

From: ann.dave.palenshus@comcast.net
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#)
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Tuesday, May 06, 2008 8:02:31 AM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 98642
 Work Zip Code: 97228

Person:
 Commutes through the project area

Person commutes in the travel area via:
 Car or Truck

**P-0079-001**

1. In Support of the following bridge options:
 Supplemental Bridge
2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:
 Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland
3. 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: Ann
 Last Name: Palenshus
 Title:
 E-Mail: ann.dave.palenshus@comcast.net
 Address: 17111 NW 69th Ave
 Ridgefield, WA 98642

P-0079-002

Comments:
 We need mass transit, preferably light rail, across both the I-5 and I-205 bridges to mend the gap of growth and commerce that exist between Washington and Oregon. For the I-

P-0079-001

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.

P-0079-002

The CRC Project is focused on providing a high-capacity transit option through downtown Vancouver to Clark College. RTC has completed a High-Capacity Transit System Study which recommends specific high-capacity transit improvements, including light rail, bus rapid transit and bus service improvements that will best serve Clark County residents in the mid-term (by 2030) and long-term (beyond 2030). To view their Final HCT System Study, visit RTC's website at www.rtc.wa.gov. Though

P-0079-002 | 5, we are so close, as Metro goes to the convention center, and it is just a couple of miles away from connecting with I-5 into Vancouver, WA. There is even a separate rail bridge
P-0079-003 | just a bit further west of I-5 that could be considered for light rail commuter traffic. For
P-0079-004 | the I-205 bridge, the Metro is already at the airport, so connecting over to Vancouver would broaden the base of commerce for commuters on that side of the river.

these recommendations are designed to connect with CRC transit improvements, they are not part of the CRC project.

P-0079-003

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-0079-004

Please see response to comment P-0079-002.