

**From:** [NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org](mailto:NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 20, 2008 11:04:19 PM  
**Attachments:**

---



Home Zip Code: 97267  
 Work Zip Code: 97223

Person:  
 Other - Live near the project area

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

**P-0415-001**

1. In Support of the following bridge options:  
 None
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: 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:

,

Comments:

**P-0415-001**

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.

- P-0415-002** Building a new bridge will only encourage more people to move to Clark County and commute to Portland. Any small gains for the environment because of smoother moving traffic will soon be wiped out by increased traffic. In a shorter time than most people think we will be back to the same slow moving traffic only this time we will have 12 lanes of slow moving traffic!
- P-0415-003** Increasing lanes and hence encouraging more driving makes no sense in these times of global warming, stated goals to reduce carbon emissions and dependance on foreign oil (or converting food crops into fuel for that matter).
- P-0415-004** There is an option that is not being considered here that would make more sense. Toll the existing bridge and use the money to improve the on ramps and other hazards and to improve bike/ped access. Tolls will increase motivation for Clark County residents to use transit and Bus Rapid Transit will make it more attractive.
- P-0415-005** I would also support a light rail only supplemental bridge.

**P-0415-002**

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-0415-003**

The DEIS included an evaluation of how this project would affect emission of greenhouse gases that found the project could slightly reduce future emissions by reducing the total number of vehicles crossing the river and by limiting congestion that can lower vehicles’ efficiency. The project reduces trips by providing light rail transit and using tolling (a necessary funding component) as a traffic management tool. The FEIS updates this evaluation and includes various potential measures for providing additional reduction of greenhouse gases (see FEIS Chapter 3 Section 3.19). In addition, a significant portion of the project’s cost is expected to come from federal funding sources and from toll revenue that would not necessarily be available to Oregon without this project.

**P-0415-004**

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project’s Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) explains how the project’s Sponsoring Agencies generated

ideas and solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, and tribes for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, many of which were non-auto oriented options such as various transit modes and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently without any capital investment. After identifying this wide array of options, the project evaluated whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and found that in order for an alternative to meet the six "needs" included in the Purpose and Need (described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS), it had to provide at least some measure of capital improvements to I-5 in the project area. Alternatives that did not include such improvements in the highway generally did not adequately address the seismic vulnerability of the existing I-5 bridges, traffic congestion on I-5, or the existing safety problems caused by sub-standard design of the highway in this corridor. Also, travel demand modeling and traffic analysis demonstrated that alternatives with substantially more transit service and only minor highway capacity improvements, had only marginal differences in transit ridership and auto demand, but had substantially greater congestion, emissions, and highway safety problems.

Regarding tolling, modeling has indicated that tolling I-5 without making the improvements that are part of the CRC project would not meet the project's purpose and need. This does not mean that some form of tolling prior to constructing CRC couldn't be implemented. The ultimate decision on any tolling options must be made by both the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions.

**P-0415-005**

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.