

From: [Carl and Barbara](#)
To: [Draft EIS Feedback](#);
CC:
Subject: re: bridge
Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 6:15:50 PM
Attachments:



P-0479-001

The bridge should be built. The problem is the bottleneck - an insufficient road system for the present (not to mention future) amount of traffic. Some council members' argument against building the bridge because of "urban sprawl" seems overreaching. If, because of better school systems, and housing, people choose to live in Washington and work in Oregon, it is bombastic for a council to wag its finger and punish those who make choices to better suit their families. It is doubtless people will continue to move to Washington and continue to work in Oregon - and just take longer to get from one place to another. Your job, it seems to me, is to make the best choices for the people in our region, providing appropriate roadways for trucks and people; not use your job as a bully pulpit to manipulate people into make choices that better suit the council's worldview. Give us some credit for making responsible and reasonable choices - it is presumptuous to do otherwise.

Regards,

Barbara Hultenberg

P-0479-001

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.