


**From:** [Dennett, Chris](#)   
**To:** [Draft EIS Feedback;](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** North PDX Resident Feedback  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 27, 2008 9:38:22 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

- P-0470-001** This email is in my response to the Columbia River Crossing proposals.
- As a North Portland resident, I am opposed to any plan that encourages automotive traffic, does not include light rail, and does not include a toll. I am also oppose any plan where the State of Washington does not share 50% of the cost.
- P-0470-002**
- P-0470-003** The Washington residents who are Super Polluter Commuters from their cheap housing in Vancouver to their jobs in Portland, must contribute half of the cost of the solution. All the currently proposed solutions seem to benefit the State of Washington, will increase urban sprawl and traffic in southern Washington, and be in direct opposition to the environment advancements of Oregon.
- P-0470-004** The solution must include a long-term plan to pay for the project (ie a toll), a means to discourage automotive transportation (ie lightrail, pedestrian/bike paths and minimal car lane increase), is environmentally sound (ie a plan to subject all Super Polluter Commuters from Washington to be subjected to the same automotive emissions standards as those in Portland) and that maintains I-5 and Columbia river shipping needs.
- P-0470-005** I would also support a plan to add a toll immediately to the present bridge to create revenue to pay for a better researched solution.

Sincerely,

Chris Dennett  
 6835 N Wall Ave.  
 Portland, OR  
 97203  
 503.214.5264

### **P-0470-001**

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-0470-002**

Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS for a description of the current plans for funding construction and operation of the LPA. This discussion provides an updated assessment of likely funding sources for this project, though it is not common practice to receive funding commitments prior to completion of the alternative selection process. As described in the FEIS, project funding is expected to come from a variety of local, state, and federal sources, with federal funding and tolls providing substantial revenue for the construction. As Oregon and

**DISCLAIMER:**

This message is intended for the sole use of the addressee, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply email and delete this message.

Washington businesses and residents will benefit from the project's multi-modal improvements, both states have been identified as contributors to the project. As jurisdictions on both sides of the river seek to encourage non-auto travel, tolls are not anticipated for bikes, pedestrians, and transit users. Lastly, CRC assumes funds allocated to other projects and purposes would remain dedicated to those projects and purposes.

**P-0470-003**

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-0470-004**

The LPA would accomplish your stated goals and include the elements you favor. However, it would not include changing automotive emissions standards. Please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.10) of the FEIS for more information on projected emissions and air quality impacts.

**P-0470-005**

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 will be made by both the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions.