



From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2008 9:19:44 AM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97202
 Work Zip Code: 97214

Person:
 Other - Concerned Portlander

Person commutes in the travel area via:
 Bicycle
 Bus
 Car or Truck
 Walk

- P-0132-001**
1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 Supplemental Bridge
 2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
 Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland
 3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:
 Lincoln Terminus: Yes
 Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Yes
 Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: Yes
 Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes

Contact Information:
 First Name:
 Last Name:
 Title:
 E-Mail:
 Address:

,

P-0132-001

Preferences for specific alternatives or options, as expressed in comments received before and after the issuance of the DEIS, were shared with local sponsor agencies to inform decision making. Following the close of the 60-day DEIS public comment period in July 2008, the CRC project's six local sponsor agencies selected a replacement I-5 bridge with light rail to Clark College as the project's Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). These sponsor agencies, which include the Portland City Council, Vancouver City Council, TriMet Board, C-TRAN Board, Metro Council, RTC Board, considered the DEIS analysis, public comment, and a recommendation from the CRC Task Force when voting on the LPA.

With the LPA, new bridges will replace the existing Interstate Bridges to carry I-5 traffic, light rail, pedestrians and bicyclists across the Columbia River. Light rail will extend from the Expo Center MAX Station in Portland to a station and park and ride at Clark College in Vancouver. Pedestrians and bicyclists would travel along a wider and safer path than exists today.

For a more detailed description of highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements associated with the LPA, see Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

Comments:

- P-0132-002** | It is irresponsible to not give consideration to the effect of a replacement bridge on further sprawl into and around Vancouver. In the 21st century we should be thinking of ways to discourage this behavior, not support it.
- P-0132-003** | I believe a supplemental structure should only be built to carry light rail or the original historic bridge from 1917 should be converted to light rail/bicycle/pedestrian use with a supplemental bridge of no more than three through lanes used for vehicle traffic. Vehicles should all be tolled which would put the necessary pressure on though-truck traffic to use I-205 instead of I-5.
- P-0132-004** |

P-0132-002

As described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the DEIS and FEIS, and in the Indirect Effects Technical Report, highway capacity improvements and access improvements can induce development in suburban and rural areas that were not previously served, or were greatly underserved, by highway access. The DEIS outlines a comprehensive analysis of the potential induced growth effects that could be expected from the CRC project. A review of national research on induced growth indicates that there are six factors that tend to be associated with highway projects that induce sprawl. These are discussed in the Indirect Effects Technical Report. Based on the CRC project team's comparison of those national research findings to CRC's travel demand modeling, Metro's 2001 land use / transportation modeling, and a review of Clark County, City of Vancouver, City of Portland and Metro land use planning and growth management regulations, the DEIS and the FEIS conclude that the likelihood of substantial induced sprawl from the CRC project is very low. In fact, the CRC project, because of its location in an already urbanized area, the inclusion of new tolls that manage demand, the inclusion of new light rail, and the active regulation of growth management in the region, the CRC project will likely reinforce the region's goals of concentrating development in regional centers, reinforcing existing corridors, and promoting transit and pedestrian friendly development and development patterns.

In October, 2008, the project convened a panel of national experts to review the travel demand model methodology and conclusions, including a land use evaluation. The panel unanimously concluded that CRC's methods and the conclusions were valid and reasonable. Specifically, the panel noted that CRC would "have a low impact to induce growth...because the project is located in a mature urban area," and that it would "contribute to a better jobs housing balance in Clark County...a positive outcome of the project". These results are summarized in the "Columbia River Crossing Travel Demand Model Review

Report" (November 25, 2008).

In 2010, Metro ran the MetroScope model (an integrated land use and transportation model) to forecast growth associated with transportation improvements of a 12-lane river crossing and light rail to Clark College. Even with a 12-lane river crossing, the model showed only minimal changes in employment location and housing demand compared to the No-Build Alternative.

For a more detailed discussion regarding potential indirect land use changes as a result of the CRC project, including the likely land use changes associated with the introduction of light rail, please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the FEIS.

P-0132-003

A supplemental bridge that only includes improvements for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians does not meet the CRC project's Purpose and Need. As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the project's Purpose and Need "was developed by relying on previous planning studies, solicitation of public input, and coordination with stakeholder groups."

In addition to calling for improved bicycle, pedestrian and transit connectivity, the Purpose and Need also specifically states the need for improving highway freight mobility, travel safety and traffic operations, and the structural integrity of the existing bridges. These later needs would not be met by a supplemental bridge alternative that only provides for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians.

P-0132-004

Traffic modeling indicates that tolling I-5, but not I-205, would divert some traffic to I-205 although most trips would remain on I-5. However, under existing conditions, trips already divert to I-205 and would continue to do so under No-Build because of the unreliability of, and congestion

in, the I-5 corridor. With the CRC improvements to I-5, many of those diverted trips would shift to I-5 because it would be a shorter and more reliable trip than I-205. Tolling the I-5 crossing causes some trips to shift to I-205 in order to avoid the toll. The net difference in the number of trips crossing on I-205 is only slightly higher with the CRC project than without it.

With few exceptions, federal statutes do not permit tolling of an existing interstate highway without associated improvements. FHWA does have pilot programs that allow state departments of transportation to apply for the approval to toll a facility. The project sponsors are not proposing to toll the I-205 crossing as part of the CRC project. It is possible that a toll could be placed on the I-205 crossing in the future separate from the CRC project. Section 3.1 of the DEIS and FEIS discusses the effects of the project on traffic levels in the I-5 and I-205 corridors.

In addition, tolling prior to or during construction can be used to manage demand and begin collecting the revenue. This is not currently proposed but could be implemented if approved.