

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:

L-005-001 | 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:

L-005-002 | I have, as one Washington County Commission, a number of comments, concerns and questions:



L-005-001

Thank you for your comment. 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.

L-005-002

The protection of Pearson Field, although important from the perspective of historic resource protection, the local economy, the provision of public services, and preferences stated by the City of Vancouver, is not the only factor influencing bridge heights over the Columbia River. Possible intrusions into Portland International Airport airspace, maintenance of marine navigation, construction staging, maintaining I-5 traffic, and constraints imposed by the location and alignment of the river crossing all constrain the ultimate design of the bridge. The upstream river crossing alignment was dropped for further consideration in October 2007. The downstream option has a curved alignment primarily for construction staging purposes, and connecting into existing I-5. The curved alignment limits the feasibility of several different structure types.

Since the publication of the DEIS, the Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) met multiple times to discuss the design of the bridges and ultimately endorsed the two-bridge concept in January 2009 and also endorsed the open-web concept in September of 2009. The Project Sponsors Council endorsed a two-bridge option in June of 2009, and also endorsed the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee recommendations for a covered pathway with the conditions of the maintenance and security plan in September of 2009. Then in February 2011, the CRC Bridge Review Panel recommended that the project discontinue work on the open-web concept and instead select either a composite deck truss, tied arch or cable-stayed bridge type. Following additional analysis and outreach, the governors, in April 2011, announced selection of the composite deck truss as the preferred bridge

L-005-002 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?

L-005-003 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.

L-005-004 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

type. For a more detailed description of the limitations and opportunities that influenced the bridge type selection process, please see Technical Screening Study Final Report December 2008, Aesthetic Screening Study Final Report March 2009, Final Type Study Report October 2009, CRC Project Bridge Review Panel Report, February 2011, CRC: Key Findings and Recommendation Related to Bridge Type, February 2011 and the memo from the governors offices – Moving Forward; CRC Background, Bridge-type Major Factors, Next Steps, April 2011. Much of this information is also summarized in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

L-005-003

The CRC project design for the new bridge will be context-sensitive and reflect the unique character of the surrounding area. CRC formed a 14-member, bi-state Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG), made up of design professionals and neighborhood representatives. The goals of the UDAG include, achieving "design excellence that can be embraced by affected communities and users" and providing "a landmark bridge that is both inspired and inspiring and fully integrates the design and function of the structure with the urban design elements." Working closely with project designers, UDAG is providing input and guidance on integrating the new facilities with the surrounding community.

The height limitations of the proposed bridge are the result of the Portland International Airport as well as Pearson Field. Neither airport can be relocated as there are very few alternate locations that are feasible based on the numerous requirements of such a facility. The Pearson field serves many purposes and is not being preserved simply because of its historic significance. The project does not wish to displace any homes or commercial enterprises, doing so only when it is unavoidable.

Despite the height limitations, the project team is working with noted architects, designers, and planners to develop a compelling gateway

L-005-004 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 I-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 I-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

which could feature local imagery, wind turbines, and other elements that will highlight the uniqueness of our region.

L-005-004

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.