

Michelle Tworoger, 1545 N. Jantzen Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97217, 503-285-8448

June 28, 2008

SCANNED
Date 6-30-08
Initial mt



Notification
Sent
7/1

RECEIVED

JUN 30 2008

Columbia River Crossing

Columbia River Crossing (CRC)
Attn: Heather Gundersen
700 Washington Street, Ste. 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

RE: DEIS Response Letter

Dear Ms. Gundersen:

I believe the CRC project is badly needed and way overdue. CRC bridge will enhance the Portland/Vancouver community while improving the trip across the river in a save productive manner. The CRC project team and many preparers have completed a difficult job and spent countless hours towards the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). There is a huge amount of collected information that is documented and reflected in the DEIS but it goes without saying which such a large community task at hand, it is impossible to cover all the bases and to satisfy all impacted parties.

As a co-chair member of the Community Environmental Justice Group (CEJG), member of the Environmental Justice Work Group & Community Enhancement Advisory Board for the I-5 Delta Project, 20 year resident of Hayden Island, floating homes owner and Board Member of the Jantzen Beach Moorage, Inc. (JBMI) located on the North Portland Harbor which is adjacent to the I-5 corridor; I, Michelle Tworoger, am submitting comments/concerns regarding the DEIS within the 60 days comment period.

I have stated at several CEJG meetings that even though my home in considered being located on ground zero, my advocacy and intent is to help reduce impacts to our vital and fully recognized Hayden Island community, as well as to fully address potential mitigation issues. This letter will list or address several comments / concerns regarding many issues contained in the DEIS.

Comment #1

The first tragic statement was discovered upon reading Appendix D of the DEIS. I discovered the lack of information regarding the floating home community specifically JBMI. The DEIS states "no address available" for the floating home facility located on N. Jantzen Avenue. As a floating homes owner, this clearly tells me that the CRC project team and/or preparers failed to provide public information and further indicates a low respect level for homeowners living in the largest floating home community (177 homes) in the State of Oregon which are greatly impacted by the CRC.

The CRC project team has conducted many site visits/tours of the JBMI community. They saw the clearly marked mailboxes plus they could have contacted Jan Hamer, JBMI moorage manager to easily obtain this important information with whom they have communicated with on several occasions.

All floating homeowners receive a property tax statement from Multnomah County and are registered with the State of Oregon, as required. To state the information is unavailable tells the readers that they chose not to take additional steps to obtain the necessary information. The CRC project team told me how and why they made this statement, which I considered to be an excuse rather than utilizing readily available resources to publish the facts. It is very disturbing to see these words in print (no address available) in such an important government publication that could leave the readers with a very cautious attitude.

Comment #2

Appendix D – Comprehensive List of Potential Property Acquisitions states the “appendix includes a list of all the property acquisitions.....” The list fails to list all. The JBMI parking lot on N. Jantzen Avenue is identified but not the floating homes. It has already been determined and communicated that all the homes along Row A (1525 through 1555 N. Jantzen Avenue) at JBMI are indeed most likely going to be displaced.

Comment #3

Single-family residences are clearly identified in Vancouver but no Oregon residences are listed what so ever.

Comment #4

Even though it is stated in the DEIS that the technical reports are more detailed, it does not address the issues mentioned above. In addition, it states “providing functional replacements could occur.....” This is a very subjective statement and potentially means a “functional replacement”, which could mean a residence with electricity and plumbing will be made available. We expect at a minimum, to have our property replaced at a comparable level, which is not stated.

Comment #5

It has been discovered most recently that some floating home properties are being reduced in value by 25% by appraisers simply because of the CRC project. This financial impact is affecting the lives of people who are close to retirement and thinking about refinancing their homes. The community does not need to wait for construction to realize impacts.

Comment #6

CRC needs to be aware of impacts to the floating home community which include the following as examples:

- Loss of rents to JBMI
- Loss of property value to JBMI such as the elimination of the following:
 - Docks
 - Pilings
 - Walkways

- Railings
- Flootation
- Pile hoops
- Ramps
- Common area water space
- Security fencing
- Mailboxes
- Parking
- Private Road
- Landscaping (ie. trees which controls embankment erosion). The embankment should be restored with native vegetation as construction is concluded.
- Utility fixtures
- Lighting
- Reduced moorage finger print with DSL
- Entry Gates
- Reduced security system
- Signage
- To mention some but not all.

Each of the above items has a financial significance to all 177 owners of JBMI.

Other impacts include:

- Reduced Peaceful enjoyment of living on the water by increased transit resulting from the CRC.
- Reduced sense of security by the elimination of the JBMI private road.
- Reduced access to JBMI property.
- Reduced overall value of the moorage to the owners by the loss of JBMI infrastructure.
- Increased pollution and noise by increased transit, which may lower property values to homeowners.
- Vibrations from increased transit especially during construction are especially of concern since water is a good conductor of sound that will impact floating homes.

Comment #7

The DEIS states Sound Walls will be included in the project but on June 12th, the CRC project team instead stated that this issue would be delegated and decided by the Urban Design Committee. A noise monitor was placed within JBMI and the decibel levels were clearly above ODOT standards. Additional noise testing needs to occur within JBMI but no documentation regarding the water levels and wind direction at the time of testing occurred. Increased transit is only going to increase noise impacts further. Sound walls need to be included.

Comment #8

The JBMI community requested a meeting with CRC that was held on June 12, 1008 to address impacts. The meeting was well attended by residents of JBMI. A list of 24 specific shared homeowner concerns (potential moorage impacts) submitted by JBMI were addressed by the project team. Unfortunately, many of the issues went unanswered because the LPA is undecided and further study of the 5 alternatives is on going. Additional concerns were documented at the meeting which should be treated as public comment regarding the DEIS as submitted by approx. 60 people.

Comment #9

A major concern that has been widely heard, is to not build an additional new bridge across the North Portland Harbor, which would compound all impacts to the JBMI community especially pollution! This would divide and cause further financial impacts the JBMI community. Plus building an additional bridge increases project costs tremendously and provides no significant community benefit.

Comment #10

The Affected Environment in Section 4, 4.1 makes no mention of median floating home sale prices. Hayden Island is clearly not mentioned. Exhibit 5.1, Segment A is footnoted and states, "does not include impacts to floating homes on Hayden Island". Again, why, excuses, lack of disclosure but instead they chose to footnote the omission for legal purposes? Exhibit 5.2 does not identify the residential homes located on the North Portland Harbor. Exhibit 5.3.3.3 in the DEIS contains one (1) sentence stating, floating homes on Hayden Island would be relocated. This document does not provide any neighborhood maps of the floating home community. Aerial maps are available and need to be included more than one time within the DEIS. The first time this community is documented is in Chapter 3 on page 301 in the noise and vibration report.

Comment #11

I was surprised to learn that no portion of Hayden Island is considered to be wetlands especially when large portions of the island are not developed. Professionals have told me that portions of Hayden Island are indeed considered to be wetlands.

Comment #12

The Parks and Recreational Effects summary makes no mention of Lotus Isle Park which has historical significance dating back to the 1930's located on Hayden Island.

Comment #13

There is an over whelming response especially from the floating home community for the approval of the replacement alternative with an adjacent alignment in the attempt to minimize JBMI community impacts and Hayden Island.

Comment #14

Section 3.3 makes no mention of median prices for floating homes in Exhibits 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. The acquisition summaries do not mention acquisitions or displacements in 3.3.4 through 7 with respect to Hayden Island or floating homeowners. The three narrative paragraphs for Oregon do not mention any residential properties. The diagram on page 3-111 does not reflect any Oregon Acquisitions / Displacements. Floating homes are only mentioned under potential mitigation measures. Exhibits 3.5 through 8 do not mention Oregon regarding Neighborhood and Environmental Justice Effects.

Comment #15

There is no mention in the displacement section, that relocated homes would be moved to a comparable area and location (i.e. if a home is located at an end slip, it would be moved to a similar location).

Comment #16

I would like the project team to commit and start accumulating information regarding relocation options taking into consideration a scenario that a possible 12 homes would request to be relocated. It will be extremely difficult to make any decision during the acquisition period if all options are not presented or made available to homeowners. There is a .5% vacancy factor of empty slips along the Columbia River.

Comment #17

The project team should consider the possibility of condemning a piece of property for development of another moorage to retain ownership privileges or working with Division of State Lands (DSL) to extend moorage lease boundaries to accommodate the displaced floating homes within the North Portland Harbor.


Comment #18

The DEIS does not include or mention the market value of floating home slips on the river. Slips have a tremendous market value and are in high demand due to such a low vacancy factor and low availability. Most floating homeowners are currently making monthly payments towards the purchase of their slips which have appreciated tremendously since the buyout or purchase of the moorage from Safeco Insurance Company. It has been suggested at various meetings that homeowners would not be compensated for the value of their water space. We need documented clarification on this issue.

I believe the DEIS should be amended to report the correct and all the facts especially when communicating with the general public, stakeholders, and other governmental authorities. It would be very difficult or impossible to make the best community decision with bias or missing information.

I look forward to my continued involvement through CEJG, working with the CRC project staff and especially during the mitigation phase as a homeowner. Thank you for all your hard work!

Very Respectfully,



Michelle Tworoger
1545 N. Jantzen
Portland, OR 97217