From:	NoEmailProvided@columbiarivercrossing.org
То:	Columbia River Crossing;
CC:	
Subject:	Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date:	Tuesday, June 03, 2008 3:29:04 PM
Attachments:	

Home Zip Code: 98660 Work Zip Code: 98661 Person: Lives in the project area Works in the project area Commutes through the project area Person commutes in the travel area via: Walk 1. In Support of the following bridge options: P-0852-001 Replacement Bridge 2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options: Bus Rapid Transit between Vancouver and Portland 3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location: Lincoln Terminus: No Kiggins Bowl Terminus: Yes Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Clark College (MOS) Terminus: Yes Contact Information: First Name: Last Name: Title:

> E-Mail: Address:

Comments:

1 of 2 P-0852-001

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.

02457

P-0852-002	I do not support the Lincoln terminus, especially the Main Street alternative. It would
	split the neighborhood in two losing the charm of the area, create a problem for
	residential/business street parking, and gone would be local events that use Main Street.
I	The street is too small to support the required structure for light rail. We need to move
P-0852-003	people quickly and numerous stops with an alignments along side of traffic will not
	achieve this goal. To reduce traffic congestion on I-5 we need to get people from the
	North that go into Portland out of their cars and into fast efficient transportation. A
1	system that goes through the heart of vancouver and has numerous stops in Vancouver
P-0852-004	
P-0852-005	Lightrail also has to be affordable and not a burden on taxpayers.

P-0852-002

2 of 2

Please refer to response to comment P-0852-001.

P-0852-003

The Clark College transit terminus was chosen by project sponsors as part of the LPA in July 2008, as it was deemed to most effectively balance the cost of the project and the projected community benefits.

RTC's Clark County High Capacity Transit System Study, published in December of 2008, analyzed specific high-capacity transit improvements that could connect with existing and future transit facilities and be extended throughout Clark County To view their Final HCT System Study, visit RTC's website at www.rtc.wa.gov.

P-0852-004

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River, and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why a third corridor, arterial crossing of the Columbia River, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need. For a general description of the screening process see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS. It should be noted that every proposal received from the public was considered, and many of the proposals that were dropped from further consideration included elements that helped shape the alternatives in the DEIS.

P-0852-005

As described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.1) of the DEIS, the operations and maintenance (O&M) costs associated with light rail (LRT) would be less than those associated with bus rapid transit (BRT), largely because LRT operates on electricity while BRT is dependent on the volatile fuel market. LRT costs approximately \$3.50, or 31%, less than BRT, per incremental rider when comparing both capital and operating costs.

Long-term operation and maintenance of the new light rail line will be funded through C-TRAN and TriMet. For more information on how O&M costs will be shared between TriMet and C-TRAN, and how C-TRAN may finance these additional costs, please see Chapter 4 of the FEIS.