

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

00060

1 that the other thing that I am sort of
2 bothered by is not only sort of just the
3 general, like, busting on you guys that's
4 been happening, but also I think that we
5 cannot let Pierce Airfield make a decision
6 of how tall a bridge should be. I think
7 it's matter of national security and also
8 an economic matter for this whole -- for
9 the whole northwest.

10 With that, thank you, Gentlemen.

11 HAL DENERINK: Thank you, Tadd.
12 Joe.

13 JOE CORTRIGHT: Joe Cortright,
14 Portland.

15 On reading the Draft Environmental
16 Impact Statement, I was struck that as a
17 work of literature it reminds me of Marcel
18 Proust's Remembrance of Things Past --
19 extraordinarily long turgid work written
20 in a foreign language obsessed with the
21 time gone by -- and one other thing, a
22 work of fiction.



23 I think there are 15 flaws in the
24 draft environmental impact statement and
25 I'll go through them quickly.

00061

1 I think it fails to comply with
2 Oregon State's transportation policy --
3 planned policy 1G that requires low cost
4 options to be implemented before --
5 COURT REPORTER: Slow down please.
6 JOE CORTRIGHT: If I get more
7 time, I will go slower.
8 -- Cost options to be implemented
9 before building a large project in
10 Washington's comparable policy.
11 It violates, two, Oregon's overall
12 use in greenhouse gases.
13 Three, Washington's statutory goal of
14 reducing greenhouse gasses.
15 Four, Washington statutory goal of
16 reducing per capita vehicle miles
17 traveled.
18 Five, the project uses improperly
19 inflated estimates of traffic by using the
20 same land use assumptions in the no build
21 alternative and the build scenarios, which
22 is incorrect.
23 It -- the EIS violates NEPA by
24 failing to give separate consideration to
25 transit alternatives and separate analysis

00062

1 of tolling. You have bundled all of the
2 alternatives. Under NEPA, you have to
3 look at all the alternatives separately.

4 It violates NEPA by failing to
5 advance the analysis of the A-Plus
6 Alternative and the Aorta Alternatives
7 that came through your process and were
8 reasonable alternatives.

9 It fails to account for the effect of
10 higher gas prices on travel demand, which
11 are already reduced in demand.

12 You failed to properly account for
13 induced demand that will occur as a result
14 of this project. You essentially assumed
15 it away in your analysis.

16 You have failed to allow for the
17 future implementation of carbon reduction
18 policies, either (inaudible) or carbon
19 trade that we -- carbon taxes that we know
20 will reduce future traffic demand.

21 You studiously ignored the decline in
22 traffic levels on I-5 over the last three
23 years -- down half a percent in 2006, 1.2
24 percent in 2007 and three percent the last
25 12 months.

00063

1 You violated public record laws of
2 Oregon and Washington by failing to
3 respond to my February 22nd request for --
4 in any timely or complete way, for all
5 documents relating to forecasts and
6 tolling.

7 You failed to analyze the opportunity
8 costs of spending 4 billion dollars on
9 this project and then not spending that
10 comparable amount of money on other
11 projects.

12 You do not have a realistic financial
13 plan for this project and you assume the
14 increase in federal taxes that do not
15 exist. You should know that -- you should
16 be honestly telling everyone in this room
17 that a bridge will not get built here
18 unless there is at least a five dollar
19 round trip peak hour toll.

20 If you are in favor of this bridge,
21 you have to be in favor of tolling it
22 because that is the only way that it will
23 be paid for.

24 And you have not been honest in
25 revealing the likelihood that you will

00064

1 also toll the I-205 bridge as part of this
2 project.

3 And you also have not produced an
4 investment grade toll forecast, one that
5 would be relied upon to issue bonds -- I
6 will be happy to revise and extend my
7 remarks in writing.

8 Thank you.

9 HAL DENGERINK: Joe, could you --
10 can you e-mail us a copy of that because I
11 don't think that our court reporter got a
12 lot of it. Thank you.

13 Okay. I want to bring up the next
14 three folks. Bob Wachter, Karen Axell
15 and -- sorry, I can't read it. It looks
16 like somebody who lives on 107th Street in
17 Vancouver.

18 Okay. Okay. Sorry about that.
19 Okay. Our court reporter has stepped out
20 a moment. The recording is going on.
21 Okay. So I would like to go ahead and
22 proceed here recognizing that we will be
23 able to transcribe this from the
24 recording.

25 Okay. So Frank.

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