

June 2002 Survey Comments—Weaknesses

Who funds a light rail and is it profitable
Too Little - Too Late
Costly. Environmental justice recommendations are too vague and abstract.
I still think there should be a truck bypass through North Portland and across the Columbia River linking Vancouver's port/industrial area to Portland's NW industrial area
Light rail construction timeline. I somewhat skeptical that the line will ever get built. I don't think there should be any widening of road capacity until the Light rail line has been developed and approved.
Reliance on financing from C-Tran and Tri-Met. (They should merge to pool resources more effectively) Time frame is not fast enough. Delta Park is a headache now. 3 years from now it will be a nightmare.
The inability to think outside of the I-5 box. Need to look into the Westside four lane arterial.
Doesn't have any really creative wow elements that can get people really excited
Widening I-5 should be more extensive...5 or 6 lanes in each direction...north-south.
My main concern is that we get bogged down in more studies and debate - it is past time to move ahead on these issues.
I don't think the issue that started all this - freight mobility - really got a fair shake in the process.
Alternative routes to I-5 are required to transit to Washington from Oregon. Traffic from Hwy 30 going North to Washington are transiting through neighborhoods of North Portland and not on dedicated highways or I-405 to I-5. That traffic volume of trucks messing with St. Johns Bridge and Rivergate / T-6 to Washington have been refused to be issues on any study. Shame on you.
the landuse and tdm recommendations are too weak!! it is not clear that the expansions in vancouver will not force oregon's hand to expand in the future. are you creating new bottlenecks for future decisionmakers to wrestle with?

Weaknesses



Keeping the HOV lanes in the I-5 N Portland area makes for a traffic mess from Delta Part north where HOV traffic needs to get the exit lanes and traffic entering I-5 want to get to the fast lane. Reduce the length of the HOV lane to Columbia BV.

The inclusion of light rail is a big negative--it will not move enough people for a reasonable price. The money should be spent on roads not light rail.

No consideration to move the improvements to the East rather than going West of the existing corridor. Too much elimination of existing homes and businesses on Hayden Island.

There doesn't seem to be enough focus on examining how these plans will be implemented and paid for. In my opinion there should be more involvement from businesses who will greatly benefit from this endeavor in terms of financing projects. Our tax dollars are already pulled in too many directions so I think it is essential to be creative with funding sources.

I fail to understand why it is recommended that there be a maximum of 3 total lanes through the corridor with one of those being a HOV lane. As a frequent commuter I do not see the logic in this. I would agree with a 3 general purpose and 1 HOV lane recommendation but as it stands I do not agree with the recommendation. This thought process placed forth by the partnership appears to only be looking at the now and barely that.

It is an all your eggs in one basket approach. I-5 being the basket. There is not enough emphasis in diverting local traffic away from it. More bridges across the Columbia in other locations would alleviate much of this pressure so I-5 could continue to be a trucker's main north-south line. By your stats - 65% -freight handling is the regions key to economic success. Portland-Vancouver need more options to cross the Columbia River than only 2 bridges. Yes rail is a partial solution but the trucks and the commuters need more options in and around the region. To only concentrate on I-5 is myopic. Portland's East side grew because the city fathers and developers had the foresight to build bridges at a time before there was a need as critical as today in Clark county. Your vision is too narrow.

The plan to add rivercrossing capacity in 2010 is too long. We will have gridlock if we don't add additional river crossing capacity before that time even with the improvements to I-5 at Delta Park. The improvements to I-5 will just add to the volume and speed with which vehicles can access I-5 but all the vehicles still need to get across the river. Without additional capacity to cross the river I-5 will just be more congested. The timeframe for a new bridge needs to be shortened.

- Cost don't see how it can all be funded. - Lack of teeth

Weaknesses



<p>No details on how to reduce local traffic. Too much reliance on light rail and bus service. North Portland roads not currently well-suited to handle local traffic -- especially since Interstate Ave. has been reduced to one lane in each direction. Three lanes on I-5 will be inadequate for handling interstate commerce (truck traffic) in 20 years.</p>
<p>Maintains status quo for Clark County as an Oregon income tax paying residential community for the Portland area. Recommendation for light rail without any use of a cost-benefit or risk analysis.</p>
<p>Fully develop and commit to specific TDM/TSM strategies especially alternative modes. Planning strategies often include a vague reference to 'increasing alternative transportation use' without any specifics. A specific strategy such as developing a bike transportation corridor along I-5 (such as there is on I-84 near Gresham) is an example. Another would be to ensure that there is a visible well-signed bike route from Vancouver to downtown Portland or at least the nearest MAX station.</p>
<p>Light rail</p>
<p>Listening to every special interest group at the expense of getting the job done. Not considering tolls as a financing tool.</p>
<p>The need to be able to handle the anticipated growth in transporting freight in and through the corridor is critical to the success of the project. I see nothing to indicate that any input has been sought from or any discussions have been held with the state mandated Oregon Freight Advisory Committee.</p>
<p>Why two different committees? Why should the environmental and public committees be separate? Think that these should be handled together with no special importance to each side. Also I do not want Oregon land use laws. I have lived on both sides of the river and that is why I now live in Washington. Keep them in Oregon. We can handle ourselves in Washington.</p>
<p>Until such time as a bridge is approved funded and built why not institute an express lane system that utilizes the inside lane on the opposite side of the peak traffic? Similar to what Seattle does. Northbound commutes at Portland Boulevard and stays there until Hazel Dell. Opposite side in the Morning.</p>
<p>1. Plan rely's much too heavily on Light Rail and not enough on Express Bussing which is far more flexible and cost effective. Put private bus lanes down in place of Light Rail tracks. Restrict use to busses AND emergency response vehicles (police fire EMT. Can't do that with light rail tracks!). Much easier and cheaper to retrofit bridges for Express Bus lanes too.</p>

Weaknesses



<p>Taking too long - I've driven the I-5 route to work for 27 years & my wish is that some of these measures will be implemented before I retire. All of this is way overdue.</p>
<p>none</p>
<p>The suggested expansion of the I-5 commuter traffic lanes may not be enough to accommodate traffic increases over the next 20 years. Budgets need to be allocated to increase public awareness of the benefits of mass-transit and incentives introduced to get more cars off the road.</p>
<p>Strong financing not available to fulfill the dream. Too many options mean that although they all sound good financially they won't all happen. In effort to appease everyone single voices often reverberate and seem more important than then are.</p>
<p>You should have seriously considered Sharon Nasset's plan instead of dismissing it. Some of your study recommendations are potential sources of wheel-spinning bureaucracy.</p>
<p>Doesn't address the immediate need for a new bridge and more traffic lanes. Ignores the serious congestion a Jantzen Beach.</p>
<p>Forcing people to take alternate modes of transportation won't work when Vancouver is really more of an extension of the Portland area. Local Area Transportation thus covers too many miles for biking buses walking. Light rail has been voted down too many times for government to try it again. Buses aren't used in Vancouver because they are not a convenient mode of transportation. A large part of Vancouver's economic connections are in Portland Beaverton Hillsboro and SE Portland. HOV lanes don't work inbound. People don't have as much time choice traveling to work as they do staggering times for coming home. It places an unfair burden on truck drivers and others who rely on highways to meet their destination deadlines.</p>
<p>Two out of the three recommendations will certainly displace my home. Light rail on the west side of I-5 will impact my livability. For almost 5 years I tolerated the HOV Northbound evening commute which was extremely painful given the lack of enforcement and abuse. I totally understand the need to improve the evening commute to Hayden Island Vancouver and points North however I am not willing to relinquish my dream of living on the river in the Jantzen beach Moorage. I still recommend the westside arterial in which light rail would run along the existing rail line.</p>
<p>Failure to widen freeway throughout the entire corridor and/or build additional routes across the river means the plan will not solve the congestion problem. As such the plan as a whole is a waste of time and resources.</p>
<p>It's taken too long to get to this point.</p>

Weaknesses



Land use issues have not brought to the public as to where a new bridge would go.

I'm a little concerned with the proposal for a supplemental or replacement bridge across the Columbia River. I would support if it is supplemental bridge for use by lightrail and heavy truck traffic. I don't think replacing the current I-5 bridge is necessary. I also am concerned with the fostering of development around I-5 as it moves north through Clark County. I think it is important to encourage the proper type of development. In order to do that WDOT and ODOT need to work very closely with local government. It is important to look at what communities that are near I-5 are planning on doing to attract economic development and to work with their plans for transportation. In this same capacity environmental justice especially north where agriculture is a large issue is of great importance. The partnership needs to pay very close attention to issues of displacement and gentrification.

LTR should cast a bigger net to anticipate growth into northern parts of Clark County

As with all visionary public plans I suspect funding is going to be a difficult task!

Freeway is full now. Adding no extra lanes means no added capacity.

1) Need to plan for future capacity expansions beyond three lanes. 2) Absence of explicit congestion pricing proposal. 3) Preference for 4th Plain over SR-500 LRT corridor to better stimulate transit supportive development and ridership.

with the data given i feel it is a bit vague on impact to housing

Even though I understand why the fact that we probably won't see results for some time is frustrating.

Waste of taxpayer's money.

in ten years are we going to have this conversation again wanting to widen the road to say 8 lanes each way???

Weaknesses



You have failed to evaluate cheap alternatives for lowering I-5 traffic. Specifically how many vehicles just passing through could be encouraged to use I-205 to by-pass the I-5 congestion and does it have the capacity needed along its length for that. Everytime I go to Fry Electronics in Wilsonville from Vancouver WA or to points farther south it is equally useful for me to go by way of I-5 & WA 14 or I-205. I-5 is slightly shorter but slower than I-205 for this purpose yet I have experienced situations with no forewarning where either one was a traffic disaster yet there is no sign to warn me and the exit for I-205 is easy to miss. I would like electronic signs N of the I-5 & I-205 juncture N of the I-5 Columbia River Bridge N of the I-205 bridges in WA and south of the I-5 & I-205 juncture in OR to report the best route for through traffic. Every through traffic vehicle taken off of I-5 reduces construction requirements there. People would use the information. If given an informed alternative

Limiting I-5 to 3 lanes in each direction through N. Portland is ridiculous especially in the context of those totally dysfunctional HOV lanes. I believe that the increased carrying capacity in the HOV lane is MORE THAN COMPENSATED FOR by the other lanes sitting still during afternoon rush hour. If (for political reasons) you HAVE to have a HOV lane then it's even more imperative to add other lanes to compensate for the presence of the HOV lanes. But even WITHOUT the HOV lane you need more than 3 lanes just to handle the traffic.

One way lines on either 5 or 205 but it is a start

1. Land Use - there is alot said without really saying anything. How will the increased capacity of transportation & transportation options directly effect the growth of Clark County!? I come from a city of approx.55 000+ people. I saw the same signs then as I do now! The immediate results was that big businesses left growth was concentrated in the outlying areas downtown was almost deserted (and is still trying to recover 20+ years later)and pockets of low income communities are still to this day not really seeing any improvement or community relationships that would be positive. This particular city now has close to a million people LRT system connected to the rest of the regions' cities 6 major freeways or interchanges leaving the downtown area neighborhoods & businesses gone without real positive community impact by transit malls/loops some downtown improvements which are turning things around....but the economic impact (which is directly effected by the land use concerns) is unbelievable! A

Weaknesses



NO DETAILS FOR THE PROPERTY OWNERS WITH THE MOST TO LOSE! No details about how the ramps would impact my view of Vancouver Washington. Great concern and sensitivity for SELECTED RACES with little or no concern for some that have lived directly in the path of the said construction and have in the past lost large tracts of land with relatively poor compensation! Fairness must be COLOR BLIND! How will the great amounts of dust and noise be compensated Will you pay to clean my house? Will you fix all the cracks in my plaster walls I can feel my house shake every time a large Heavy truck travels past my house I suppose the cracks and fractures in my houses foundation could be fixed again if I could afford it. What about all the mature shrubs and trees? will they be relocated or discarded like trash?

I see that you are keeping the HOV lane idea I understand that there is a strong opinion that HOV lanes encourage ride sharing that may be true to some small extent. But what I see on the roads as I am travelling to and from work is the HOV lanes are not being used by such people mostly they are families or people with kids or single occupancy vehicles. The HOV lanes are actually in my opinion a waste of road surface that would be better used for regular traffic. I know of no one at work or any of my customers who are able to commute with some one else or who do. I think that eventually the I-5 bridges will need to be replaced by new bridges that are higher above the Columbia river and do not lift so I think that you should start working on that in this study. Finally the schedule that is forecast for the work from this study is too far out to do any good for the traffic problems. There needs to be a quickening of the work it seems we study things to death bypass some of the studies and lets

See strengths.

The weakness of the plan is the development time. I have been in the construction industry for more than 30 years and a resident of Oregon and Washington for over 50 years. In that period of time I have watched more money wasted on projects that are out dated before the project is complete. The reason this happens is very clear in your current proposed plan. You are only planning for the nest 20 years. Assuming everything goes as you have stated in your development time lines this project won't be complete for 20 plus years. Oh you might get the widening of I-5 done in 15 years but by that time our communities will still have out grown the need you are currently placing on I-5 because we needed what you are proposing 5 years past. This adds up to 20 years and we have not taken care of the cause and effect. Either design for the future 20 years after construction is complete or change the mode of transportation/communication. If we would take note as to how the Los Angeles and Sacramento

Probably the biggest issue is how these improvements will be funded. However if both states work together in one unified voice funding will be easier than each working independently.

Weaknesses



*lack of clarity of how impacts on existing neighborhoods will be minimized. *lack of clarity on what might minimize air pollution/noise pollution in surrounding neighborhoods. *impacts might be off-set by encouraging investment & development along previously ignored areas such as Lombard street East of Freeway.

Don't see any.

1. No mention of putting the plan to a public vote in Clark County this should be mandatory given last effort to bring light rail to this area. 2. Routing of lightrail using SR-500 completely unacceptable. Plethora of public access issues (who lives and works on SR 500). Put the lightrail where the people are Fourth Plain Mill Plain or 78th Street. Max Service in Portland is through neighborhood residential and business districts and to route along SR500 is to treat Clark County residents as second class citizens. It also duplicates existing traffic patterns removing any incentive to take lightrail versus driving. 3. The widening of I-5 as suggested is inadequate with present traffic and projected growth patterns. I-5 from Salmon Creek in Clark County to Lombard needs to be 4 lanes (3 traffic + 1 HOV each way) in order to handle volume for the next ten years. 4. In adequate detail as to how this plan will be financed. Please be aware that C-Tran's record/reputation of financial cost to service d

Negative impacts to close-in neighborhoods exceed positives associated with widening the freeways

Please stop pushing light rail already. If drivers want four or five or more lanes on I-5 each way across the river give them four or five or more lanes on I-5 each way. This highway is for commerce. Your efforts to force people out of their cars are not appreciated by drivers of trucks or cars. Instead try increasing the subsidy for a natural gas bus service that goes more places more often and for lower fares designed to encourage ridership.

Funding - need more specifics. Consider toll booths & increased commercial trucking fees. Don't raise fuel taxes any higher!

3 lanes are already in place if the hov lanes are dropped or reduced--the hov lanes are the main cause of the current gridlock on I-5 north in the afternoon--traffic runs smoothly until 3pm--at 3:10 traffic has started to back up to portland blvd-by 3:40 to the fremont bridge--by 4 pm this extends all the way south to terwiliger.

Major fatal flaw is having only two dedicated through lanes and one hov lane. This will put the corridor in the same state as today. Traffic flows heavy but at a steady pace during the day before hov lane goes into use--when 90% of traffic is then forced to squeeze into two lanes the effect on the system is the same as an accident closing a lane.

Weaknesses



The lack of prioritization. It appears to me that the committee has chosen all of the best alternatives; however what will be chosen as a result of budget constraints? The finance plan by the way is obviously not well formed. The bridge could likely pay for itself through tolling but how do you plan to fund the other non-transit elements? An increase in transit funding appears unwise in this time of economic stagnation. Perhaps you should focus on the highway elements and allow Tri-Met to chase fed. dollars for the transit elements.

We live at the junction of I-5 and I-205 so our concerns are about what impact this will have on an already over-traveled side street (NE 12th Ave). It is already a dangerous road with no sidewalks once you start working in the Salmon Creek area we fear there will be an accident involving one of the children because of increased traffic flow. What can be done about this?

LRT proposals are too broad and without enough supporting logic. For example the majority of the expected ridership will have to get to LRT by auto; how will parking be provided and at what cost?

First off you have not justified your program for the human impact of the proposed freeway and the displacement of these individuals or their homes. Second I can not understand how you can think that you can not have the same bottle neck problem whether your going from 3 lanes to 2 or from 5 lanes to 3. Especially based on the increased volume you are projecting. Your plan is already out dated. Third How can you justify a light rail system that the voters - the ones that pay for the whole thing - have voted this down three times not once not twice but in fact three times.

Timing is too far in the future for light rail and other improvements Recommendations look quite specific but timing looks like it's pretty vague at this point

YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE IS BAD! These questions are skewed so we have to support HOV and light rail....I don't! I am 35yr old travel to Portland daily I am in the media business and I'm really disappointed in how this whole thing has been handled!

timeframe for light rail is too long; engineering dollars must be found and preliminary engineering should start at the same time or before the I-5 lane construction engineering is started.

Continuing to focus compressing transit demand into the I-5 corridor is a no-win proposition. The key to future planning is to provide alternate transportation routes outside the I-5 corridor in order to relieve the transportation congestion. A westside loop/route should be priority. Rail transit is not proving to be a significant or cost effective mass transit alternative. It's ridership is largely coming from cheaper and more flexible bus alternatives.

Weaknesses



<p>More light rail? It's done nothing for the Sunset Highway except siphon off dollars that would have provided increased capacity for cars.</p>
<p>none known</p>
<p>Light rail will not be cost effective recommend dedicated busways as a much more economically viable solution. The finance recommendations are way to weak/vague. These need to be much more specific actionable realistic and tied to each specific project that makes up the recommendations.</p>
<p>Little regard for the rights to property owners near I-5. Removing whole neighborhoods. Tearing down historically significant homes and buildings. Not a good way to build PR.</p>
<p>Transit portion is overly expensive. Light rail is too expensive. Expand the bus service instead. We should build an additional bridge west of Vancouver and Portland to provide additional choices for commuters and freight traffic. To ignore this need is short-sighted and not very smart.</p>
<p>We need to get started now not years from now</p>
<p>Don't see any weaknesses</p>
<p>Too much emphasis placed on road widening which everywhere else in the U.S. has made transportation worse not better.</p>
<p>Construction Timetable</p>
<p>why not widen to 4 lanes it's better that way</p>
<p>Putting in another bridge is expensive and we are becoming known as a City of Bridges. Is there no other way? Is it out of the question to widen the interstate bridge? The southern terminus of I-5 seems to be too close to downtown should be further south. We have taken 405 and at some times of the day (evening rush hour) it seems congested and slow-moving.</p>
<p>Finance options summary does not discuss congestion pricing. This corridor is the most logical in the region as it is the easiest to price. Congestion pricing allows region to avoid complicated blending of two road tax systems that are inadequate to meet current needs.</p>

Weaknesses



I've commuted from Vancouver to Beaverton for five years starting with the year that the HOV lanes went in temporarily for the I-5 bridge construction back in 1997. I've read the published reports that show how well-used the HOV lanes are but I can tell you that as a commuter who sits in that traffic every day far more people are being negatively impacted than are being benefited by an HOV lane. Especially southbound from 134th in Vancouver there are days when I commute and NOT ONE car uses the HOV lane. I strongly feel that these are a waste of a traffic lane.

No mention that I could see of a user pays system. Hasn't the time come for tolling and such things? A little mushy on the specifics. Probably shorts necessity for more auto traffic lanes notwithstanding ROW constraints. Hardly compelling just a hope and a prayer.

(1) limiting I-5 to three through lanes in each directions will not come close to addressing the future capacity needs in this corridor. In fact in most locations there are already three lanes in each direction so this recommendation represents no real improvement to Interstate capacity. In fact by designating one of the three lanes as an HOV lane southbound vehicular capacity in Portland will actually be reduced over the current situation. (2)The cost of the light rail element is disproportionately high in terms of cost per person. If I understand your charts it costs almost as much to provide light rail service for 10 000 peak hour riders as it does to provide highway service for 60 000 peak hour travelers. In light of these costs you should have least explored a totally express bus option and considered eliminating the light rail element. (As a side note it is difficult to determine from the cost of the various elements of the proposed project from the data presented. Just what is the cost of t

Weaknesses



Light rail for Vancouver. Who would want a 2 hr train ride to Hillsboro. We need to have the Ore jobs moved to Vanc. I never hear conversation regarding that. More lanes. What a laugh. When Vanc doubles in size are we going to add more lanes again. Move the jobs.

Provide a phased light rail loop in Clark County in the vicinity of the I-5 SR500/4th Plain and I-205 Corridors---is a 19 minute delay per day worth \$2 billion? NO NO NO Add a new supplemental or replacement bridge across the Columbia River with up to 2 additional lanes in each direction for merging and safety and 2 light rail tracks--- Business displacements & those bridges should/are registered historic features In adding river crossing capacity and making interchange improvements every effort should be made to:3) minimize the use of the freeway for local trips.---most of the bridge users are commuters...isn't that a 'local trip'? Adopt and implement a Bi-State Coordination Accord---absolutely not!! Allowing Oregon or Portland mismanaged government any control or influence in our community is a recipe for failure!!!! Develop a public outreach plan for EIS process that includes special outreach to low-income and minority communities---is this a politically correct way of saying we're kicking people o

Transit: I think it would be beneficial to increase transit service to communities outside the I-5 & I-205 corridors such as Battleground (SR-503) Washougal & Camas (SR-14) because they add quite a bit of congestion to the roads during peak travel times. Interstate 5: It shows that I-5 would be a maximum of 3 lanes from the Freemont Bridge to the I-205 interchange in Vancouver. This would be a strength by not promoting vehicular traffic and forcing commuters to consider alternative modes of transportation. Unfortunately later in the section it states that a new I-5 bridge concept would add 2 additional lanes in each direction across the Columbia River for a total of 5 lanes each direction! Therefore I believe the recommendation is actually for a MINIMUM of 3 lanes in each direction along I-5. Also there is discussion regarding HOV lanes but no definition on how it will be implemented. I would recommend that the HOV hours be expanded from 6-9AM and 3-7PM with a stronger emphasis on enforcement

Weaknesses



Additional rail capacity must be expanded to include incentives to take more trucks off the corridor. currently truck rates from pdx to puget sound and reverse are lower than rail.with trucks legally able to gross 105 500 lbs in both oregon and washington they cause more damage than their fees can cover. not only does this cause more damage to our roads and bridges but adds greatly to congestion.

I think that lightrail will take most people catching it in Vancouver too long to get to Portland locations and should not be counted on for serving many of the existing commuters. It is very slow new sections of it should have every effort made to avoid traffic lights. High speed trains should be considered for the long term plan. 3 lanes with one as HOV lane right now is not affective. I don't think your plan adequately addresses this.

I am concerned that the Columbia River crossing with a lifespan of 80+ years is lumped in with a 20 year plan. Any new bridge is unique in the plan in that it will have a lifetime of 80-100 years. This is well outside the time scope of the rest of the recommendations. It would be short sighted to base the size of any new bridge on just the 20-30 year projections used in the rest of the plan. In the lifetime of the bridge I believe we can expect to see the need for additional capacity across the Columbia. When considering the large investment in money to build a new bridge it would be much more cost effective to add extra capacity at the start with the anticipation that this capacity will be needed well before its lifetime is over. If we don't do this we are just creating a bottleneck for the next generation of transportation plan.

Light rail is a failed strategy supported by political science and science fiction. It is social engineering designed to control and conform the population for social liberal purposes. It cannot and will not provide transportation for 95%+ of the population. The funds wasted on light rail should be used for improved bus and auto lanes. The result of the I-5 plan will cost Oregonians MILLIONS of dollars in time lost sitting on inadequate highway systems. Traffic will be diverted to local neighborhoods to the peril of children; destroying the livable neighborhoods so often espoused by the politicians. Light rail will continue to fail compared to express bus and increased auto capacity.

Expanding I-5 to only three lanes with one being an HOV line is unacceptable. We live in a major metropolitan area -- Salem has 3 lanes through it's metro area. Portland needs at the very least 4.

Light rail. Too expensive little real benefit.

Construction of bridge influence area will not occur before 2010. Need to be more specific about financing of these projects over next 10 years.

Weaknesses



The financing aspects appear to be something of a problem as we have increasing needs overall from an ever-shrinking pie. Perhaps more emphasis on local tolls/user fees to help finance.

The voters in the state of Washington have turned this idea down twice what would be wrong with just dropping the whole idea?

I wish Washington had got on this sooner so it would be done by now.

there is no room for max rails on I-5 just put in more buses please another bridge would work also

The riders will not pay the real cost for riding the system and they should pay for the entire cost of the system and rides.

Realizing the source of the problem which would be viable living wage jobs in SW Washington.

If you decide to funnel all traffic over one place on Hayden Island you only create more congestion.

too long of process. Design by committee is no good. Let the professional designers do their jobs.

Ridership among people need to be promoted (Americans love their cars!). Frequent departure/arrival stops and schedules, strategic stops (proximity to job, shopping, etc.) might eventually convince more people to use transit and public buses.

A 10 lane bridge is unacceptable. 3-through lanes across the river is acceptable and appropriate, but adding 2 additional lanes each direction for merging is too impactful on the communities on either side of the river. We can avoid the removal of the existing bridges by handling the merging traffic on 2 additional lanes in conjunction with the light rail bridge and there-by retain the classic picturesque river crossing. Moving the rail crossing opening to the center of the river channel will virtually eliminate the need to raise the bridge for barge traffic. 2 Supplemental lanes only! Just do it!

your time frame is to short !! The governors budget for each state should be under the inflation of the state then the cost of transportation systems in each area of the state can be funded !!!!! Under land use.. Manage land development.statement

However, they need to make things more accessible to kinesthetic learners, such as myself.

Weaknesses



It takes a long time to ensure all parties are receptive and move on needed improvements

Disappointed that the Rose Quarter project was removed from the overall I-5 corridor plan. Mayor Katz's dream of ridding Portland of I-5 through this area is an impediment to effective regional transportation planning.

Cross river commuter traffic at the expense of, or without improvement in, Clark County local transit service? I hope not.

There should be no impact to any historic lands. What are you thinking? You can rebuild roads, redirect traffic, but you can't rewrite or relocate history.

Too vague in terms of finance. Light rail not compatible with Clark County land uses. Costs not in line with current light rail costs (i.e. westside MAX). Couldn't you do the express bus and three lanes option without the forced (sic) transfer? That would be my preferred option.

Believe railroad should be followed and developed for passenger service and freight.

Needs more community ideas. Does not look at the buses in Vancouver and the fact that the buses start to late and end to early to work with light rail.

Even the concepts for highway configurations with the least impact will damage neighborhood quality. We need to sink the expanded highway, create lids and/or wide bridges/parks. Vancouver is trying to reshape, renovate its downtown, wants a new exit, is willing to spend "tons" of money on a sports arena, convention center, etc. If Vancouver's dreams come to fruition the surrounding neighborhood will become more valuable - a combination of residences and boutiques and all the stuff that good renovation brings. The cost of protecting the surrounding neighborhood properly needs to be regarded as just another crucial aspect of the project. Anything less is short-sighted. In public info - I'd like to see possible encroachment areas listed include footage - such as "the highway is now 50 ft. from this property. An encroachment of 1 ft. means the highway will be 51 ft. closer." This way people will understand more thoroughly at first glance.

Does not address the need for added and needed capacity in the I-5 corridor. There is a need for additional capacity in the corridor over and above the 20 year goals in year 2002. With 3% compounded growth in Clark County over the last 10 years and a forecast of 2.5% growth over the next 5 years there is nothing about the plan that provides hope for the future.

Weaknesses



But not a very broad spectrum was shown . For example the rail study was not very extensive and did not show all the possibilities like a new rail only bridge for highspeed rail, long distance trains, commuter rail, and light rail.

Insufficient emphasis on the route of the existing railroad bridge. That needs to be rebuilt anyway and could be built to be a truck route and handle trucks, cars, and busses as well as high speed and light rail traffic from existing locations plus also the projected rivergate development industrial/harbor area.

We've already voted down light rail.

Does not address overpass impacts on neighborhoods with I-5 expansion!

Light rail.

Not enough study done on west side arterial. Commuter Rail came in too late to be serious consideration

Needs specific remedies for those who may be displaced or financially impacted in a detrimental manner.

No plans for view stop. Pull off and stop. Park your car then walk back.

The residential impact is huge! It would destroy the largest floating home community in the state and not benefit Hayden Island at all.

LRT is a total waste of money. Lack of financing plan is irresponsible. Ignoring the bottleneck on the east bank of I-5 stretch is also irresponsible.

Need to get on with it. It isn't getting cheaper, and you're losing ground against growth in demand.

Pg 19 - A4(a) - add + "reduce traffic in the Kenton neighborhood" Pg 27 - A1.1(i) - change "willy" to "will" Pg 37 - #6 - remove "the" from "Interstate Avenue" Still have not seen a great bridge design - consider offering a "reward" for best design in a competition. Need the fed funding of bridge and LRT together so that both can actually get built.

Widening I-5 to 3 lanes plus additional crossing for vehicles is a bad idea, moving congestion into neighborhoods.

Weaknesses



Perhaps these should receive even more attention and consideration. Public participation is good, but can always be improved. Visual impact must be considered on this option. Physical impacts are unavoidable. Rebuild plans should begin for Safeway, etc. Rebuilding ideas will help defer shock.

Financing - (how about congestion pricing?) Why is it that so many must cross the bridge to commute. If we could discourage that, we would not have these problems. Also, another root cause - population growth, is not addressed. If population keeps increasing 20 lanes at some point would not be enough.

Environmental impact review should be shortened. Minority and low income should have a option for moving people to improved and sometimes new locations rather than having to alter a plan and fit in with their present residences, which area often in a state of disrepair.

I feel we need to have a route trucks will travel more than cars. If we wait there will be more buildings to move & it will be harder. For now if we can not build then buy the roight of way and hold it. It will be less expensive than at a future date.

