



From: NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 2:29:13 PM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 97202
 Work Zip Code: 97202

Person:
 Commutes through the project area

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

- P-0458-001**
1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 Do Nothing
 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:
 Last Name:
 Title:
 E-Mail:
 Address:

,

P-0458-001

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-0458-002** Strongly against additional freeway capacity. Sounds like a lot of money for a slight increase in capacity that will just encourage more sprawl in SW Washington.
- P-0458-003** Increase in capacity that will just encourage more sprawl in SW Washington.
- P-0458-004** Additional bus, rail, and bike transit is fine by me.
- P-0458-005** If we're going to replace the bridge, I'd be glad to spend a little extra for something more attractive than a viaduct.

P-0458-002

The proposed new add/drop lanes (i.e., lanes that connect two or more interchanges) are used to alleviate safety issues associated with the closely spaced interchanges in the project area and are not designed to increase capacity generally on I-5. 68 to 75% of I-5 traffic enters and/or exits I-5 within the CRC project area, and these add/drop lanes provide space for this traffic to do so without disrupting cars and trucks traveling to destinations further north and south of the project area. The project does not propose to add lanes north or south of the project limits.

The DEIS evaluation found that the project, with a toll and light rail, would actually reduce the total daily volume of traffic using the I-5 and I-205 river crossings by approximately 3%. The FEIS analysis of the project has been updated to include an evaluation of how the CRC project would affect Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.1). Rather than inducing sprawl, 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 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. The model showed only minimal changes in employment location and housing demand compared to the No-Build. For more information see FEIS Chapter 3, Section 3.4.

P-0458-003

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-0458-004

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.

P-0458-005

The CRC project design for interchanges, roadway elements, transit stations, and other facilities 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. All UDAG meetings are open to the public to attend and observe. 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 will provide input and guidance on integrating the new facilities with the surrounding community. This work includes identifying significant iconography (for example, symbols and patterns) that will reflect the history of the area, the Native American communities, early pioneers, or other significant themes. These images will be incorporated into an art master plan. Additional discussion of bridge designs can be found in Chapter 2 of the FEIS and in the Visual and Aesthetics Technical Report supporting the FEIS.