02668 1 of 6

00001	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING DRAFT EIS
8	PUBLIC HEARING
9	
10	WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2008
11	
12	RED LION HOTEL
13	VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

02668 2 of 6

selling its appeal to the majority of the population who would use it and no convincing proof that light rail is the best and only viable solution for interstate traffic flowing faster across the I-5 corridor, for less congestion and for greater highway safety.

The mayor said it's wasting taxpayers' money to answer any more questions. I'm a tax payer. The cost of a thorough and honest assessment of this issue is certainly a drop in the bucket compare to the billions of dollars I hear the project will ultimately cost.

Thank you.

HAL DENGERINK: Thank you, Debra. I don't know how to pronounce your name.

DVIJA MICHAEL BERTISH: You did fine earlier. Dvija Michael Bertish. I am at 1514 East 29th Street in Vancouver. And I am -- personally I oppose the elements of the project that incorporate light rail or displacements of land acquisitions. I am also offering technical comments on behalf of Rosemary Neighborhood Association and



02668 3 of 6

Columbia River Keeper. I also ask for an extension of the public comment period -- I echo that sentiment -- and I think that the Environmental Impact Statement is technically inadequate.

As a major federal project over a major water body and through a sensitive aquifer area, there is no reference in the EIS to hydro-geologic studies. Water modeling, impacts of construction on the river, and the NEPA process requires an EIS to address these major components in a single environmental document before a record of decision is issued. The draft is not compliant with this requirement.

NEPA does not allow for the compartmentalization of project components and multiple documents to avoid substantive review.

The document briefly mentions sole source aquifer designation and then states it is EPA's job to ensure public health and safety standards and compliance with sole source protection.

There is no hydro-geologic analysis

2.4

presented in the draft which insures compliance with the project under sole source review. EPA is not supposed to do your background job for you.

There is no mention of the proximity of Vancouver Lake to the project just downstream. Any disturbance of river sediment will flow right into our river and into the lake via the Flushing Channel. The lake is currently under preliminary site assessment with EPA for superfund status and no downstream effects are even mentioned in this project in the draft.

There is also no mention of existing superfund sites and proximity to the bridge area including ground water plumes and their potential effects from environmental disturbances of this magnitude.

The draft references Burnt Bridge Creek several times including impairments, but only lists two parameters. The draft does not state that Burnt Bridge Creek is currently under a TMDL study and CRC 02668 5 of 6

should coordinate water quality monitoring and erosion control in coordination with Ecology's efforts currently underway.

Parameters should be expanded to include all of those listed in the study with Ecology. There are no long-term impacts listed that are in 3.19.9 that talk about the possibility of long-term subsidies of the public for maintenance and operations of light rail. And I personally can't afford to pay more taxes on that.

Finally, the draft list census data for the Metropolitan area as a whole -- this is insufficient. Every neighborhood that this project goes through is an environmental justice community and it requires different data than a group data set.

HAL DENGERINK: Thank you. Okay. The next three folks are David Palenshus, John Mohlis and John Felton. All right. Robert Ross.

24 ROBERT ROSS: My name is Robert 25 Ross, 1111 West 22nd Street, Vancouver.

00115	
1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON)
4	County of Clark)
5	
6	I, Cathy S. Taylor, a notary public
7	for the State of Washington do hereby
8	certify that I transcribed to the best of
9	my ability said proceedings written by me
10	in machine shorthand and thereafter
11	reduced to typewriting; and that the
12	foregoing transcript constitutes a full,
13	true and accurate record of said
14	proceedings and of the whole thereof.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	Witness my hand and notarial seal
20	this 16th day of June, 2008.
21	
22	Cathy S. Taylor, RPR, CSR
23	Notary Public for the State of Washington
24	My Commission expires April 15, 2009
25	