

00001

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING DRAFT EIS  
PUBLIC HEARING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2008

RED LION HOTEL  
VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON

00041

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

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

15 Thank you.

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

18 DVIJA MICHAEL BERTISH: You did fine  
19 earlier. Dvija Michael Bertish. I am at  
20 1514 East 29th Street in Vancouver. And I  
21 am -- personally I oppose the elements of  
22 the project that incorporate light rail or  
23 displacements of land acquisitions. I am  
24 also offering technical comments on behalf  
25 of Rosemary Neighborhood Association and



00042

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

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

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

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

25 There is no hydro-geologic analysis

00043

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

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

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

21       The draft references Burnt Bridge  
22 Creek several times including impairments,  
23 but only lists two parameters. The draft  
24 does not state that Burnt Bridge Creek is  
25 currently under a TMDL study and CRC

00044

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

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

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

20 HAL Dengerink: Thank you. Okay.  
21 The next three folks are David Palenshus,  
22 John Mohlis and John Felton. All right.  
23 Robert Ross.

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

00115

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
County of Clark)

I, Cathy S. Taylor, a notary public  
for the State of Washington do hereby  
certify that I transcribed to the best of  
my ability said proceedings written by me  
in machine shorthand and thereafter  
reduced to typewriting; and that the  
foregoing transcript constitutes a full,  
true and accurate record of said  
proceedings and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and notarial seal  
this 16th day of June, 2008.

---

Cathy S. Taylor, RPR, CSR  
Notary Public for the State of Washington  
My Commission expires April 15, 2009