


**From:** [richard@hamje.net](mailto:richard@hamje.net)   
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC Submit Comments Page  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 20, 2008 7:27:23 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

From: Richard Hamje  
 E-Mail: [richard@hamje.net](mailto:richard@hamje.net)  
 Comment or Question:

**P-0418-001** I have recently been seeing conflicting data on bridge crossings. The CRC projects very high future demand for crossings, while ACTUAL crossing counts have been declining since 2006.

It seems that CRC has unstated assumptions about the future which are very questionable: gasoline prices remain low and stable for the next 20 years; residential expansion in Clark County continues at its record pace of 2005, not its lower historical pace; Portland never imposes restrictions or tolls on vehicle access to the city core; that no cultural stigma becomes associated with unnecessary driving. Any or all of these assumptions could easily prove to be wrong (the first two already are) and skew the resulting demand for crossings significantly lower.

**P-0418-002** I have not seen a convincing argument as to why the I-205 crossing is not suitable for I-5 truck traffic. I have no numbers, but I suspect that the majority of trucks bound for points south of Portland use I-205 today. If correct, this means that the I-5 truck traffic is local, and thus that the I-5 crossing is NOT imposing a large cost on interstate commerce as implied by CRC.

**P-0418-003** Finally, a new bridge will encourage more driving, and more suburban sprawl in Washington. We should not be spending gigantic sums to encourage behavior that is clearly not in our long-term interest.

**P-0418-004** For these reasons, I believe that the only reasonable alternative for CRC is the No-Build option. If Clark County wants to separately fund a transit crossing to the benefit of its residents, this would be a good thing for the region. Otherwise, the money could be better spent elsewhere.

Richard Hamje  
 Beaverton, OR

### **P-0418-001**

Traffic forecasts reported in the DEIS and used to inform decisions on a locally preferred alternative were derived from adopted regional employment and population forecasts and state-of-the-art modeling and evaluation conducted by Metro, RTC and the project team, and reviewed by all project sponsor agencies as well as FTA and FHWA. In addition, an independent panel of traffic modeling experts was convened in October 2008 to review the modeling methods and findings. These experts concluded that the project's approach to estimating future travel demand was reasonable and that it relied on accepted practices employed in metropolitan regions throughout the country. These findings are summarized in the "Columbia River Crossing Travel Demand Model Review Report" (November 25, 2008). This independent review confirmed the approach CRC modeling used to address multiple variables that can affect travel demand, including gasoline prices, tolling, travel demand measures and induced development.

### **P-0418-002**

The ability to efficiently move freight in the Vancouver/Portland region is critical to the overall health of our economy. As such, the CRC project is designed to improve freight mobility on I-5, as well as make it safer and easier for trucks to get on and off I-5 to reach businesses and Port facilities. The two ports are located very near to I-5, and rather distant from I-205. The Freight Working Group, comprised of representatives of the Vancouver-Portland metropolitan area's freight industry, met several times throughout the process to advise and inform the Columbia River Crossing project team about freight issues. The group provided insight, observation, and recommendation about the needs for truck access and mobility within the corridor; characterized the horizontal and vertical clearances, acceleration/deceleration, and stopping performance needs of trucks that must be accommodated; and provided meaningful comments on the effect of geometric, regulatory, and capacity changes on truck movements in the corridor. See Chapter 3 of the FEIS for

detailed discussion of how the project increases freight mobility and access along I-5 and in the region.

**P-0418-003**

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-0418-004**

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.