

**Hines, Maurice**

---

**From:** Robert Dean [robert@deansurveying.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 16, 2011 9:37 PM  
**To:** Columbia River Crossing  
**Subject:** FEIS failed to address my concerns

**Categories:** Orange Category

P-014-001

The FEIS failed to address concerns I raised in January 2011 at at meeting with Don Wagner and Thayer Rorabaugh.

This was their response. On construction mitigation they pledged to keep 3 lanes open throughout. That would be possible if people heed the admonition to choose alternative routes.

Ken Cassavant was the prof I contacted. I have not heard of his findings.

Robert Dean  
7101 NE 74th Ave.,  
Vancouver WA 98662  
(360) 892 2600

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Wagner, Don" <[WagnerD@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:WagnerD@wsdot.wa.gov)>  
**Date:** January 4, 2011 3:09:05 PM PST  
**To:** <[robert@deansurveying.com](mailto:robert@deansurveying.com)>, <[leavitt@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:leavitt@cityofvancouver.us)>  
**Cc:** "Rorabaugh, Thayer" <[thayer.rorabaugh@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:thayer.rorabaugh@cityofvancouver.us)>, "Holmes, Eric" <[eric.holmes@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:eric.holmes@cityofvancouver.us)>, <[jeanne.harris@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:jeanne.harris@cityofvancouver.us)>, <[wagnerd@columbiarivercrossing.com](mailto:wagnerd@columbiarivercrossing.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: meeting with Don Wagner

Robert, thank you taking the time to discuss your thoughts on the CRC project with me yesterday. After reading your memo to Mayor Leavitt I thought it best to clarify a couple of issues in that memo.

First, in a couple of places you interpreted my comments related to the work of Bridge Expert Review Panel (BRP) to mean that I felt the Panel or the CRC project might be going with the "Kevin Peterson" design or that I don't believe anything will be built. That was not my intent. My comments were to convey that the BRP is looking a many different options for bridge design and alignment and at this time I don't know what they will ultimately put in their report. The BRP report will be processed through the local partners and ultimately will inform what bridge types are included in the FEIS. While I may not know which bridge

**P-014-001**

It is not clear what Mr. Dean believes the FEIS failed to address in this portion of his letter and the letter from Mr. Wagner to him. It is also unclear why Mr. Dean believes that three lanes on I-5 can be kept open during construction only if people choose alternative routes. Regardless, the project is committed to keeping three lanes open in both directions during construction. As the construction plans are further developed, we will work with interested citizens and neighborhoods on the specific details.

type will finally be built, I believe we were going to take the CRC project through to construction.

In your seventh paragraph you credit me with the following quote; "Tell it to the Columbian editorial board." While I agree that a comment very similar to this was made at the meeting, it was not made by me. As I was not the one who made the statement, I suggest you check with the person who made the statement on his exact wording and context.

In the eighth paragraph you indicate that I was meeting with the feds to find out who was the lead agency on the project. There is no question as to which Federal agencies are the lead agencies on this project. The Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration (both divisions of the US Department of Transportation) are the lead agencies. They published the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in 2008 and they will publish the Final Environmental Impact Statement. They will ultimately issue the Record of Decision on the project.

In the ninth paragraph you indicate that my reference to the project being an issue in the last election might be "alluding to the election of Jaime Herrera I think". My comment was much broader than that. Several candidates at the local, state and federal level on both sides of the Columbia included positions on the CRC project in their campaigns.

Lastly, the BRP will be holding their last group work session on January 18 and 19. Their report is not scheduled to be delivered until January 31, 2011.

I hope this helps to better understand comments I made at our meeting.

*Don Wagner*

*Columbia River Crossing*

---

**From:** Robert Dean [mailto:robert@deansurveying.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 6:45 PM  
**To:** [leavitt@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:leavitt@cityofvancouver.us)  
**Cc:** Rorabaugh, Thayer; Holmes, Eric; [jeanne.harris@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:jeanne.harris@cityofvancouver.us);

[wagner@columbiarivercrossing.com](mailto:wagner@columbiarivercrossing.com)  
**Subject:** meeting with Don Wagner

**P-014-002**

Please see the responses to these comments in Mr. Dean's letter (P-012-001 and P-012-002).

January 3, 2011

**P-014-002**

Today I met with Don Wagner at his office between 1:30 and 2:30. Jeanne Harris arranged the meeting and was there briefly to introduce us. She had to leave for another appointment and so she asked Thayer Rorabaugh to stand in for her. Thank you Jeanne!

Don Wagner led off with assurances that he had read my previous letter on traffic staging and they were addressing my concerns. Thayer, also, had been forwarded from Tim Leavitt a similar letter which he had read. Thayer gave examples from past projects of how they work with local businesses and do their best for them. I expressed thanks to Tim Leavitt and the City for asking the right questions and for Resolution M3663. Don and Thayer said they are going through the list of caveats in the LPA to make sure they are addressing them.

I acknowledged their success with previous projects (Salmon Creek and Delta Park) and asked if they would do specific studies on this one to protect small businesses; especially since this project will last up to nine years. I mentioned legal (Executive Orders) and moral imperatives to look out for small businesses. I explained the 5 year refinancing problem building owners face and used my building in Hazel Dell as an example.

I gave Don the newspaper article on the WSU study of economic impacts of reconstruction of the locks and also Ken Casavant's bio and contact info. He seemed interested in pursuing my request.

I mentioned that the DEIS attributes an estimated \$8 million annual savings to the trucking industry in 2030 with build out of the new bridge. Is that enough savings to justify \$4 billion expenditure? Don responded that that was only for one aspect of benefits. I suggested that commuters would have no net benefit because we will be paying for it with tolls. Don said we would only be paying a third (let's see, \$1.5 billion capital plus interest plus collection costs plus cost overruns =?).

I asked if there was a cost/benefit analysis for the project. No. Was he aware that Steve Stuart had asked for one for tolls? Yes. It has not been done yet because they do not have a final design (he implied that they might be going with the Kevin Peterson design).

We talked about the need for an SEIS and the political inertia involved. They both are aware of sunk costs and the benefits of spending money during design phase rather than as cost overruns later. Don Wagner said, "Tell it to the Columbian editorial board."

I had mentioned the need for an SEIS to Tom Warne earlier. He was very circumspect. I got the impression at this meeting that it is being discussed. Don Wagner said he is meeting this afternoon with the feds to find out who is the lead agency on the project. I suspect Tom Warne wants to know if an SEIS will be called for if they switch to the Kevin Peterson design.

Don mentioned that there are hundreds of ways for the project to fail. Most prominent causes are funding and political will. He mentioned voting (on light rail) and the last elections (alluding to the election of Jaime Herrera I think). He seemed melancholy to me and resigning himself to imminent failure of funding. He exchanged glances with Thayer as if they had just been talking about it before I came.

I said I did not know of anyone who wanted to see the project fail. Don disputed that. I said I am on the email lists and some want to see light rail fail and some want to see tolls fail but we all want a better crossing that we can afford and that does what it's supposed to do.

Don said several times things like "If this gets built" and "If they build this design" as if he has doubts that anything will be built and if anything it will be Kevin Peterson's design. He said the IRP Expert Panel will be reporting January 19.

We talked about the original scoping and that there was no justification in the record for rejecting the Bi-State Industrial Corridor. I suggested the need for a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement going all the way back to scoping and goal setting. The number 1 goal should have been to relieve the choke points to commerce on the West Coast of the US and allow future growth. If the Bi-State Industrial Corridor failed question 6 in Step A Screening Report then did they ask the right questions?

Don mentioned that a westerly arterial, west of the lake, to Ridgefield was rejected about 20 years ago. I suggested that was a lot of freeway to build through a wilderness.

We talked about preserving the historic bridges. Don said they are spending tens of millions to mitigate for the loss of 1.5 acres of the Historic Preserve. The bridges themselves are doomed. They are seen as a safety hazard by WSDOT (legal justification for destroying them) and the bridge lifts are a nuisance to Downtown commerce.

We talked about retro-fitting the Interstate Bridges for seismic safety. Don said the \$300 million cost was for the first stage only – piers.

Don and Thayer both dispute that the RR bridge can be raised. They say for 90' clearance above the water and at 2% grade the RR would land too far North to make the Vancouver yards. My preliminary calculations from the GIS say it would land under the Mill Plain Overpass.

I suggested they redo the RR bridge and build the Bi-State Industrial corridor with light rail, bike paths, etc. and have it paid for by the RR, Coast Guard and Ports rather than on the backs of Vancouver commuters. They scoffed that the RR, Coast Guard or Ports would pay for anything.

Thayer said most of the Port traffic goes East and there is little truck traffic between ports. I did not have a chance to dispute that as we moved on to other things.

Don said the rumor that they hope to toll both crossings (I-5 and I-205) is not true. He wishes it would go away. He did say they might consider pre-construction tolling as they are doing in Seattle. I suggested that was a good idea and that they should test their financial and traffic projections immediately before committing the \$4 billion. I asked if any law changes were required for tolls. He said no federal changes for I-5 (not so for I-205) and some changes for Oregon and Washington.

I gave Jeanne Harris and Don Wagner signed hardcopies of the attached donwagnerletter.PDF

Robert Dean, President  
Dean Surveying, Inc.  
717 NE 61st St., #100  
Vancouver, WA 98665  
(360) 892 2600  
fax (360) 256 1156

\*\*\* eSafe scanned this email for malicious content \*\*\*  
\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*

\*\*\* eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content \*\*\*  
\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*