



To CRC comments on EIS report.

A new interstate bridge over the Columbia river needs to be a safe utilitarian structure. It does not need to satisfy someone's aesthetic perception. However, a new bridge won't reduce congestion to the south of the bridge on the Oregon side of the river.

Light rail appears to be the certain choice for rapid transit. Once the rails are laid they will be permanent.

Bus rapid transit is a better choice.

Your plan to put the transit terminals in Vancouver neighborhoods doesn't make sense since a greater population lives outside of old Vancouver. This idea is stupid.

How will bringing commuters from miles away (east, north, west or south) into Vancouver reduce congestion on those roads? According to the EIS report light rail will reduce air pollutants by 30 to 90 percent in the year 2030 (but not in the sub-areas where the terminals are located.) I can hardly wait! But wait, the reduction in pollution will occur because of cleaner fuel NOT BECAUSE of LIGHT RAIL.

An increase of 2000 to 5000 more auto trips per day, perhaps a Lincoln terminal, would increase air pollution, water run-off to Burnt Bridge Creek, pollution of the Wash. St water well, would increase crime, would increase noise in this area from idling autos, would endanger school children, would increase parking on neighboring streets. With no mitigation for the neighborhood indicated.

As for actual construction of roads and facilities there are of course better business practices written on a piece of paper without enforcement these rules are useless.

I've been subjected to this mess three times since I moved here in 1950. During the construction of Pacific Pointe Apt. the neighboring houses were shaken and rattled without abatement. Objects fell from shelves. Three of us on this street have had our windows replaced (our cost) after that and I've had one ceiling repaired with two to go. During the road work close to 45<sup>th</sup> and main clouds of dust rose over the neighborhood with a water truck parked near but largely unused and unmanned. Lastly, last year my parents home was torn down and thrown away so people's right to drive where they chose could be accommodated, nice.

It's not just to expect a neighborhood to be forced to live with more air pollution, more crime, more noise.

It's sad that you would shove this into ANY neighborhood.

The Washington Policy Center lists five principles of responsible transportation policy. The second principle states that policies should improve the freedom of citizens to LIVE and work where they choose. Building a terminal one block from my home will inhibit the livability of the home I chose to live in so many years ago. The people's right to travel where they choose is clearly at odds with my right to live where I choose.

As I type this the sun is shining, an errant breeze is sighing through the trees wafting the sweet licorice fragrance of the wall flowers into the house, the mourning doves are mourning and the bumble bees are bumbling.

A transit terminal would be terminal to peace and quiet in any neighborhood. Why would you want to destroy a neighborhood "for a socialistic benefit where, supposedly, a greater collective good is created"?

Last phrase taken from second principle from the Washington Policy Center.

Regards, Jeannine DeGagne

RECEIVED

JUN 27 2008

Columbia River Crossing