "spin" artists. Be sure your factual information dispersed to the public eliminates the cover-ups (there will be booboos inevitably and a little room will fall on your parade and sometime s... just happens - deal with it and be forthright with the public and you will gain support all the way through (i.e. there are still Blazer fans hanging inspite of!)

1868

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

I would like to see what impacts the approaches will have on both sides of the river. What will the impact zone be. This should be explored before any more of the potential solutions are deleted.

1869

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Downstream traffic impact. Long term prognosis for the solutions. Impact to downtown vancouver.

1870

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Retention of the existing bridges is impartial because of design constraints, those bridges would impose on a new bridge, and because the costs for seismic retrofiting would likely be very big, and possibly prohibitious. The best solution appears to be a 130' high 2-deck bridge whose navigation channel would move toward the rover's center. The 2- deck 10 lane (5 lanes each deck) would likely minimize the construction cost and minimize right of way impacts on Hayden Island and in Vancouver.

1871

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Movement of the primary river navigation channel toward river center may also necessitate modification or reconstruction of the BNRR bridge immediately downstream. That modification / or construction could include additional freight tracks, dedicated tracks for light rail, and even truckl lanes to connect Portland and Vancouver port districts.

1872

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

No. No Growing US has ever solved auto transportation issues. Be envouraging auto usage let's try the following: 1) eliminate all access to Hayden Island from I-5. Vancouver no longer needs Hayden Island Retail. Most New residents on Hayden Island will commute to Portland. Entering I-5 disrupts I-5 traffic. Add a two lane bridge from Hayden Island to the Expo Center. 2) Add the 3rd Lane at Delta Point. 3) Remember the traffic stops at Jayden Island and Delta Park NOT on the bridge. 4) Move Jobs to Vancouver from Portland. Portland should continue to discourage business growth, Clark County should encourage business growth and restrict housing growth to regain commuter balance. 5) Have Oregon fix their school system so families do not have to move to Vancouver to get into good schools.

1873

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Money! As a billion dollar project expands to 2.3 Billion, the bill quickly approaches \$3,000 - 5,000 per Clark County resident or \$5,000 - 10,000 per family. This could be better spent envouraging businesses to move their jobs to Clark County & out of Portland. HOV lanes and commuter /bus parking in Vancouver and Clark County.

1874

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

Reverse Oregon HOV lane in the morning at Delta Park

1875

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

Light Rail across the river and up Washington Street

1876

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

Plan on using tolls to pay

1877

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Flip Chart Notes**

Where is the environmental justice for Vancouver?!

1878

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Flip Chart Notes**

The tunnel concept has the least impact on the entire area

1879

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Flip Chart Notes**

Please do not fear light rail for its ability to connect culturally, economically, and racially diverse communities. We must not attempt to cut ourselves off from Portland.

1880

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Flip Chart Notes**

Use trackless trolley, not light rail, has less infrastructure demands and is more flexible.

1881

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **Flip Chart Notes**

Supplemental (multiple bridges) are a good idea because is something (earthquake, boat crash, plane crash) happens to one bridge, we still have an alternate route and offers direct relief.

1882

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

I desire a better I-5. I live in a neighborhood next to it. I manage my driving on it by using transit, biking and living near work. Please do not widen the highway so that more traffic fills it with SUVs who keep moving further away from work. Consider tolls to help freight & transit mobility and drivers who have to get where they are going.

1883

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

This major project needs to be done in phases: 1) new suspension bridge just east of current I-5 bridge or tunnel. 2) Use current bridges for Light Rail and local access. 3) Design into one of the bridges the capacity for High Speed Rail. Do this now as insurance and investment in our region. This corridor includes RAIL. If you don't, you can expect to spend over \$500 million for a separate crossing just for High Speed Rail. OR and WA DOTs need to agree on a corridor now!

1884

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

Build It and they will come....LIGHT RAIL....Without a vision ('people') we will perish.

1885

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

The traffic jam is NOT the bridge! It is Hayden Island Access and Delta Park Lane Reduction. Eliminate Hayden Island Access and give the (?) a dedicated 2 lane bridge to the Expo Center only (not north). Vancouver no longer needs Hayden Island Retail. Jantzen Beach was built in 1970 so Vancouver could avoid sales tax. I live in Vancouver and do most of my shopping on Hayden Island and Jantzen Beach. I would like to be able to ride light rail from downtown Vancouver to Jantzen Beach and then to downtown Portland.

1886

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

We do use and need Hayden Island and will for the years to come!

1887

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Flip Chart Notes

If I'm coming up MLK to get a drink at Shenanigans - I should NOT have to get on an Interstate Freeway.

1888

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Letter

I retired from Tri-Met after thirty years of observing how public transportation benefits taxpayers of Oregon. Today I want to give you facts on why rail service should be included in the Columbia River Crossing Solution. The Amtrak Cascades ranks among the top Amtrak rail lines in the United States. This Passenger Railroad runs from Eugene, Oregon to Vancouver, British Columbia, following the Interstate 5 Corridor. In 2005 the passenger count increased 5.6 percent to 636,892 passengers in this corridor. The American Public Transportation Association (APTA) reports 9.7 billion trips were made in the US during the year 2005. This was a 100 million ride increase over 2004 public transit usage. Light Rail picked up the largest increase in passengers. Minneapolis Light Rail increased by 168% in 2005. Houston Light Rail trips increased by 38%, Salt Lake Light Rail increased by 13%. APTA also reported Commuter Rail trips increased significantly in 2005. San Carls, CA Commuter Rail trips increased by 12.5% Indiana Commuter Rail saw an increase of 7.3 in 2005. Tri-Met is building a Commuter Rail line from Wilsonville to Beaverton to be open before year 2010.

1889

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Letter

Referring to the CRC Draft Component Step A Screening Report, dated 3/22/06 on page 3-2, figure 3-1: The Oregon origins and Washington destinations shows where potential Interstate Bridge usage would occur in 2020. It is quite evident most are in close proximity of the Interstate 5 corridor. Light Rail is most effective when there is a concentration of potential riders as portrayed in this diagram. The Light Rail Yellow line along Interstate 5 picks up 12,000 rides daily. If the Yellow line were extended to Clark County it could pick up 12,000 rides during each rush hour by the year 2020. Planning and building rail options is the best solution in crossing the Columbia River. And it will cost less than a new freeway bridge. This includes a Light Rail bridge at the Interstate Bridge location. Adding a 22 foot wide Light Rail double track supported between the North and South lanes of the I-205 bridge. And upgrading the present heavy rail bridge will enhance Amtrak service, future Commuter Rail service plus improve freight movement.

1890

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

I attended the Open House last night. I want to urge the CRC Task Force to approve the Arterial Bridge option for further study. As I understand it, this option would provide for arterial capacity for local trips that now constitute 1/3 of the traffic on I-5. For this concept to work, it must also have transit ROW, preferably for lightrail. It can also be an opportunity for an outstanding bike/ped facility on the down stream side, assuming the new arterial bridge would be adjacent to the existing bridges on the downstream side. Staff raised a question as to whether federal highway \$ could be used for this option. Federal FTA \$ could be part of the transit piece with local (toll?) funds covering the remainder. FHWA \$ could be used to pay for the needed upgrades to the exiting freeway...eliminating substandards on/off ramps and seismic upgrades, etc. Clearly this option would be relatively low cost and would provide the best transportation options to commuters...arterial roadway, high capacity transit and direct bike route.

1891

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	x
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	x	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Another option that I urge the CRC TF to keep in the running is the Short Tunnel, with retention of the existing bridges. This is expensive but full of potential if the existing bridges are retrofit for arterial traffic and high capacity transit, again LRT would be preferred. The old freeway approaches between the bridges and the tunnel portals on both sides of the river could then be converted as well to boulevard designs, freeing up adjacent land for development, trying downtown Vancouver to the Historic Reserve, etc. The fundamental approach must be 1. provide for local rips...some arterial capacity...2. for a real transit option...extension of the Yellow Line just makes sense, and 3. a safe and direct bike/ped facility. Whwther this is achieved by construction of an arterial bridge LRT and upgrading the freeway OR by construction of a freeway tunnel and conversion of the existing bridges to arterial/lightrail depends on how deep our pockets are. Either would do the trick. But please...I shold NOT have to get on the west's Interstate Freeway to get from N. Portland to Shenanigans to have a drink.

1892

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Yes. The Connection to HWY 14 (WA) when gong North on I-5 needs better signage, and perhaps new bridge lanes or this function.

1893

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	x	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

I believe Tolls is way to fund addtion costs and time delay in traffic= \$\$ money

1894

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

I'm leaning toward construction of a tunnel and including light rail on the bridge. Although the tunnel is probably more expensive than some options, it impacts the environment less than other options.

1895

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

Extend Max, Light Rail across the river, it is begging to come acrooss noth now that is at the expo center. It could easily cross further west near the railroad crossing.

1896

Community Livability .Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

"Limit number of people who move to Washington or Oregon" Tom McCall

1897

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

No. Commuter Rail shold be studied further. Odots Columbia Rail study indicates the need for major improvements. With these improvements, rail may be feasible. Your traffic info indicated that a significant amount of the traffic is travelling longer distances than just the bridge zone. A 3 or 4 track rail bridge could solve or helo 2 problems Ofreight and people in a more environmental way.

1898

Community Livability .Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I would like to make a recommendation to reward people for using alternative forms of transportation;i.e., bicycles or car pooling. And I don't know how it would be instituted, but give them cash or tax incentives to use mass transit because many of us are -- have jobs in Oregon, we pay Oregon income tax, and I think it would be a good way to maybe give us a way to vote. Maybe if we don't get tax breaks, maybe these fundscould go into a pool for the new bridge or the new improvements. That's simply it. Maybe a card reader at the end of a bridge so you can record whether you're going across the bridge and you're using it. And I think that would be a way to get us to use alternative forms of transportation. We had an opportunity once when the bridge was closed and people took vacations, they car pooled, and they took the load off the system. And I don't think that the answers to this are going to be a great big sweeping ideas, I think it's going to be a combination of many ideas that will make this whole project work over the span of the project whether it be, I don't know, what 20 years, a hundred years. And that's it.

1899

Community Livability .Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion .Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# .Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety .Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

One thing that I saw in here was on this -- onthe Mill Plain to 205, I don't know what they call it,extension or something, there's a problem when you're on Mill Plain going west, the right lane backs up and takes 45 minutes if you stay in that line lane to either geton 112th north or 205 north. They need another right-turn lane going onto 112th so that the people trying to get on 205 and them aren't fighting for thatlane. It's probably the worst traffic in that part of the county. I think they might be better off, rather than doing the big extension on Mill Plain first, they might be better off doing 18th Street. They are doing this onramp interchange thing on 18th Street over 205 and itmight be better off doing that first.If they were to go around the neighborhoods within maybe a mile north of Mill Plain or two miles north of Mill Plain and off 205, a half-mile survey, all the people that live around there I think they might agree because we're the people that get affected by those two the most. That's it on that one. Somebody should talk to Oregon about making the HOV lane northbound by Delta Park reversible for the morning commute in the interim while they are building this new freeway system. That's it.

1900

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

My suggestion does not depend upon which type of bridge is chosen, the height of the bridge or the approximate location of the bridge. My suggestion is that the bridge and associated highways on Hayden Island in the Delta Park area be used as a bypass for that whole area and the existing bridge and existing I-5 interchanges on the island and Delta Park be used as surface roads accessed from either end of the upcoming new construction. That means trucks, cars, shoppers and anybody with business on the island or in the Delta Park area including all interchanges and current highways exit southbound I-5 before approaching the new bridge to be built, do their business and then find their way south on existing highway and merge with the new structure south of Delta Park. So if you're heading south and you need to bypass all that commercial in the area just mentioned, you will not be bothered by all the trucks, et cetera, needing to go there because you will have a bypass of the entire area. And if that means that the bypass over that area needs to be elevated, which I think it does, so much the better. Just don't make it easy to get off of this new project onto the existing spaghetti that's there. The entrance and exits should be on either end of the project and nothing in the middle. That's it.

1901

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I am a resident of North Portland and I have a small business up in St. Johns and I'm concerned with the non-containment diesel emission area for that corridor. I'd like the project to consider using or cleaner burning fuel sources in their equipment as they are building go the bridge. I am concerned with air quality and I hope they incorporate some plan to mitigate that or either try and use their most invasive equipment in off-peak traffic hours. Maybe at night, if possible. Second, I am a big proponent of a third bridge near the railroad bridge helping to alleviate the traffic in St. Johns because the St. John's bridge is horribly congested with freight traffic. Moving the bridge further west from there and then taking it up to Highway 30, the backside of Marine Drive and then crossing the rail bridge to the north side of Vancouver So that way we bypass all of downtown Vancouver and alleviate the freight traffic from St. Johns. And if we can build that new bridge and keep the existing bridge in the place meantime in order for us to build faster then we can go back and correct the existing I-5 bridge to be more structurally sound and encompass lightrail on the existing bridge or do whatever we need do there. Keep the same line on it. I don't feel like I can offer any way to help. Offer my -- I'd like to know how I can help further other than giving my comments here, how I can get involved. And I don't feel that the third, a new bridge to the west side has been thoroughly evaluated, communicated to me based on the presentations here today. And all the media access I have in finding information surrounding it, it still seems to be a very viable option. Thank you. I am in support of a new bridge, though. Appreciate them looking into all the environmental concerns.

1902

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

While I think the interchanges on either side of the river need to be adjusted, I still think there is going to be a huge chronic traffic problem unless we somehow split off long distance thru-traffic away from local Hayden Island, Jantzen Beach, Marine Drive traffic; and so my favored alternative would be to build probably the medium height new bridges next to the existing bridges. I don't know if you can put them bookend on either side of the existing bridges or put both spans or a single span on one side, however that would work. But I think you need to have some sort of an express lane system like we've seen in other cities whereby Mill Plain or by the Delta Park area you split off thru-traffic away from anyone who just wants to go to Marine Drive, Hayden Island, to downtown Vancouver and split off that local traffic. Leave that on the existing bridges and make the three lanes in each direction in a new bridge solely for thru-traffic. If the people coming west on Highway 14 are trying to go to Portland it's just going to be too complicated to get a ramp onto any new bridge.

1903

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

They would just have to stay the same as they are now and curl on to the old bridge, but I still think that would move as quick as it does now if not better and they can just drive over the old bridge southbound and then merge into the freeway when it reconstitutes all the lanes together. And the trick here, of course, is that if you're merging express lanes with existing bridge lanes some of the kinks and the traffic flows better for awhile but if you're looking twenty or thirty years out, that traffic level is just going to continue to build and you will end up with the same problem, the same choke points where you have people coming in and out of downtown or Jantzen Beach and you need to kind of siphon that off, if you can, from thru-traffic if the whole I-5 corridor is going to remain a viable corridor for people just trying to get from Seattle to Portland or Seattle to Los Angeles or whatever they are using the freeway for. Just Tigard, Ridgefield to Tigard, whatever it may be. And that's what I've got.

1904

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I have a small berry farm in Washington and in the summertime I haul my berries to Salem, Oregon and I go down 205. I go down about 3 p.m. down to Salem and I come back about 6 p.m., and both ways in Oregon it's stop-and-go, stop-and-go. On the way back when I get to the Glenn Jackson Bridge on 205, then the traffic speeds, speeds right up. And the way I see it, Oregon needs to raise their gas tax and do something about the freeways. Just having another good bridge is not going to solve the problem because the freeways are too plugged up. In Washington, we raised our gas tax twice in the last few years and there's projects going on all over around Vancouver. Oregon, the last time they had it on the ballot in 1999 - worked against it and got it defeated and the roads in Oregon are a mess, they need to be upgraded and widened. When I go to the ocean, I go down to Lincoln City and the road is terrible. Sometimes it's a two-mile backup on Sunday afternoon coming back through Dundee at that one traffic light there. Now I know they're planning to build a bypass through Dundee but it should have been done 20 years ago. That's my comments

1905

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

See about getting voter approval to support the tax base to bring MAX across the 205 bridge which I thought was a great idea in that they had made provisions or could do that with slight modifications. So if they could bring that up in the vicinity of Vancouver Mall, they could haul a lot of people to the airport or into downtown Portland to work in the greater downtown area, which are quite a few of them. I'm sure they made some sort of a study so that they knew proximate costs and what was going to happen with that. And beyond that, eventually I don't think it would be hard to develop MAX on an east-west access so that it could be closer to downtown Vancouver and maybe eventually they bring it across. I don't know if they got space between the two bridges or what they would have to do to connect to the other end of MAX over here time-wise and money-wise. And then if they, which they probably do, need another bridge or tunnel or need some access across, that's fine. But it seemed to me the financing and the time element involved to make those changes would be much less easier to do than digging tunnels or constructing the bridges. So that's about my thinking. But all this is going to happen beyond my time so I'm not too worried.

1906

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	x	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	x		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I was a structural inspector for construction of the southbound bridge that's out there now and some of the remodeling of the northbound bridge. The northbound bridge was essentially, it was originally straight through level bridge. They built the southbound bridge with one long span and a hump in it in order to facilitate river traffic and avoid -- reduce the interference with highway traffic. One of the interesting things about the northbound bridge is when they took out two spans and replaced it with a single span and raised the line and it necessitated jacking the one end of the span that supported the towers and they had to cut the towers free and as they jacked the span, when they tipped the tower back like a hinge, that was quite a challenge. Through the late fifties, or early fifties rather, the existing northbound bridge, which is very narrow, was actually carrying four lanes of traffic, two lanes in each direction, got hit very often; got hit one day with a truck hauling I don't know how many, but a truck load of chickens and had chickens all over the highway and the river. Next time, within about oh, a month or so, it got hit again with a load of chickens but this time they were frozen chickens. So they were

1907

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	x	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	x		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

more interesting. In the late sixties, early seventies in the Vancouver shipyard they were fabricating drilling towers that would be used for oil drilling off the California coast, and moving one of those drilling towers downriver, why, they didn't get the lift span high enough and the tower had the hit the lift span on the northbound bridge and caused considerable damage. Fortunately, why, they got the new southbound bridge up high enough by then and the tower cleared that, but we had traffic. We kept traffic going but we had to restrict it for a while while the repairs were done. What else? When the lift span on the northbound, excuse me, on the southbound bridge was fabricated on barges over on Hayden Island about where we're sitting now and then floated into position in about a half-open position and the cables that provided for lifting the span were hooked up, the Corps of Engineers had a barge they wanted to move up the river that was -- the spuds for the barge were too high and they wanted the lift span in its half-open position. So we told them that we would have the bridge operational and raise it on a certain date. Had an electrical failure, couldn't raise it with electrical. So there's gasoline-powered generators that lifted the standby lifting equipment. Started up the gasoline-powered generators and ran out of gas. About that time the barge was, was coming up the river and I swear to gosh that I was looking up at the top of that spuds and fortunately it cleared by about a foot. Anyway, then after the northbound bridge, excuse me, the southbound bridge was completed, why then four lanes of traffic were shifted over on to the southbound bridge then. Still narrow but a lot wider than the other bridges. Anyway, some of the things. Have to think of more.

1908

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I'm David Rowe and I worked with Max for 20 years. I worked with TriMet for thirty all together. And I've seen how well public transportation can help public taxpayers and so I'd like to see them plan for the whole region instead of just the bridge influence area along I-5 because 205 effects I-5 corridor just as much as the interstate bridge does, and rail is the best way to solve highway congestion. In Orange County, California, in the 1950's they built highways, freeways, and it encouraged more people to buy more cars, use more gas and they have traffic jams that last almost 24 hours a day. If we continue on that same route we'll have the same problem. So this project that we're faced with now getting across the Columbia could be solved by many other things other than more highway bridges.

1909

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

There's the option of Amtrak Cascades running from Portland to Seattle, if they would improve that rail structure in a few years they can start using high speed equipment on it. That's one method to take passenger traffic off of the I-5 corridor. Also by improving the rail infrastructure for heavy rail you also improve rail freight. Rail freight would alleviate the truck traffic between Seattle and Portland and Seattle on south into California. So that is one option that they should pursue. And I don't see that this study is looking into how much improvement would affect the I-5 traffic. And the next thing that they could be looking at is light rail on I-5 and 205. 205 is not part of the survey, it should be all-inclusive because whatever happens on 205 has a direct impact on I-5 because it's part of the overall regional transportation corridor up in, north and south. So one of the things to alleviate some of the passengers or auto traffic on 205 is installing a light rail bridge on top of the 205 bridge. I've talked to some engineers in TriMet and they think it's possible to put light rail, two tracks, which are 22 feet wide, where the bike trail is now. And that would be going all the way up to 205. The bike trail could be -- that's existing now on 205 could be relocated on put a cantilevered out from 205 bridge on the west side of the attached southbound bridge structure and that would improve bicycle transportation

1910

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

because it's reducing the east wind which gets very atrocious most of the time when you're riding a bike across that bridge. So you have a natural windbreak from the bridge which you don't have now with the present bike trail. So you're correcting the bike travel by adding the light rail lane between the two north/south lanes. Back to the I-5 corridor. I think the solution or one of the options were presented by another citizen group put building another bridge alongside of the I-5 bridge structure and it could be used for light rail and also automobile traffic and local freight traffic on a two-lane bridge built on the west side of the I-5 bridge. The center span could be raised up allowing river traffic. River traffic could be -- uses the center lane, center of the river and to safely go up and down the Columbia River. The thing about the river traffic, if we improve the heavy rail bridge downstream to put it in the center of the river, then river traffic doesn't have to make the dog-leg turn that they do presently. That would have a tremendous impact on river traffic. I would envision the time where they could have cruise ships come up into Vancouver. I envision cruise ships from Seattle coming down the coast, coming up to the Columbia River and that would be a very scenic route similar to Europe's trips on the Rhine and some of the river travel that they do in Europe. So but the bridges have to be made safe for river traffic. So all of these needs need to be looked at and I don't see the whole concept when they are looking at it. They are just -- they are reviewing the bridge influence area which is I-5 and so it's kind of focused on that point but they need to focus on the whole area, heavy rail traffic, I-5 traffic and 205 traffic and get it a comprehensive plan and then go forward with that plan for the next thirty years instead of just having one project now, then ten years from now they revisit the same problem again. I think do a comprehensive study now and do a complete plan and then go forward with it. That's it.

1911

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	x	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	x	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	x		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I was listening to the gentleman talking about the bridge, the remodeling, and the different ideas that they have about elevating the bridge or having a draw bridge feature and I still think it's just still one bridge, and my concern is that if you widen the bridge or whatever revamping that you do to the bridge itself, it's still going to be a problem if it needs to be closed for a collision, an emergency of some sort, repair, something. There's still going to be a bridge out of commission. So I would say that there should be like three different bridges across, so that if there was one that was closed for a collision or an emergency of some sort or a fix, then there would be back-up bridges to keep the traffic flowing still. There could be different assignments to each of the bridges like one bridge for the trucks, and sometimes those trucks just go so fast going on the bridge, so they can just have their own bridge and then another bridge additional bridges for other reasons. I would rather have additional bridges than have a bigger bridge on I-5 because it's still just one bridge. Because, you know, sometimes I get trapped on I-5 and you can't get anywhere else. If you're stuck there is no other way to cross the bridge. There's no way to really get to the 405 bridge. So I'm just stuck in the place I'm in. There aren't any alternative routes. And the Marine Drive area there, the street, the boulevard itself is great. But the ramp, the onramp, is just too short. There's a Safeway and then that new restaurant, that Hooters restaurant that was just built right there, and then the Safeway grocery store are right there right next to the onramp. It's just so crowded right there. It seems like those two particular buildings should just be taken out of the way and then they can make the on-ramp have more space, more room to it. Because everyone makes such abrupt stops because sometime there's people on I-5 who want to go, you know, to the Jantzen Beach exit and when you're getting on you're having to cross traffic with them. So there's this constant stopping and halting and there's always getting -- everyone's getting in the way of each other. So if those two buildings were out of the way then there would be more space. Let me think what else was there? Yeah, I think just the main thing is I'd rather have several bridges than just one. I think that's it.

1912

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	x	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	x	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

My suggestion, and I'm not going to read it, but my suggestion is to build a four-lane local bridge that connects Hayden Island with both Oregon and Washington. This would be the west side of the current two I-5 bridges and have MAX share one lane in each direction with cars, trucks and buses. Basically the track would be in the pavement and this would be instead of having MAX have a separate right-of-way to cross the river. I think it's more cost effective and more capacity-effective to have MAX share right-of-way on a local bridge with cars and trucks. Design the bridge such that it would divert most local traffic to and from Hayden Island off of the current interstate bridges. I personally think the interstate bridges have enough capacity now. If you have a three-lane freeway coming on to the bridge and off of the bridge in each direction, why do you need more lanes on the bridge if you have

1913

Community Livability / Human Resources:	x	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	x	Project Financing:	x	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

a local bridge that would be connecting Hayden Island. That's where the traffic -- with three lanes in each direction on the freeway the bridge is not a bottleneck. Also to reduce traffic on the bridge I would recommend that a rail transfer yard for containers and truck trailers be built in Vancouver. Anything that had a point of origin or a point of destination in Washington would be unloaded in Washington and anything that had a point of origin or a point of designation in Oregon would be unloaded in Oregon. That would save a certain amount of truck traffic crossing the bridge if it's unloaded on the opposite - loaded or unloaded on opposite side of the river. Another thing that I think needs to take place is we need to get rid of what I call the diamond discrimination lanes. It only slows down the entire freeway with people cutting from the diamond lanes over to the exits and weaving through traffic to get to the diamond lanes. Makes much more sense to have three free-flowing lanes that come on to the bridge in each direction. Finally, I want to say something about tolls. If tolls are one of the funding methods that's used, it shouldn't just be for autos, it should be for all users; that includes transit, bicyclists, pedestrians, ride-share. Everybody needs to help pay the tolls on the bridge. It's a matter of equity. The reason I suggest that the local bridge be on the west side of the current I-5 bridge is because that's where the destination points are on Hayden Island. It's where the job base is. It's where most of the traffic is going to the shopping center.

1914

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

For the short term I would like to see the commercial trucks be allowed to use HOV lanes on the Oregon side. I think that would -- those are just passing through on the way past Vancouver. It would free up a lot of space in the middle and the right-hand lanes for those that are accessing off and on to I-5. And the second one is that right now the official Hayden Island representative is a real estate developer of the Waterside Condominiums. I think the official representative should be a member of the neighborhood association. That's it

1915

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I think allowing the big rigs to pass through is a good idea on the HOV lane. However, there needs to be a solidwhite line so that there is no changing lanes. It is against the law to change lanes over a solid white line, and therefore people have to plan ahead to get out of the HOV lane prior to the Jantzen Beach exit or Marine Drive exit. So I would just make it a solid line, prepare yourself, know where you're going, stay in that lane and it's against the law to change lanes.

1916

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

Well, the first thing I wrote up there is a little philosophical or, well, it's spiritual. It's out of scripture. You know, without a vision, the people perish or we perish. You can take it philosophically; without some kind of goal or positive object or goal or -- trying to say? The steps you take toward a goal. What do you call that? The objectives. Without positive objectives you're just going to actually be staying. And, you know, we're growing so fast, you know, Clark County is projected to have four hundred thousand by maybe two years from now. It's here. I get to the point about the river crossing. I'm saying I agree with the tunnel concept and the retaining of the existing I-5 bridge for MAX and two lanes each way for auto and some bus travel on a close-in basis. And there needs to be three two-lane tunnels at three different entry points. So I'm an expensive one. And then in the next question, I'm saying that land use is a very serious problem, especially in Clark County. It appears to me or it seems to me that developers present a special interest problem. Quote me that, you know, builders rule in Clark County. And I think some examination, you would find that they'll deny this, but the facts are there. Access points in and out of Clark County will depend, well, depend on developer cooperation. Somehow - this is my additional comment here - some options as I see it is to reconstruct the existing I-5 bridge to a double-deck bridge. The top deck being fixed and the lower deck being movable or raisable, if you will, lift span, I should say.

1917

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

Or construct a new double-deck bridge with a lower deck as a lift deck and the top deck fixed. Talking with some engineers here, that's a little tricky because of the height differential; in other words, you would probably have to lift the lower deck more often because it would sit lower to try to get the whole thing balanced out. So maybe that's not necessarily the best idea. I did fix up a situation here where I think this three-tunnel thing would come into a new alternate I-5 east with that tunnel going underneath Washington State Route 14 up into a portion of the edge of Pearson Airpark and into SR 14. That would be a route. But you wouldn't want it to congest with the main I-5. So extend an alternate I-5 east as the tunnel comes out of the ground. Call it daylight. And then join main I-5 down near Delta Park or something like that. That tunnel should be just a two-lane tunnel for auto traffic only and I'll say more about that in a second. Likewise, I was saying, suggesting, that another tunnel maybe be parallel to the existing I-5 bridge. Two lanes for auto traffic only that would -- would be extended past Jantzen Beach but would divide traffic between the bridge which could be used, the existing bridge, which could be used for local, so to speak, Jantzen Beach area traffic. Then the third tunnel - I told you expensive - would be an alternate I-5 west. A permanent alternate. That would have a tunnel going into the port area; maybe trucks would be using that. Mixing trucks and tunnels is a little bit spooky to me because if you have -- well, fuel trucks I would keep up on the bridge. I would never allow -- personally I would never allow, I would not recommend or suggest fuel trucks in the tunnel, any tunnel at all. Anyway, the I-5 alternate tunnel west, I-5 west alternate tunnel would go underneath Jantzen Beach and pop up somewhere near Delta Park which is going to be widened anyway. But I think they should prepare to maybe run a tunnel underneath Jantzen Beach or somewhere of that vicinity and cross the river that way and go into the port area or come around through the port area. Again, trucks would be fine except for fuel trucks.

1918

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Transcript

I'm old enough to remember a very horrible truck crash underneath a viaduct almost similar to a tunnel. And anyway I think that's about all I have scribbled out. I appreciate the efforts. I've been here long enough to see the difference between Portland Metro and which includes Vancouver and Seattle. You have the progressive people moving, seems like, getting together in Seattle and Seattle grows and flourishes where Portland has been an extremely liberal city town. It's a major city but it acts like a town sometimes. I don't know how to say this. But the lack of progressiveness and, you know, getting together, you hear more, to me sometimes, from the folks that - if they want to quote here, and I've heard this - if they want to work in Portland, let them live in Portland. These are some Vancouver folks. Well, you can't live like this, you know. I mean, I'm sort of at three score and 13 and a half. I'm steeped in any ways, too. But, you know, I don't want grandkids and anybody's grandkids to have to undergo the pay me now or pay me later thing. And they are the pay me later situation. You know, that's a little stupid. So we need to get on with it. I don't know where the money's coming from. You know, I probably just tripped the cost even if it is or is halfway engineering feasible. That isn't a good sentence but feasible engineering-wise. So thank you for letting me ramble on and I'm sure that chamber of commerce of Portland and Vancouver, I don't know what they do, being awful facetious, seems like cities like Atlanta and Boston and other cities seem to - San Diego now is building a great sports complex which includes a mall where everybody, maybe grandma goes, and she doesn't know a baseball from a basketball, you know. That's a little nasty but... But, you know, progress. You know in a lot of these cities and we seem to be like deer standing in the headlights, you know. I hope that we can really progress and really progress for the good of the order which includes our families. Thank you.

1919

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Could we provide incentives to use alternative modes of transportation? Provide tax credit incentives to those employed in Oregon or put funds into the bridge project to facilitate alternative modes of transport (e.g. tram, bicycle, etc. Please give me a call (503) 757 7660 anytime. Thank you.

1920

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	x	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	x		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

Walk - bicycle "one less car in front of you - one more public parking spot!!" Please let us help auto traffic - don't (maim and kill us) hurt us.

1921

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Lenny Anderson (4-14-06: I was up at the CRC Open House at the Red Lion last night and noted that my old neighbor here on Swan Island, Shenanigan's, is now in that hotel. I drove via MLK and of course had to get on the freeway to get to Hayden Island. So I asked or commented..."I should be able to drive up MLK and have a drink at Shenanigans without having to get on an Interstate freeway! Where's the arterial bridge?" Remember 1/3 of I-5 trips are local. Two options that have arterial pieces...Arterial Bridge with lightrail plus freeway upgrades and Short Tunnel with retention of one or both existing bridges are still in the running. The problem with the former is "Can you get federal \$ to build an arterial bridge?" I think you could get FTA money for a lightrail bridge, then use other sources for the arterial lanes/bike-ped facilities, etc. FHWA money could pay for upgrading the freeway...i.e. eliminating some substandard on/off ramps, etc. The Tunnel, a guy from PB told me is 3 times the cost of a bridge! But converting the old bridges to arterial plus LRT and the freeway approaches to boulevards would free up some land for development, off-setting some of the costs. We will see. The best solution may be to study this for 50 or so years.

1922

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Ron Swaren (4-14): My favorite option --RC-14, Fig 5-16 on page 5-15 of the screening report--got knocked out, but then revived as RC-23. Well, of course, we didn't figure that nothing would have to be done at all to I-5! But, honestly, I'm not sure what. There were some some ideas in a Tribune ope-ed. It is an attempt to arrive at a Happy Medium. Hopefully solving two problems in, essentially, one plan. Lenny seemed to be posing a slanted question. So, now, if we could just get together on what sort of arterial bridge and the location! Shenanigans may be important to him, yet some other spot to someone else. But I would like to know why anyone would want to open up more corridors than already exist, which is why I would prefer the RC-15. I do think a strategic component of that alternative is the future of Central Vancouver, so they definitely would need representation. The report poses the criteria then subjects each alternative to pass-fail marks on those criteria. Are they even asking the correct questions? They always bring analyses back to one essential argument--How is the I-5 corridor affected. Should not the question be: How can we cost effectively and safely improve travel between two regions on either side of a natural barrier? For example, in citing the seismic insufficiency of the current bridge do they examine options to rectify that? (cont.)

1923

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] (cont.) Ron Swaren (4-14): I worked on the seismic upgrade of the I-5/Ship Canal Bridge in Seattle. It was insufficient, too, but we upgraded it. The screening report says that traffic will increase by 15% in 2020 and collisions by 40%. Yet if some traffic is rerouted don't these stats change? Also, I think Interstate speeds should be 45-50mph within city limits, if it would greatly reduce accidents. When I lived in Seattle people sometimes drove frighteningly fast, just because they could. It has a bigger, wider I-5, and night time joyrides sometimes got out of hand. I guess I would be eating my shorts if RC-15 was built and congestion got worse and worse on the I-5 resulting in mass car pile ups in foggy weather just when a Richter 9 chose to hit. So what solutions could, also, improve traffic on the route, as it presently stands? Hey, we've all got free advice to offer...It would ne nice to "study this for 40-50 years." This is a stressful time as many complicated decisions must be made in a rather short span of time. Its definitely a Time of Transition for our Metropolitan area... time to rise to the challenge!

1924

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Doug Allen (4-15) I attended the open house also, and was disappointed with several aspects of the project, although my kids enjoyed building bridge models with "Connects." One Blue Shirt told me that Max takes 45 minutes to go from downtown to Expo Center, and that a Max crossing would end up costing \$20 per ride (amortizing the capital cost over 20 years, 0% interest rate). Since the schedule shows 29 minutes from Pioneer Sq. to Expo, this shows more than a little ignorance from someone who claimed to be an expert at doing economic analysis. I also can't figure out his Max costs. If Max is added to an Portland Transport Columbia River Crossing Comments http://www.portlandtransport.com/crc_comments.html arterial crossing, we should be able to get from Expo Ctr. to downtown Vancouver for \$100 million more than a bridge without Max, and ridership should increase by at least 15,000 per day if C-Tran can provide good feeder service. That comes out more like \$1 per rider over 20 years. I think that shows a general bias towards high cost solutions. I noticed that all options that rehabbed the existing bridges for continued I-5 use presumed that they would not get seismic upgrading. Therefore those options failed their criteria! There was also a bias towards handling all capacity on the freeway, seemingly ignoring the regional agreement in the previous I-5 study that limits I-5 to a maximum of three through lanes. It looks like the idea is that since there is no regional money allocated for a project, the sky's the limit, because it has to be funded 100% by pork-barrel appropriation, and the best way to do that is to have a big project that can attract lobbying by contractors and engineering firms. This stinks. The fundamental premise of this project needs to be re-thought, because the screening questions all seem aimed at a freeway project on a massive scale.

1925

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up]Chris Smith (4-15) Michael, the short answer to your question is No. The private sector participation in the task force seems to be from the trucking industry and chamber of commerce types.

1926

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Ray Whitford (4-15): I went to the Vancouver Open House on Wednesday Night (nice neighborhood near the freeway with the schools, parks, and sports fields). After speaking to one and then a second engineer, it looks like a suspension bridge of any kind isn't going to happen. Flight paths into Pearson Airport will not be overlooked as their were back when the current drawbridge towers were designed. Secondly, an idea I was hoping could fly is dead in the water since tall towers (500-1000') will not fly because of PDX flight paths. I'm hoping for a tunnel for I5 (not likely) and for using the current bridges with longer/higher spans for local traffic and mass transit. What just upsets me is the lack of vision for High Speed Rail, mainly from the Oregon side. Washington is spending money but Oregon isn't. And Oregon DOT doesn't have any direction to proceed from the elected officials. CRC could be the place and time to get serious about our regional identity and to be able to link our three main economic hubs to feed off each other. Think of the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver and how Portland isn't going to be affected by it. People from around the world might like the idea of seeing our vineyards and possibly investing in our industries. But Oregon can't see beyond our School Funding issue. Which must be solved for us to move ahead anyway. Why is it so hard to solve? Why are teachers at public schools so under-valued? I volunteer at a school in SMART and I think teaching should be valued higher than administrators. Give the Admins better pensions over time. Not salaries that are four times higher than the teachers.

1927

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Chris Watson (4-16): Justin, the CRC task force was put together starting with the two Governors' offices, so I would assume the membership selection was pretty political, with the most powerful stakeholders elbowing for seats at the table. I'm happy that the Coalition for a Livable Future got one seat.

1928

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Michael Wilson (4-16): Chris not knowing how these task forces are set up I'll ask the \$64 question. Who decides which companies and industries get a seat on the task force?

1929

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 17, Lenny Anderson Says: Commuter Rail just doesn't have the numbers. Look at figures 3-1 and 3-7. The O&D for trips in 2020 are concentrated along I-5, the rail line north is along the western edge of this area. Likewise in figure 3-7, one can see that while Central City has 8500 origins, N Portland, Delta Park, Hayden Island and Rivergate together have twice that...17K. CR does not lend itself to distribution as well as lightrail does. I expect that all the talk of BRT, etc., is just going through the motions...extending MAX makes the most sense. □Travel time from Expo to Rose Quarter is 20 minutes...add 5 to Downtown Vancouver and 10 to Pioneer SQ, and □you have a pretty competitive travel time that allows links to Rivergate, Swan Island, Lloyd, with stops on Hayden □Island, Delta Park, Lower Albina, etc

1930

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Justin (4-16) And anyways, the CRC isn't about what kind of trainsets might potentially run over the river. The CRC committee seems like they don't want any, anyways.

1931

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 17, EvergreenTransitFan Says: With our SOUNDER Commuter Rail line, the communities North of Seattle are calling it a waste of public dollars, but that is about to change very soon. In many neighborhoods within Seattle, Premium is now over \$3 per gallon, and mid-grade is a few cents away. When Regular hits \$3.01 per gallon in Snohomish County, the two-zone Everett-Seattle fare will be cheaper than a gallon of Regular Gasoline. SOUNDER-South has the benefit of serving more communities, creating more possible trips, and in the case of KENT, has spawned development around the station. The trains get more passengers when fuel prices go up. They may face the same fuel costs, but in terms of Passenger-Miles Per Gallon, a 10 car Commuter Train, seating 120-140 passengers per car, will still get more PMPG, even if the locomotive only gets 3 Gallons Per Mile. Also, in Tacoma, Pierce Transit responded to an air quality crisis in the late-1980s by going to CNG as soon as their buses came due for replacement. That is now virtually-complete, and since their is not much CNG refueling infrastructure, they are dependent on their pumps not failing. They failed once, but thankfully their were alternatives. The Regional Express routes to Seattle they contract with Sound Transit are for the most part still using Diesel, so they were able to suspend route 590, and advised passengers to take SOUNDER. Fortunately they got the pumps working again by the Morning Rush-hour. The problem is, Tacoma-Seattle Commuter Trains are already packed, but they can add cars to them as needed, and that is an advantage. Hopefully if Gas Prices continue to hit \$3 per gallon every summer, we could see a move to begin expanding Tacoma LINK, and maybe even gain support. It would be a win-win for everybody. (cont.)

1932

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:Theme Week Coming Up] Michael Wilson (4-16): Justin my comments were in one post, but they were not intended to be complementary. I am not suggesting that anyone around the area try to use a fuelcell powered vehicle for transit. I do see the need for a variety of ideas that are not now being,imo, seriously considered and believe that opening the marketplace may give those ideas some exposure. Secondly I think it is wise to look down the road a few years. The U.S. is in serious financial difficulty and it may take awhile to get things straightened out. At the same this nation and that includes Portland has a population that is growing older. These two things coupled with a few other items may make it more difficult to use tax dollars to finance transportation projects, thus I believe that looking to the private sector may be in the best interest of all involved. Besides I happen to believe in an open society and that includes the marketplace for goods and services. From what I have seen the evidence is in and the government hasn't done a good job in the transit business. We simply need a greater variety of service providers.

1933

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	x	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 18, Ron Swaren says Evergreen Transit Fan, I would like to see a little imagination at work in these heavy rail commuter lines to make them cost effective. I suppose with Sounder they want to use a standard diesel-electric and conventional cars. Probably the same will happen with our Hwy 217 route, since it will run on Standard Gauge track. However, we have a quirky little scenic train that has been running from NW Portland out to Astoria and back as an excursion. They use some high quality, but out of date, passenger cars. When I have been in Europe I have seen huge yards of older passenger cars. Would these be so hard to refurbish? You already have the basic carriage and car. If they were not available stateside, why not bring a group of them over by ship? So there could be a number of underutilized standard gauge rail lines in the Northwest that could have a scheduled service---if the cost was low enough. I guess governments don't think in very tight budget constraints. I know it is imperative that governments have safe facilities. But weren't railcars of the 1950's built to high standards?

1934

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: RC-7 to RC-12 the Supplemental Bridges] Isaac Smith Says (4-17): [Re: RC 7 and 13:]This comment applies to any new or replacement bridges. It's unclear if these will just be freeway bridges. If so, these plans will do nothing to solve the root problem, which is the lack of options. Will local traffic still be on the freeway? If so, that's stupid. Any plan should include more travel choices. Local trips must not be on the freeway and light rail must be extended to Vancouver. This the minimum level of acceptance.

1935

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	x
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 19, EvergreenTransitFan Says: Their were stories about UTA in Utah going to use ex-Metra Gallery Cars in their new Front Runner system, but they have since ordered new rolling stock from Bombardier. Miami's South Florida RTA started using used cars from Toronto, because it was only going to be temporary, but now they are going for Colorado Railcar DMUs. Probably due to their higher capacity, and the fact that Colorado Railcar goes against the grain. Commuter Rail coaches are usually 85ft, their's are 89ft. Wheelchair lifts would probably take the place of seats on the older cars. In Dallas, RDCs still run next to modern rolling stock. Up in Canada, West of Toronto, 1950s vintage rolling stock still runs on VIA 1 and 2, the Canadian, and until recently, they were also using them in corridor service. Amtrak even used inherited equipment on runs East of Chicago for decades, the coaches and sleepers have been retired, but the baggage cars and diners continue to run. On the Heartland Flyer out of Dallas, they use ex-Santa Fe High Level coaches, these cars were built in the 1950s, and they are capable of operating with Superliners, as they do on the Coast Starlight. Toronto's Go Transit still uses bi-levels that date back 2 or three decades, alongside brand new ones. Also before the Gallery Cars pioneered by Chicago and Northwestern and the Burlington, railroads often used rolling stock that had been retired from main-line passenger duty.

1936

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	x	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 17, EvergreenTransitFan Says: Nice artwork on the Rail, I thought that Sound Transit would buy whatever rolling stock TriMet used, for ease of maintenance and other issues, but unfortunately, the higher voltage requirement made it a free-for-all on the bidding. As for High Speed Rail, I can understand why it may not be a good idea, right now. We cannot seem to get the necessary capitol to improve the tracks on the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor, throughout it's entire length. There are many choke points, where either a third main track or just another crossover could clear it up. North of 49, I believe the line is single-tracked, and it prevents Amtrak 516 from terminating in Vancouver B.C.(It currently turns back in Bellingham. It is T-4 years until the Vancouver Olympics, and it would be nice if Amtrak Cascades had at least the pre-Amtrak schedule on that route with 2 daily trains running). Ferries crossing a river do have problems with constrained space. The Evergreen Fleet(Washington State Ferries) is phasing out Passenger Only ferries, due to high operating costs. Vehicles pay fares of around \$10 a crossing, and the Auto-Ferries get close to being self-supporting. Under Long-Range Planning, the two routes with multiple stops are going to be broken up in the next decade or two. Private operators stood up last year to take over Passenger Only operations, and so far, one is working well, with Kitsap Transit, and the other went out of buisness after a few months. High Diesel Prices were one reason. I am not sure if a Passenger-Only Ferry or Water Taxi could work in the Columbia River crossing.

1937

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 19, 2006 07:16 PM EvergreenTransitFan Says: EMUs sound great, and perhaps somebody can apply some better styling to them, compared to the M-7 EMUs that Metro-North and Long Island RR use, or the SEPTA Silverliners. SEPTA's Commuter Rail system in Philadelphia is entirely Electric, either with Locomotives or EMUs. There has been some problems with the bidding process on the new Silverliner V and it had to go to re-bid.

1938

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 17, Isaac Says: People might not be interested in commuter rail at the moment, but it would be a good investment in our future. As central Vancouver densifies, more people will be closer to the train station and likely be willing to ride. It would be successful if it were integrated into the existing transit system (CTran). It's ridiculous to think that would be difficult or impossible. There's no reason for that kind of assumption. It's evidence that this study is biased at the core to one size fits all superhighway construction. Light rail would be the highest priority for transit improvements as it's already so close and could generate high ridership. There will always be traffic on I-5. Whatever we do now to alleviate it will just be a temporary fix as traffic will grow indefinitely. The only good way to think about this is to offer as many different alternatives as possible to the single-occupancy vehicle, which there aren't very many of right now (express bus, commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, freight rail, etc.). This is of the highest priority as oil is becoming more expensive (peak oil).

1939

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	x	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	x	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Arterial Crossings, RC-19, RC-22 and RC-23] April 19, Lenny Anderson Says: Chris, The short tunnel could also offer options for local trips & transit, if the existing bridges are converted to arterial structures with lightrail. It remains in the running, but would be costly.

1940

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters**

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 17, EvergreenTransitFan Says: (cont.) In Vancouver, Light Rail would be one great option, if only the funding can be found. I have been following(and participating) in discussions on a few different boards up here on the alternatives to the rejected Green Line Monorail. An increasingly popular idea on one discussion board is the idea of a hybrid-Light Rail line connecting Ballard, Downtown, and West Seattle, with Streetcars as feeders. Now in Vancouver, that may seem like an idea that is ahead of it's time, but I wished just once, a Washington State City would do something to be ready for future traffic problems other than just putting in more asphalt and concrete.

1941

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters**

[Re: AORTA Response] April 17, 2006 12:08 PM Jim Howell Says: Ron, The new bridge would be built downstream (west) of the existing bridges (see aerial photo).

1942

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters**

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 18, EvergreenTransitFan Says: One thing that is needed, is a funding mechanism that makes sure their is the money to build. A legislator from Vancouver has to learn to work with legislators from Seattle, Spokane, Bellingham, and other parts of the state, to show that legalizing the use of Tax-Increment Financing in Washington State benefits every region, it is not a single region centric thing

1943

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** **Source:** **WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters**

[Re: RC-13 and RC-20, the Tunnel Options] April 18, 2006 09:16 AM adron Says: Don't like it. :(

1944

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 19, EvergreenTransitFan Says: They are using locomotives and multi-level cars on SOUNDER. It has been running since 2000, and ridership has been steadily growing. For the Everett line, I have suggested the use of DMUs. We also have the BNSF Woodinville Sub, which runs on the Eastside of Lake Washington, it has little freight traffic, and runs from Tukwilla to Snohomish, and has the potential of being a suburb link. It currently hosts the Spirit of Washington Dinner Train, and the slow orders are many, and BNSF wants to drop the line North of Renton's Coulon Park(they still need to get to the Boeing Plant). There are people on the internet up here that are vocal about preserving it, and so are 8 of 9 County Councilmembers. SOUNDER has proven it's worth for special events at the Stadiums, and for the NFC Championship Game, they ran three trains from Pierce County to King Street Station. They have 4 daily trains, but perhaps more will be added in the next few years. Gas Prices are now hitting \$3, which for the Everett Line, is the fair to Seattle. Also on the Everett Line, there is a deal in place called RailPlus, where Amtrak Cascades cross-honors passes (but no single-trip tickets) on Amtrak Cascades Trains running North of Seattle. It has not yet been extended to the South segment, but it might be a good idea. The fare for SOUNDER between Everett and Seattle is \$3, now equivalent to a gallon of gas, and just a little more than ST Express Bus Fares, and Community Transit charges \$3 for Commuter buses, \$3.75 from Stanwood in the northern part of Snohomish County to Seattle. There may be an un-tapped market North of Everett as far as Stanwood, but nobody is considering it right now. (cont.)

1945

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:TR-7 High Speed Rail] April 18, 2006 02:47 PM Lenny Anderson Says: The State of Washington is spending serious dollars to get the travel time to Seattle from Portland to 3 hours. Oregon is spending hardly anything. Just to get the Talgo to do all it is designed to do would be a great improvement. We should push for the modest freight rail improvements in the Portland/Vancouver area that the Governors' TF recommended; public \$ should be used on the assumption that these improvements will allow for more and faster passenger rail trips from Union Station across the river and beyond.

1946

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 19, EvergreenTransitFan (cont) Also, on a railfan board, I saw an article from the Billings Gazette about an idea for the very cars used on the Lewis and Clark Explorer. The Montana/Wyoming Association of Rail Passengers thinks they could work on being a feeder to the Empire Builder that can serve most of Montana's biggest cities. One of the three cars was used by Great Northern on that very route. It was dropped in 1962. We need an interconnected network of rail transit, but paying for it is the problem.

1947

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:TR-7 High Speed Rail] April 19, 2006 02:18 PM Lenny Anderson Says: Look at the data...most trips across the river are local or intra-regional...and the rail lines are on the edges of where folks live in Clark county. Commuter and High Speed rail need to be part of our future, but they do not address the cross river need. For that we need just a "Broadway Bridge" with MAX.

1948

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 19, 2006 Jon Says: I think it makes a lot of sense to get MAX to downtown Vancouver where the hub for the C-Tran local system is and which is also a major metro regional center. As far what happens past downtown Vancouver and with what mode I think is a matter of large debate in the Vancouver area. The local C-Tran bus system can serve as a feeder system for the MAX line to Portland but they can also operate independently with C-tran feeding into the heart of Clark County with or without riders transferring between systems. I question commuter rail in that most commuter rail systems are peak-hour in peak direction on weekdays only and have only about 3-4 trains per commute time. If it could be more frequent it could be a more logical option in my opinion. I dont understand the logic behind using a streetcar in the Columbia River Bridge area. Light Rail makes a lot of sense especially with the existing yellow line, but a streetcar seems so out of place in this setting.

1949

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

The Columbia River crossing by itself is insufficient information in relation to the rest of the traffic congestion. The bridge can stay the same but increase the lane traffic south of the bridge. Need a new bridge to the west of the ports starting in Ridgefield area, across the Columbia, Hillsboro reentering I-5 around Wilsonville.

1950

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 19, April 19 Justin Says: You know, I'd rather see Electric Multiple Unit trains than DMUs, because of the pollution issue, and electric trains are cheaper on maintenance and fuel costs. □California is looking at electrifying the Caltrains corridor in the Bay Area, in addition to their high speed rail system on the planning boards. Which will cost \$25 billion, by the way. =P

1951

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

You destroyed lots of homes the past time you widened I-5. Why should we lose our homes just so new ones can be built? We live here 37 year and now new people and their homes are forcing us out.

1952

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Rail Transit, TR-5, TR-6, TR-11, TR-12] April 19, Lenny Anderson: Ride the Yellow Line out to Expo...you are about 1 minute from Jantzen Beach, 5 from downtown Vancouver. It would need to continue to some logical first phase endpoint like Clark college (then you could ride from CC to PSU on the Yellow Line in about 45 minutes). Funding? locat match...bridge tolls, C-Tran sales tax increase, City of Vancouver sales tax increase? Interstate URA extension to Hayden Island.

1953

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

How will you be including neighborhood associations in the NEPA?

1954

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Arterial Crossings, RC-19, RC-22 and RC-23] April 19, Lenny Anderson Says: It would seem that the Jim's proposal, RC 22, would pass muster if it is coupled with freeway improvements as is RC 23. The key data point is the % of current freeway trips that are local. The best way to improve freeway operation is to offer a real option to people who don't want to be on it in the first place...those making local trips.

1955

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** Open House Survey

Don't enlarge the footprint of the I-5 corridor so that you remove our homes. Why haven't we heard about environmental justice for the Vancouver side of this project?

1956

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: Arterial Crossings, RC-19, RC-22 and RC-23] April 19, Isaac Smith Says: The (multimodal non-freeway bridge) would make the most sense of any of the solutions. It is the simplest and most likely the cheapest. If near 30% of all traffic on the bridges is local, you could reduce the congestion by 1/3 (giving room for trucks) by just rerouting them onto a local bridge. As it is, it's such a hassle to get to Hayden Island, and it would just make sense to give the people what they want, easy access to local destinations and smoother freeway traffic, uninhibited by all those clogging the entrance and exit lanes getting to the island. This gives more options to people which, if you ask them is what they want. Coupled with light rail, this is the best solution. There would be no need for further freeway improvements as the current bridges would have the equivalent of another lane of capacity, very cost-effective.

1957

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

No. The recommendation is not clear enough. What are the impacts. Some of these will hurt my neighborhood. Where is the environmental justice to protect us and our homes? Not enough detail on the Number of lanes.

1958

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: AORTA Response] April 17, 2006 10:53 AM Ron Swaren Says: Jim (or anyone), Where exactly would this "Non-Freeway Multimodal Bridge" be placed? Alongside the existing crossing?

1959

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

No. I need more information on the impacts to neighborhoods, with these recommendations. I can't make a decision base on the information so far.

1960

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: AORTA Response] April 17, 2006 08:14 PM Isaac Smith Says: Question: What does the acronym AORTA stand for? This is the best solution, as I have stated in previous strands. It's by far the cheapest, especially if the current bridges are not lifted, and gives the most travel options to a corridor that has very few. There's no reason to spend a lot of money when we can solve the problem cheaply. Light rail MUST NOT be removed from any crossing plan as it's so close already and the ridership potential is huge.

1961

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

I strongly support! Lane consistency, environmental justice, economic justice, increase bus service

1962

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: AORTA Response] April 18, 2006 08:16 AM Jim Howell Says: Isaac, AORTA is the acronym for the Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates which is a statewide volunteer organization working for safe, environmentally sound, cost-effective transportation since 1976.

1963

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Neighborhood livability, freeway lane continuity, environmental and economic justice, more mass transit

1964

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:TR-7 High Speed Rail] April 18, 2006 09:18 AM adron Says: Just on the positive side... we still at least have the current rail right of way, it could almost be high speed. (If the track would be upgraded between Vancouver and PDX we already have Talgo Equipment in the area, which could at least hit 100mph)

1965

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

No. There needs to be more information and details. I need to know the impact of these ideas and solutions before to anything.

1966

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:TR-7 High Speed Rail] April 18, 2006 09:59 AM Ray Whitford Says: Agreed Chris, the CRC will go down as the time that we lost the opportunity to create a right of way for true "high speed rail" in Oregon. It will cost us over 1 Billion dollars 20 years from now when we realize that we need a separate bridge or tunnel just for this needed corridor. 20 years from now the US will not be able to support us, like now (if they can). But I have even less faith in the US Treasury in 20 years. I have asked the CRC over and over again to understand that HSR needs to be a capacity that is built into the design. DON'T BUILD THE CORRIDOR! PLAN FOR IT!!! How hard is this to understand? Where is Earl B. and Brian B. on this critical issue!

1967

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Environmental and economic justice, increase mass transit /bus system, lane consistency.

1968

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:TR-7 High Speed Rail] April 18, 2006 05:56 PM Isaac Smith Says: I completely agree with Ray. You don't need to build HSR now, but dedicated space must be included in any new crossing. Just like I-205 was built with space for a future transitway, so should the crossing be built with this in mind. We WILL need HSR in the future, whether it's 20 years or 50 years from now. To provide the ROW for it now and to plan for it will save hundreds of millions of dollars in the future. "A local high speed rail service would likely have very few stops or stations, and perhaps no stops within the Bridge Influence Area, and thus would not actually carry many passengers for local trips..." This report and committee are too narrowly focused. They seem to think that only the immediate "bridge influence area" should be considered for this crossing. Should people in the influence area be the only ones served by this interstate crossing? This is a multi-REGIONAL corridor. It is the axis for ALL land travel between California and Vancouver, BC. We MUST acknowledge that this crossing is part of a much greater whole and provide for future needs, i.e. HSR. It won't cost too much to build the ROW into the crossing, especially compared with the cost of a future crossing dedicated to HSR. "Finally, in order to improve existing transit service in the Bridge Influence Area, it would have to be integrated with the existing bus and rail network, which is infeasible..." They said this sort of thing before in regards to commuter rail. This is simply not true! Throughout the world and even the US HSR stations are fully integrated into local transit systems and are usually the major hub in the transportation system. It's not difficult. I don't know why they keep saying this. They're lying. There are too many major assumptions based on speculation or less that are dictating major decisions in this study.

1969

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Will the I-5 corridor be widened? None of the proposals seemed to address this.

1970

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re:TR-7 High Speed Rail] April 18, 2006 11:51 PM Ray Whitford Says: I really don't understand the rationale for saying on one hand that the I5 Corridor is critical for the West Coast of the US and then on the other hand say that HSR isn't needed at CRC because it most likely wouldn't make a big impact in the BIA. Their wishes to convey the importance of the corridor is not a hard sell on citizens of PDX/VAN. But this logic seems to suggest that the corridor isn't the reason for the CRC, it's only the BIA that matters. It's like nothing else matters. Why have the statements in the roll out of the issue and then do nothing to support the corridor and the region?

1971

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

You need to be specific about how many homes you will demolish with each alternative. You also need to get the environmental justice involved on this side of the river. You have 2 taskforce people on EJ. What are they doing for us?

1972

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: TR-1 to TR-4 the Bus Options] April 18, 2006 02:41 PM Lenny Anderson Says: The problem with the bus options is that for any to work you must have right of way...so two lanes of any new or supplemental bridge would dedicated to buses/HOV...not such a bad idea. But what happens on the OR side? I-5 will not be widened through N. Portland, and we have already built MAX, so the BRT or Express Bus either go into regular traffic or a GP lane s-bound is switched to HOV (OK by me, but not likely to be popular in Clark county). The other option is that buses deliver riders to the existing bays at Vanport/Delta Park to transfer to MAX Yellow Line. Why not just do the transfer in downtown Vancouver and put MAX across the river. MAX from Expo to Rose Quarter is 20 minutes...add 5 minutes to get to downtown Vancouver; its another 5-10 into downtown Portland. A pretty competitive trip. You will note in the Governors' TF a firm commitment to MAX across the river was made, as well as a recommendation that express bus service only to be areas NOT served by MAX. Fred Hansen insisted on this and was supported by TF members from both sides. I expect that including bus options is comparable to the South Corridor study that started with everything but MAX, only to conclude that rail is the most cost effective option with the highest ridership, etc.

1973

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comment: I commented at the Hudson Bay High meeting and want to add to those comments. Ped Bike facilities: First of all the bridge must provide a first class bike/ped crossing. This would include: Wide unobstructed paths. The stand 10 wide path is not adequate because of the speed and volume of bike traffic. View points to the west. The east side of the existing bridge provides magnificent views of the the mighty Columbia River and Mount Hood. This treasure must be preserved and enhanced. The enhancement should include but not limited to the following: No obstructions to the east. Seating out of the way of bike and ped traffic and most important Sound mitigation. The bridge needs to include local access to both Vancouvers Downtown and river front as well as to Jansen Beach area. I recommend 12'wide pathes on both sides of the bridge with wider sections for view point . The paths on both sides have a side benefit as emergency access Transit Service I like the full BRT alternative. This appears to be the most cost effective alternative. Open House. I was disapointed not see or hear any information about how the bridge will land in Vancouver.

1974

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

[Re: TR-1 to TR-4 the Bus Options] April 18, 2006 07:07 PM EvergreenTransitFan Says: Long Trunk Routes that get caught in street congestion and freeway congestion are in-efficient. Rail Transit works for long trips, and buses can feed into the rail system. I think that it might be a better idea to have MAX cross the river, and that way C-Tran can re-deploy service hours, stretching resources.

1975

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters**

Comment: It is critical that you include light rail and improved bus service in any plans you have for the corridor. A wider freeway and bridge will likely be over filled by the time it could be finished. Any new bridge also needs to be free of disruption from shipping on the Columbia.

1976

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 1** Source: **Open House Survey**

No. None of these show how wide I-5 will be.

1977

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters**

Comment: How about a bridge or tunnel East near Troutdale and another one west of I-5? I think the population is growing so fast by the time you get anything built you will have to build another. so lets look at more then one crossing spaced out so our other roads leading to those passes across the river doesn't get over run with traffic.

1978

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **O - 2** Source: **Open House Survey**

How many homes will each one destroy?

1979

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: **No Question** Source: **WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters**

Comment: As a resident of the Arnada Neighborhood I want to say that I don't believe that widening I-5 is the best way to alleviate traffic congestion. Let's focus on mass transit solutions: trains, bus lanes, freight (truck) lanes, tunnels, another bridge for trains and buses, etc., etc.

1980

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

No, because not enough detail was provided to the impact of each recommendation, such as: How many lanes will there be? Are you planning to increase the number of lanes? Increasing the footprint of the bridge will necessarily adversely impact the I-5 neighborhoods in the future.

1981

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comment: I urge to Columbia Crossing that I-5 should add a tunnel with MAX Tracks and vehicles access and secondly adds another bridge for Grand Blvd and Grand Avenue both of Vancouver & Portland. I urge to support "Dig In" that compares other state had already "Dig In" campaign. I want seeing that underground tunnels for MAX light rail and all vehicles in widest lanes and both above and below bridge and tunnel supports. Let me know give me different nine options! Send me FAX immediately! Thanks David Johnson

1982

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

The issue of environmental justice needs to be strongly considered relative to any changes and plans. The number of lanes should remain consistent throughout the I-5 corridor focusing more on bus commuter service. Unless Clark County residents have a say financially on light rail relative to taxes and maintenance, I am against it.

1983

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

The recommendation should include a provision that prohibits the removal of homes and businesses along the corridor?

1984

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Environmental justice for neighborhoods along the corridor, neighborhood livability - no home removal! Park over the corridor - similar to Seattle.

1985

Community Livability_Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion_Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#_Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety_Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

No. I need more information on all of these solutions. This is a fairly vague question, and should be broken into more than one question.

1986

Community Livability_Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion_Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#_Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety_Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

How many homes will each proposal destroy? I am more conscious of the views of the popular than your entire team. You haven't once said what the project will do to the communities it destroys/

1987

Community Livability_Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion_Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#_Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety_Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

Only match what Oregon is building.

1988

Community Livability_Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion_Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#_Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety_Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

I want bus not train. We don't have control owner train costs. Buses are feasible.

1989

Community Livability_Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion_Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#_Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety_Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

Environmental justice needs to be addressed. Keeping the lanes on the Washington Side consistent with the Oregon Side. Increase in the bus system.

1990

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

No. I don't agree and I need more details about highway improvements, how they will impact my own home, before I will agree to anything that the staff recommends. The number of lanes on the bridge will impact the whole of the project. What about the environmental justice?

1991

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question Source: Open House Survey

How are you going to involve the neighborhood associations in NEPA?

1992

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

I need more information on impacts of each item. The question is to broad and vague.

1993

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 Source: Open House Survey

I need more details about the impact these "improvements" will have before I could agree to staff recommendations.

1994

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 Source: Open House Survey

I strongly support! Lane consistency, environmental justice, economic justice, increase bus service

1995

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

they should consider what will be happening in the future 10 or 15 years from now. Also buses.

1996

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Too vague - need more details and info on how these items would impact the big picture of the crossing before agreeing.

1997

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

Need more details about the recommendations before I could agree

1998

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

Induced travel, capacity consistent throughout the study area. No more lanes in WA than in OR. Environmental Justice mitigation efforts, bus rapid transit.

1999

Community Livability	Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Travel Demand, Congestion	Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp#	Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

environmental justice - effect on neighborhoods

2000

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

The lane capacity should be consistent with the number of lanes on the Oregon side. Highway Improvements were not well detailed. Those improvements will have serious effects on our neighborhood

2001

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 1 **Source:** Open House Survey

There are no recommendations that do not impact Hayden Island!

2002

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: O - 2 **Source:** Open House Survey

I believe it is essential that sound walls become a requirement as the project is developed and constructed to protect the quiet enjoyment of households that live on the N. Portland Harbor waterways.

2003

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comment: If you take a walk through the parking lot at the Delta Park-Vanport park and ride of the MAX Yellow Line on any given day of the normal work week, you will find the vast majority of the vehicles parked there have Washington license plates. This leads one to conclude that these Vancouver/Clark county residents are "voting with their feet," so to speak, indicating their preference for the light rail option. How many more Clark county residents would make the same choice if they didn't have to travel across an overcrowded Interstate Bridge and, instead, could go to a park and ride light rail station closer to their home in Vancouver? Quite a few, I'll bet. □As TriMet's light rail system continues to expand on the Portland side of the river, I suspect more and more Vancouver residents are going to look at it and the tremendous service it provides and say to themselves, "Why don't/can't we have something like that over here?" I remember a conversation I had with a C-Tran bus driver several months ago. In the course of that conversation, this man - who is an east Clark County resident - acknowledged that when he and his family want to come to downtown Portland, they just drive over I-205 to one of the MAX Red Line's park and rides and take the train the rest of the way. Again, the question: how many more are there like him?□□Here are some comments about the public transit options retained for further study. (1) Express buses, even those with their own lanes or rights of way, are still part of the overall traffic mix on the roadway. Look at how often the C-Tran express buses get slowed by clogged traffic conditions. (2) Each bus, since it's powered by an internal combustion□engine, is a source of pollution in our airshed AND contributes to global warming. (3) Buses can only carry a limited number of passengers for each operator.

2004

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Let's take a look at light rail. (1) Light rail trains, since they have their own exclusive roadway are not vulnerable to delays caused by traffic tie-ups on vehicle lanes. (2) Trains are a clean form of transportation, contributing neither to pollution in our airshed nor to global warming. (3) Light rail is also more efficient when you look at the operator-to-rider ratio. A bus operator can transport a maximum of around 50 passengers in their vehicle. By contrast, a single light rail operator can transport around 200 passengers. And then, there's the comfort factor. A train is just a whole lot more comfortable and pleasant to ride on than the bus. I realize that some may be skittish about the light rail option because of its rejection by Clark County voters a number of years ago. Since then, there have been some potentially significant changes that have taken place in our region, changes which could affect how people view the issue. First, population has continued to grow and, with it, the daily congestion in the I-5 corridor between the two states. Second, TriMet's light rail has grown significantly since then, with the opening of service to west side and Hillsboro, the Red Line to Portland International Airport, and the Yellow Line to the Expo Center. Add to that plans to extend service out to Clackamas Town Center along the I-205 corridor and to Milwauke, plus renovate the Portland Transit Mall including adding rail service to 5th and 6th avenues. I am sympathetic to Jonathan Schlueter's concerns, as quoted in last Thursday's editions of The Oregonian, about solving the bottleneck here in the Portland area affecting the freight and commerce delivery system. Besides actually adding capacity, I believe a concurrent way of achieving that objective is to give non-commercial users of the transportation system other viable options.

2005

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comment: I AM INTERESTED IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING. I COULDN'T FIND ADDRESSES WHERE THE APRIL OPEN HOUSE MEETINGS WILL BE HELD. A COUPLE COMMENTS. I WAS A STRUCTURAL INSPECTOR ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SOUTH BOUND STRUCTURE AND ON PART OF THE NORTH BOUND STRUCTURE RECONSTRUCTION. I WAS THE PROJECT MANAGER ON THE I-205 (JACKSON) BRIDGE. ONE OF THE ARTICLES MENTIONED A TUG WITH A BARGE IN TOW HITTING THE SOUTH BOUND BRIDGE IN 1994. IN 1969 +/- THE NORTH BOUND BRIDGE WAS STRUCK BY AN OIL DRILLING PLATFORM ON A BARGE RESULTING IN CONSIDERABLE DAMAGE TO THE LOWER CHORD OF THE LIFT SPAN. PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION OF THE SB BRIDGE THE 1917 BRIDGE CARRIED 4 LANES OF TRAFFIC(AFTER THE TROLLEY QUIT RUNNING) AND WAS HIT MANY TIMES BY TRUCKS ON THE HIGHWAY. THE SB BRIDGE CARRIED 4 LANES OF TRAFFIC WHILE THE NB STRUCTURE WAS BEING REMODELED.

2006

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

I am in favor of any means of having another access point to Portland, whether bridge or tunnel. A big question, when you have another bridge or tunnel, be it 6 lane, 8 lane, 10 lane, is what do you connect the new structure to? Interstate 5 on the Washington state side, where I live, has had ongoing improvements for years in an attempt to handle the increasing traffic flow. Interstate 5 in Oregon, from the Columbia River to south of the Teweliger curves, has not significantly changed since the Fremont Bridge was built. The freeway in the Metro area still necks down to 2 lanes in several spots. This is amazing in 2006. The new tunnel or bridge will provide the opportunity to have larger traffic jams until I-5 through Portland has at least the same traffic carrying capacity as the new tunnel or bridge. Portland's history of promoting mass transit and having a non-driving mayor, stunted freeway development and has caused our automotive transportation plan to be years behind schedule. Sincerely, Bruce Haebe Kalama, WA

2007

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Having lived in downtown Vancouver for 40 years it's my opinion that a 3.5 mile tunnel from Mill plane to just beyond Columbia blvd. along I-5 would be the best solution.I know that the cost are high but so is the delay and the sheer interruption of constructing a bridge of that size. Invariably there will be cost over-runs and other complications of building a structure of that magnitude in such a small area, while maintaining a vital link of transportation.By by-passing Jantzen beach and Delta park it would allow for inter-port truck traffic witch tends to slow traffic anyway and ease the bottle-neck at the SR 14 and downtown interchanges.Construction of such a thing would pale in comparison to that of a bridge and comparatively, should hardly be noticed.The price is worth it. Mike Baur

2008

Community Livability _Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comment: I also do not like the traffic using the Columbia Bridge, and using MAX still gives me the problem of sitting in line getting on the freeway and getting through the bottleneck from MArine Drive over the Columbia. (negates the time saved using MAX) I would suggest a loop that would run pass the EXPO and cross over Columbia next to the train tracks, and continue to the I-5 205 exchange. Seems that would relieve some tension and get people home faster that live in that area, and leave some space for drivers that need to get through North, or SR500. Just a suggestion.

2009

Community Livability Human Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion _Accessibility:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# _Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety _Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comment: Any proposed project crossing the Columbia would be remiss if it did not include light rail and mass transit at the heart of its mission statement. While mass transit would ease congestion, link the cultural centers of both cities, and decrease the region's dependency on fossil fuels, having a reliable transportation network such as light rail would ensure that we are not talking about a fourth bridge across the Columbia in twenty years. Growth in the region will occur whether we in Vancouver are prepared for it or not. The key to maintaining the distinctive lifestyle that so many value in the city is to be ahead of the curve and forward thinking enough to handle growth in a sustainable and responsible manner. By linking SW Washington with Portland light rail, we could establish a region that is able to withstand the impact of future energy crises, while meeting the challenges of accomodating growth--this would good for our region's economy and good for the citizens of Vancouver.

2010

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comment: I attended the Open House last night. I want to urge the CRC Task Force to approve the Arterial Bridge option for further study. As I understand it, this option would provide for arterial capacity for local trips that now constitute 1/3 of the traffic on I-5. For this concept to work, it must also have transit ROW, preferably for lightrail. It can also be an opportunity for an outstanding bike/ped facility on the down stream side, assuming the new arterial bridge would be adjacent to the existing bridges on the downstream side. Staff raised a question as to whether federal highway dollars could be used for this option. Federal FTA \$ could be part of the transit piece with local (toll?) funds covering the remainder. FHWA \$ could be used to pay for the needed upgrades to the existing freeway...eliminating substandard on/off ramps and seismic upgrades, etc. Clearly this option would be relatively low cost and would provide the best transportation options to commuters....arterial roadway, high capacity transit and direct bike route. Another option that I urge the CRC TF to keep in the running is the Short Tunnel, with retention of the existing bridges. This is expensive, but full of potential if the existing bridges are retrofit for arterial traffic and high capacity transit, again LRT would be preferred. The old freeway approaches between the bridges and the tunnel portals on both sides of the river could then be converted as well to boulevard designs, freeing up adjacent land for development, tying downtown Vancouver to the Historic Reserve, etc. The fundamental approach must be 1. provide for local trips...some arterial capacity...2. for a real transit option...extension of the Yellow Line just makes sense, and 3. a safe and direct bike/ped facility. Whether this is achieved by construction of an arterial bridge with LRT and upgrading the freeway OR by construction of a freeway tunnel and conversion of the existing bridges to arterial/lightrail depends on how deep our pockets are. Either would do the trick. But please....I should NOT have to get on the west coast's Interstate Freeway to get from N. Portland to Shenanigans to have a drink!

2011

Community Livability / Human Resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural Resources:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Process :	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Demand, Congestion / Accessibility:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Transp# / Modal Choice:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economy and Freight:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Financing:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Alternatives:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety / Seismicity:	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Question: No Question **Source:** WSDOT "ContactUs" - emails/letters

Comments I attended the April 13 Red Lion session. These are my two comments: 1. Eliminate movable bridge options. That era is long past, and movable bridges mean time lost waiting for lifts, pollution while idling, accidents and slowed river traffic. 2. I like the supplemental tunnel concept. Leave the existing bridge for local traffic, pedestrians, bikes, mass transit. Use the tunnel to move through traffic. And consider having the southbound tunnel come up and parallel the southbound lanes and rejoin after Columbia Blvd, possibly eliminating the need to reconstruct that part of the freeway. Sincerely, Craig Walker