From:	morry@mailsnare.net
То:	Columbia River Crossing;
CC:	
Subject:	Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date:	Wednesday, June 25, 2008 9:14:12 PM
Attachments:	

Home Zip Code: 98671 Work Zip Code: 98671

Person:

Lives in the project area Works in the project area Commutes through the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via: Car or Truck

- 1. In Support of the following bridge options: Replacement Bridge Supplemental Bridge
- 2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options: Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland

 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: Morry Last Name: Secrest Title: E-Mail: morry@mailsnare.net Address: 1191 42nd St Washougal, WA 98671

Comments:

My recommendations regarding options for a new bridge across the Columbia River: 1) Disregard Pearson Airport and build the better bridge across the Columbia River.

We NEED the bigger bridge; we DON'T need Pearson airport. More people have crossed the bridge than have ever used the Pearson airport. Historical relevance of the airport? It already has a museum. The bridge has enough history that we could support a new museum. I don't want to minimize the importance of the Pearson airport; but its museum has already captured all of its glory and importance.

I rode in a small aircraft at Pearson Airport one afternoon, with an experience pilot. We were to take a brief trip to another small airport to the northeast, then return. However, the pilot found that there were so many restrictions and requirements on that day, that he was unable to do anything more than practice "touch and go" exercises for half an hour, basically circling the airport. My impression was that this airport is so restricted by safety requirements, and so hamstrung by FAA requirements, that it is all but useless. And, actually, rather dangerous. Better to close it down and move its function elsewhere, with more room and fewer restrictions.

Pearson Airport is already limited on all four sides by highways, hills, and industrial development. It cannot enlarge.

Pearson has limited utility.

Pearson has safety issues.

We already have three other small airports in the area, along with the magnificent Portland International Airport, all of which service small planes.

There are three other nearby airports which can service the same small-aircraft flying needs:

Mountaindale Airport, near Sunset Highway and Mountaindale Road, 503-282-9701

Robert L. Delaney airport, north of Lake Vancouver, West of I-5, north of Vancouver Lake; 503-573-5130

Fly For Fun airport, 8807 NE 142nd Ave Vancouver WA, 4 miles NE of Vancouver; 360-253-4850

2) Buy out Pearson Airport and close it; and augment the facilities at one or more of the other three.

Alternatively, there is another area which could really use the characteristics similar to the Pearson Airport.

That is, at a location north of Stevenson, Washington.

There is already a small airport just north of Stevenson, the KeyWay airport, 509-427-

8722.

If this one cannot be enlarged to match the Pearson, then I would suggest:

3) a new airport further north, along the Wind River Road.

The researchers watching Mount St. Helens, funded by the State of Washington to monitor the mountain, have the north side covered with access roads; but the south side has no fast coverage for those instances when the mountain rumbles and they want to get researchers up there in a hurry.

North of Carson, along Wind River Road, a small airport would afford excellent access to the south side of Mount St. Helens.

Plus, it will offer access to the amenities available at Stevenson (restaurants and motel).

4) Alternatively, money could be put into expanding the airport at Toledo, Washington. It is also moderately close to highways to Mount St. Helens, and in addition, is close to several areas which are undergoing expansion of industrial activities (and its concomitant, housing.) Thus, expansion here would pay for itself.

5) The money needed to improve existing airports or building a new one will be adequately covered by the profit from the sale of the land on which the current Pearson airport now sits. If nothing else, one may consider the profit from utilizing the entire area as a parking arena for viewing the July 4 fireworks extraveganza. Surely, leasing the area at 10-year increments to industrial expansion would bring much greater income.

Morry Secrest 360-835-7965