

## P-0213-001

The evaluation of the five alternatives in the DEIS was preceded by an extensive evaluation and screening of a wide array of possible solutions to the CRC project's Purpose and Need statement. Chapter 2 of the DEIS (Section 2.5) explains how the project's Sponsoring Agencies generated ideas and solicited the public, stakeholders, other agencies, and tribes for ideas on how to meet the Purpose and Need. This effort produced a long list of potential solutions, many of which were non-auto oriented options such as various transit modes and techniques for operating the existing highway system more efficiently without any capital investment. These options were evaluated for whether and how they met the project's Purpose and Need, and the findings were reviewed by project sponsors, the public, agencies, and other stakeholders. Alternatives that included only TDM/TSM strategies, or provided only transit improvements, would provide benefits, but could only address a very limited portion of the project's purpose and need. This extensive analysis found that in order for an alternative to meet the six "needs" included in the Purpose and Need (described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS), it had to provide at least some measure of capital improvements to I-5 in the project area. Alternatives that did not include such improvements did not adequately address the seismic vulnerability of the existing I-5 bridges, traffic congestion on I-5, or the existing safety problems caused by sub-standard design of the highway in this corridor. The DEIS evaluated alternatives with more demand management (higher toll) and increased transit service with less investment in highway infrastructure improvements (Alternatives 4 and 5) compared to the toll and transit service levels included in Alternatives 2 and 3. The additional service and higher toll provided only marginal reductions in I-5 vehicle volumes, and they came primarily at the cost of greater traffic diversion to I-205. This analysis found that a more balanced investment in highway and transit, as represented by Alternatives 2 and 3, performed considerably better on a broad set of criteria.

	02142	2 of 2
	2. WI	HAT HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT MODE DO YOU SUPPORT? (please check any that you would support)
<b>5</b> _(		Bus rapid transit between Vancouver and Portland
		X Light rail between Vancouver and Portland
		Do not add high capacity transit between Vancouver and Portland
		No opinion
	3. WO	DILD YOU SUPPORT BRINGING BUS RAPID TRANSIT OR LIGHT RAIL TO THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS?
	(ple	e sse check any that you would support)
		No Yes No Unsure Opinion
		Lincoln Terminus (39th and Main)
		kiggins Bowl Terminus (I-5 and 45th)
		Mill Plain MOS Terminus (15th and Main)
	DO	YOU WANT TO STAY INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT?   Optional
	English State	YES NO Would you like to be added to the project mailing list?
	Name	e (First & Last Name, Organization)
		without the transmission of the change of the collection of the collection
	Addre	ess (Street, City, State, Zip)
	E-mai	(euter address to receive monthly electronic updates)
	Estations	
	Bert Charles Cont	
		Thank you!
		Give this form to project staff or return to the project office:
		Postal Mail Fax
		Columbia River Crossing Project 360-737-0294
	C/0	O Heather Gundersen, Environmental Manager  700 Washington Street, Suite 300  Durffel Street Residual Control of the Street
		Vancouver, WA 98660
		Draft EIS information Submit Online Comments  www.ColumbiaRiverCrossing.org
	W	www.columbiarivercrossing.org/CurrentTopics/ www.ColumbiaRiverCrossing.org  DraftEIS.aspx
		Comments must be postmarked by July 1, 2008
		Oregon Department of Transportation  Washington State Department of Transportation  Hondout 050808
		Mandair College

## P-0213-002

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 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-0213-003

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.