

## **Harris, Brendan J CDR USCG D13 (USA)**

---

**From:** Ley, Rep. John <John.Ley@leg.wa.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 10:55 AM  
**To:** Harris, Brendan J CDR USCG D13 (USA)  
**Cc:** Wilson, Sen. Jeff; Quam, Dana; O'Neill, Anne  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Interstate Bridge Replacement NIR for 116'

Commander Harris:

I recently became aware of the I-5 Interstate Bridge Replacement (IBR) program submitting an updated Navigation Impact Report (NIR) to your office. I understand your office is negatively impacted due to the federal shutdown and civilian staff are not available to begin evaluating the proposal.

First – I want to applaud the current Coast Guard position on the IBR proposal over the Columbia River – you seek to protect the current 178 feet of clearance for marine vessels and would prefer “unlimited” clearance. I want to encourage you to stand firm. I am very much opposed to the current proposal offering 116 feet of clearance – 62 feet too low.

It is possible to satisfy your appropriate requirements with either an immersed tube tunnel (ITT) or a bascule bridge. The IBR team have not seriously considered these, especially an ITT. Their alleged analysis was done simply to discredit other viable options.

Transportation architect Kevin Peterson has created a 3<sup>rd</sup> alternative that would match the 144' foot clearance of the I-205 Glenn Jackson Bridge, “if” there were truly a need for a “compromise” proposal. He would repurpose the current two historic bridges as a local “collector distributor” for Vancouver and Hayden Island traffic ([here](#)), thereby adding vehicle capacity to the corridor and improving travel times for cars and trucks.

There are viable alternatives that either meet your request and requirement to protect maritime commerce and vessels or offer a much higher compromise. Please reject the current IBR request for 116 feet of clearance on the Columbia River at the I-5 Interstate Bridge.

Sincerely,

John Ley  
360-786-7812