

Joint Interim Committee On The Interstate 5 Bridge

PUBLIC COMMENT

The IBR recently posted the following **three lies** on both their Twitter and Facebook sites.

Why isn't a tunnel a feasible solution for our program?

Lie #1

It would eliminate important connections to Hayden Island, downtown Vancouver and SR-14.

At the riverbanks a bridge must come down from +100 feet, an immersed tunnel will come up from only -20 feet. A bridge will require massive new \$500 million interchanges on both Hayden Island and Vancouver. An immersed tunnel can connect to current interchanges, saving a billion on new interchanges. The world's most beautiful cities Hong Kong, Sydney, and Gothenburg have all built multiple immersed tunnels to protect their city waterfronts

Lie #2

It would cost more than a replacement bridge.

The IBR's estimate is based on its "Tunnel Concept Assessment", a worthless report that evaluated an immersed tunnel under the wrong barge channel location. Both British Columbia (Fraser River) and Denmark (Baltic Sea) have recently evaluated the cost of a bridge against an immersed tunnel. Both found a tunnel cheaper and greener. In 2020 Gothenburg completed the six-lane, 1,000-foot Marieholm Tunnel for \$225 million. San Francisco's Bay Bridge cost \$6.5 billion, \$5 billion over estimate and ten years late.

Lie #3

It comes with significantly more environmental impacts.

A bridge requires new massive half-billion-dollar elevated interchanges on both Hayden Island and Vancouver. These will cause visual blight, plus air and noise pollution to rain down the cities and river for a hundred years. An immersed tunnel will give a quiet Columbia River and less noise on both riverbanks. It will also allow for a riverfront-walk park. A bridge will also require six 75-foot wide pile caps at the river surface restricting the flow of the river.

Respectfully
Bob Ortblad MSCE, MBA