

The Columbia River Crossing Does Not Qualify for Federal Funding

For the following reasons:

- P-080-001** | 1. A range of highway and transit alternatives thoroughly studied though construction. With cost, benefit, and impacts identified has not taken place
2. Reasonable alternatives accepted into the NEPA Scoping process were removed without consideration or study.
3. 4(f) Historic Resource avoidance if it is prudent or feasible to construct in a different place. It is both prudent and feasible to construct the Third Bridge "port to port" connector. The Columbia River Crossing current "Locally Preferred Alternative" removes up to 20 Historical properties. The Third Bridge was removed from the process without being considered.
4. Purpose and Needs avoidance of impacts to I-5 freeway, residential, retail, and commercial area is not being followed. There are several less impacts with a Third Bridge Alignment avoidance of 4(f) Historic Resources, no construction congestion on I-5 Freeway, removes traffic from I-5, fewer impacts in downtown Vancouver, no removal of business and residences on Jantzen Beach, in Oregon it is mostly bare, vacant, and publicly own land.
- P-080-002** | 5. No No-Build Alternative or Baseline applied to project. No-Build Alternative as required was not developed or studied. NO ACTION is different than a No-Build Alternative
- P-080-003** | 6. Light rail does not go to the 5 key service area's. To service an area the location must be with in ½ mile of the High Capacity Transit stop. Only one area is serviced the central city. The central city location is not a destination it is a transfer for regional and other areas.
- P-080-004** | 7. Navigational safety issues of marine and airspace are not constrained with the Third Bridge located 1 mile further west from the current bridges.
- P-080-005** | 8. Cost and Benefit anlysis has not been complete on this project. Vacant land cost less than buying property, removing people, removing business, residents, and preparing the land for construction. Up to 7 years of construction on I-5 freeway will damage the national economy as well as the region and our two States. Putting money into infrastructure not into tearing down properties currently in use.

Thank you, kindly
Sharon Nasset Third Bridge Now . com

P-080-001

Please see Chapter 5 of the FEIS for the Section 4(f) Evaluation. The "Avoidance Alternatives" discussion starts on page 5-60. Also see the responses provided to Ms. Nasset's comments made on the DEIS, and the response to Ms. Nasset's FEIS comment letters P-077 and P-079.

P-080-002

A No-Build Alternative was studied in the DEIS and FEIS. See description of the No-Build Alternative in Section 2.4 of the FEIS, and analysis of impacts in Chapter 3.

P-080-003

The light rail alignment associated with the LPA was chosen by project partners to maximize ridership and to offer an alternate means of transportation to driving a vehicle in the I-5 corridor. It is expected that the CRC project will qualify for federal funding.

P-080-004

The Bi-State Industrial Corridor does not adequately meet the project's purpose and need. Also see responses to Ms. Nasset's other FEIS comment letters, including P-077.

P-080-005

The project has completed a benefit cost analysis. It can be reviewed at, or a copy obtained from, the project office.

Economic impacts, as well as the impacts and costs associated with property acquisition and relocation, are discussed in the FEIS.