

From: dick_schouten@co.washington.or.us
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Friday, June 27, 2008 3:33:21 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97007
Work Zip Code: 97124-3072

Person:

Person commutes in the travel area via:

Bicycle
Car or Truck



1. In Support of the following bridge options:
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
 - Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland
 - Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland
3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:
 - Lincoln Terminus: No Opinion
 - Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion
 - Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion
 - Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

First Name: Dick
Last Name: Schouten
Title: Washington County Commissioner
E-Mail: dick_schouten@co.washington.or.us
Address: 155 N. First Avenue, Suite 300 MS 22
Hillsboro, OR 97124

Comments:

I have, as one Washington County Commission, a number of comments, concerns and questions:

First, can operations at the present Pearson Field be modified so that Pearson can be used by roughly the same number of present users, while still allowing a Columbia River Crossing bridge (CRC) to be built into Pearson's present airspace?

A CRC will necessarily be a gateway for Oregon and Washington, the Cities of Portland and Vancouver, and for the entire Portland/Vancouver/Beaverton Metropolitan Area. A CRC will necessarily be located on the American West Coast's principal highway and international connector, and necessarily cross or span one of the world's greatest rivers within view of Mt. Hood and the Columbia River Gorge.

The present CRC bridge replacement option fails aesthetically as a world class gateway or river crossing. The present replacement option is utterly unworthy of the phrase "Emerald Gate" recently used in an Oregonian newspaper editorial.

These aesthetic considerations also have enormous economic significance. What economic values for example have: the Golden Gate Bridge provided to the City and County of San Francisco, the Brooklyn Bridge to New York City, and the Sydney Harbour Bridge to Sydney because of those bridges' aesthetics?

The above aesthetic/economic considerations greatly outweigh the present value of Pearson Airfield's current location and operations. But if Pearson Field was to be re-located, a compelling monument and/or other appropriate commemoratives ought to be built, clearly visible and worthy of the present Field's clear historical significance.

I also have a number of questions regarding a whole other set of other CRC considerations:

Does the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require ODOT and WSDOT to account for CRC induced land use development in places such as Clark County, northern Portland and Oregon's Washington and Clackamas Counties while doing their analysis of CRC bridge options?

Is it true that traffic forecasters involved in planning and studying the present CRC bridge options assumed a new 12-lane bridge would not trigger any more housing and/or job growth than would be the case with the present 1-5 Columbia River bridges?

Has and/or will ODOT and WSDOT respond to the warnings regarding housing demand and job growth found in that 2001 document cited in the June 22, 2008 Oregonian newspaper as "Findings and Policy Recommendations Report of the land use Committee of the Portland/Vancouver 1-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership"?

If ODOT and WSDOT has analyzed and/or responded to the warnings in the above

Findings and Policy Recommendations, what are those responses and analyses? And how would they best summarize them?

If ODOT and WSDOT will be responding to the above Findings and Policy Recommendations when will those responses be publicly available?

If available, what is ODOT and WSDOT's analysis and conclusions if any, regarding the present CRC bridge options and their respective effects upon future land use development in the Portland/Vancouver/Beaverton Metropolitan Area?

If ODOT and WSDOT will not be responding to those Findings and Policy Recommendations, then why will they not be responding?

Again as one Washington County Commissioner, (representing Aloha, Beaverton and Cooper Mountain), I am concerned about the effect of capacity increases along the 1-5 corridor, more specifically the effect of a CRC/I-5 Project on housing and job development in Washington County generally, and Aloha, Beaverton and Cooper Mountain in particular.

"If Oregon 217 in Beaverton is not widened and the Sunrise Corridor in Clackamas County isn't built, 'then the effect of the capacity increases in the 1-5 corridor would be greater,' the [Findings and Policy Recommendations] report states." (Please see the Oregonian of June 22, 2008, at page A13.)

Given the huge costs for CRC bridges, funding CRC may well place future funding for OR 217 and Sunrise Corridor Projects in great jeopardy. CRC's high costs, a number of possible negative CRC related land use consequences and transportation projects aborted elsewhere in the region may then mutually reinforce the possibility of the others' negative consequences.

Washington County Commissioner Dick Schouten

