

- P-041-001** | 1. The use of 2005 traffic volumes for the bridge traffic and transit ridership, etc. is inappropriate due to the availability of more current data for a 2011 EIS.
- P-041-002** | 2. The discussion of vehicle crashes (pg 3-23) for the bridge is incomplete, as it includes only motor vehicle crashes and not all vehicles (bicycles).
- P-041-003** | 3. On page 3-26 the discussion is incomplete, as it misses analysis of the adjoining public parking off street.
4. The analysis and discussion of future off street parking is missing the analysis of operation and maintenance cost of the new project park & ride facilities.
5. The analysis of the first and last mile access to transit stations is incomplete, as there is no comparison to bike sharing as an option vs. driving SOV, bus transfers, etc.
6. The EIS mentions that bicycle access to future LRT stations/ P+R will be facilitated along a bike route along Columbia Street (pg 3-41), but this facility is planned but not currently signed as a bike route yet. And the planned bike lane access along Columbia Street (Vancouver TSP/ VCCV) is threatened by addition of double turn lanes from Mill Plain couplet onto Columbia.
7. The EIS (section 3) discusses ADA and pedestrian improvements along the LRT route, but the analysis/ planned improvements is missing for station to station access (east to west across Main Street between Broadway to Washington or north to south on the other sections).
8. The discussion of future bike pedestrian access along/ across Fourth Plain to the north/south road to the Clark P+R (pg 3-42) is missing the proposed bike pedestrian facility from the Rose Village neighborhood along K Street dead end south of 26th St (west side of military graveyard), as discussed by the PBAC.
9. The discussion of future bike pedestrian access along/ across Fourth Plain to the new road to the Clark P+R (pg 3-42) is missing the proposed bike pedestrian facility from the Arnada neighborhood along G, H, & I Streets dead end, as discussed by the PBAC.
10. The discussion (pg 3-42) of future bike pedestrian access to future CRC built facilities (P+R, etc.), is missing the links to the SR500/ Leverich Park/ Discovery Middle School, as discussed by the PBAC.
11. The EIS content (Exhibit 3.1-26)) reporting planned/ proposed CRC bicycle pedestrian facility network to LRT stations in Vancouver is not equitable to that concerning the Portland jurisdiction, especially Hayden Island, given the PBAC input.
12. Page 3-50 analysis misses the option of the CRC project utilizing existing underutilized off street parking structure spaces (Vancouver Centre, etc.) vs. only discussing the hard use of future CRC stalls. The use of existing parking stalls (excess capacity) for the P+R could reduce the construction costs and minimize the loss of historical buildings along Columbia. The Vancouver Centre parking structure was enlarged to over 800 stalls vs. the smaller original structure and the 4th building has not been built nor is it likely to be built.
13. The discussion (pg 3-51) of the of the construction/ workzone impact mitigations does not go into enough detail, especially given the tools used during the Yellow Line construction.

P-041-001

The traffic volume cited in the FEIS (134,000 vehicles per day) was from a specific count conducted in October 2005 when all ramps and the mainline volumes were obtained simultaneously. The day in October 2005, which needed to be selected in advance for the major traffic counting effort, was within one percent of the average weekday traffic volume for the entire year (2005). Traffic volumes fluctuate and did decrease during some years. Traffic volumes obtained from the Oregon Department of Transportation's automatic traffic recorder (ATR) monitoring sites show that traffic volumes have, in fact, been increasing in the last few years. Whether the traffic volumes forecast for year 2030 will actually be achieved in that year should not be the only consideration. In its July 27, 2010 report, the Independent Review Panel expressed concerns about a longer horizon. The IRP commented, "The desirability of living in the Portland/Vancouver region is not going to diminish, so populations will continue to grow.... [T]he IRP believes the greatest risk in the decision-making process is not over-sizing the bridges but not building enough capacity for the next 100 years."

P-041-002

The section of the FEIS discusses vehicle crashes. Page 3-16 of the FEIS mentions the safety problems faced by bicyclists and pedestrians on the bridge.

P-041-003

Analysis of parking facilities will progress following the Record of Decision. There will be more specific assessment of the traffic and bike impacts at each site. The previous analyses have been more than sufficient to enable decision-making appropriate to the planning level of design. The project does not intend to utilize space in existing parking facilities as these have been constructed for other purposes, are not FTA facilities, and will presumably be more heavily utilized, consistent with the design projections which led to their sizing.

CRC EIS COMMENTS

Todd Boulanger, PO BOX 61542, Vancouver, WA 98666

P-041-003

14. Clarify the total effect of the Mill Plain lane closures (pg 3-51), as the text mentions a second turn lane onto Columbia, but this would effect important regional bicycle access to P+R stations (first and last mile).
15. There is no discussion of the work zone mitigations for continued bike lane access (pg 3-61).
16. Pgs 3-62 & 63 include an incomplete analysis of the mitigations for bike and pedestrian access due to parking.
17. There is inadequate discussion of the work zone/ closure mitigations developed during the bridge trunion repair project (Amtrak commuter rail, etc.) (pg 3-66).
18. The report analysis misses discussion of adding bikestation facilities to transit hubs in Vancouver and Hayden Island for the first and last mile access to LRT stations.
19. The EIS does not discuss why the minimum parking stall totals were increased between options and from the DEIS, thus enlarging the property takes.

You have asked about some very specific bike and pedestrian connections. The following details should answer your questions:

- The path between Rose Village and Fourth Plain, and the path between Fourth Plain and McLoughlin are planned project elements.
- The most direct route for the Arnada neighborhood to the proposed station on McLoughlin would be by way of G, H and I Streets directly to McLoughlin.
- No improvements are proposed on 39th Street in the LPA. A future project would complete the interchange at SR 500 by adding the ramps to and from the north, and would include improvements to 39th Street and allow the connections referenced to be made.