



Summary of Outreach Event

Organization	JBMI
Date / Time / Length	Thursday, June 12, 2008
Location	Jantzen Beach Super Center
Contact person	Jan Hamer
Staff present	Frank Green, Heather Gundersen, Lou Schwab and Danielle Cogan
Number of attendees	65
Inside Bridge Influence Area?	Yes

Summary

JBMI asked CRC staff for a follow-up meeting regarding their questions about potential right of way impacts to the moorage. Staff answered a list of 24 questions developed by JBMI residents.

Materials Distributed

Draft EIS Table of Contents
Draft EIS Summary and CD
Visuals of adjacent and offset transit alignment on Hayden Island]
DEIS comment forms

Questions and Comments

The JBMI residents in attendance specifically request that the following questions and comments made by them and recorded in their presence be included in the Draft EIS comments being gathered by the Columbia River Crossing project.

- N-009-001 | • When will the impacts to our community be known?
- N-009-002 | • Will local trips between Washington and Oregon be tolled?
- N-009-003 | • We live in the middle of the river, we should be exempt from any toll.
- N-009-004 | • What is the process for responding to Draft EIS comments?
- N-009-005 | • When and how are responses sent back to people?
- N-009-006 | • Will this project have a 1% art fund?
- N-009-007 | • Get rid of Pearson Air Park and Fort Vancouver Historic Reserve
- N-009-008 | • Build glass sound walls like in Eastern Europe
- Start investigating the possibility of extending our land lease boundaries with DSL for the potential relocation of homes within the moorage or on the river right next to us? Can this be done as soon as August?
- If the size of the structure changed during the construction process, would you need to get a temporary construction easement?

N-009-001

The impacts to JBMI floating homes were described in the DEIS to the extent that they could be estimated at that point in project planning. The designs assessed and described in the FEIS are further developed and based on focused refinements of the Hayden Island Interchange. JBMI residents have been involved with these refinements both as members of the public and with roles on the advisory bodies. As later refinements result in changes to estimated impacts, the CRC project team will keep JBMI informed and updated.

N-009-002

Details of the tolling system are still being refined as the project development enters the final design stage. It is currently not anticipated that transit users, bicyclists or pedestrians will pay a toll. Additionally, certain toll discounts or waivers for other groups have been and will continue to be considered. The ultimate decision on any tolling options will be made by both the Washington and Oregon Transportation Commissions.

N-009-003

The comments and their responses are on a CD included with the FEIS document. The CD is also available upon request by contacting the CRC project office.

N-009-004

The CRC project will not have a 1% art fund. The federal agencies are not required to provide 1% of project costs for public art. However, the project has made considerable commitments to aesthetics, has designed a visually unique and inspired bridge, and will be incorporating public art at key locations and at transit stations.

N-009-009**N-009-010****N-009-011****N-009-012****N-009-013****N-009-014****N-009-015****N-009-016****N-009-017****N-009-018****N-009-019****N-009-020****N-009-021****N-009-022****N-009-023****N-009-024****N-009-025****N-009-026****N-009-027****N-009-028****N-009-029****N-009-030**

- Does airport noise impact sound wall study?
- If I sleep during the day and work at night, how will my need for quiet be accommodated during construction?
- Please bring a portable microphone to the next meeting.
- If the parking lot remains intact, does that mean the road will remain intact?
- If the rail bridge goes over our community, will a person be able to access our moorage from the structure?
- Explain the difference between acquisitions vs. displacements
- If my property is in close proximity to the bridge-a few feet in front or behind it- what will happen? Will I be moved or compensated?
- At what point do you say, this property is too close to the new bridge for it to stay where it is?
- This (an offset or adjacent transit alignment) will destroy property values for some of us.
- What will happen to our housing fees if one home is displaced?
- Is there a specific federal definition for impact?
- Should we send our comments now?
- Will you pay for HOA fees at a new moorage? What about the cost of increased rent and for how long?
- What happens to the housing fees the remainder of moorage tenants must pay if some homes are removed?
- Has the project or ODOT ever built in floating home areas?
- There are no owner based slips available and not many rental either
- I want our community to stay together
- Those impacted should be moved as a group
- Some may lose their homes and others may lose a piece of their ownership stake
- Will the project pay for the lease, sub lease and damage for personal property?
- Could the project create another marina?
- If the proposed improvement exceed the current noise level, do you get a sound wall?
- Has the project studied an arterial bridge?
- Will the highway between Marine Drive and Hayden Island be metered?
- Everyone who owns a house in this community paid a lot of money for the house and the slip.
- There are 177 slips. If 13 houses are taken, will only 42 months in lost rent for each of those houses be paid to JBMI.
- JBMI management formally requests having access to the appraisal process.

Follow Up

Continue to meet with the group during the project development process

Number of New Sign-ups to Mailing List:**N-009-005**

The protection of Pearson Field, although important from the perspective of historic resource protection, the local economy, the provision of public services, and preferences stated by the City of Vancouver, is not the only factor influencing bridge heights over the Columbia River. Possible intrusions into Portland International Airport airspace, maintenance of marine navigation, construction staging, maintaining I-5 traffic, and constraints imposed by the location and alignment of the river crossing all constrain the ultimate design of the bridge. The upstream river crossing alignment was dropped for further consideration in October 2007. The downstream option has a curved alignment primarily for construction staging purposes, and connecting into existing I-5. The curved alignment limits the feasibility of several different structure types.

Since the publication of the DEIS, the Urban Design Advisory Group (UDAG) met multiple times to discuss the design of the bridges and ultimately endorsed the two-bridge concept in January 2009 and also endorsed the open-web concept in September of 2009. The Project Sponsors Council endorsed a two-bridge option in June of 2009, and also endorsed the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee recommendations for a covered pathway with the conditions of the maintenance and security plan in September of 2009. Then in February 2011, the CRC Bridge Review Panel recommended that the project discontinue work on the open-web concept and instead select either a composite deck truss, tied arch or cable-stayed bridge type. Following additional analysis and outreach, the governors, in April 2011, announced selection of the composite deck truss as the preferred bridge type. For a more detailed description of the limitations and opportunities that influenced the bridge type selection process, please see Technical Screening Study Final Report December 2008, Aesthetic Screening Study Final Report March 2009, Final Type Study Report October 2009, CRC Project Bridge Review Panel Report, February 2011, CRC: Key Findings and Recommendation Related to Bridge Type, February 2011

and the memo from the governors offices – Moving Forward; CRC Background, Bridge-type Major Factors, Next Steps, April 2011. Much of this information is also summarized in Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

N-009-006

Glass or acrylic sound walls are not currently proposed for the project. Please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.11) of the FEIS for a discussion of noise impacts and mitigation. Sound walls are evaluated for all locations where there would be noise impacts. However, the states' feasibility requirements and cost-effectiveness requirements must be applied to each proposed wall. As a result, some of the potential sound walls that were considered are not recommended for inclusion in the project.

N-009-007

The CRC project conducted a marina study, per the request of floating home residents. The results of this study are summarized in Section 3.3, Property Acquisitions and Displacements, of the FEIS.

N-009-008

It is not expected that the size of the structure would change during the construction process. Necessary temporary construction easements have been identified and are included in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3), Property Acquisitions and Displacements, of the FEIS.

N-009-009

Ambient noise, including existing airplane noise, is captured in the monitoring of existing sound levels. Existing sound levels are an input into modeling of future sounds levels and therefore do have an influence on the projected impacts and can have an effect on mitigation. See the FEIS Chapter 3 (Section 3.11).

N-009-010

Construction noise mitigation is discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.11) of this FEIS. Though, in general, noise mitigation measures are greater at night when most people are sleeping, there are strategies and techniques for minimizing construction noise impacts in the daytime hours as well.

N-009-011

The JBMI parking lot will be partially acquired and will require the reconfiguring of N Jantzen Street through the parking lot. The road directly north of the parking lot, N Jantzen Avenue, will be widened and will include improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

N-009-012

There will be direct pedestrian and bicycle access to Jantzen Beach Drive. There will be no access directly from the moorage to the rail bridge.

N-009-013

The CRC project may acquire portions of properties or entire parcels for construction and operation of the LPA. These property acquisitions may or may not result in the displacement of a specific use (residence, business, etc.) from the property. If a specific use is displaced from a property, that means it would no longer be able to continue to exist at that location and would need to be relocated elsewhere.

N-009-014

Current assumptions are that floating homes will not be allowed to moor within 15 feet of the light rail bridge or within 50 feet of the I-5 bridges for operations and maintenance of the structures, as well as for safety considerations. These distances are taken into account in the number of floating homes that would be displaced by the project, as described in

Chapter 3 (Section 3.3), Property Acquisitions and Displacements, of the FEIS.

N-009-015

Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) of the DEIS disclosed all known floating home displacements that would result from the two highway and two transit alternatives crossing the North Portland Harbor (pages 3-105 and 3-112, respectively). The DEIS also listed potential mitigation measures tailored to suit the unique situation of the floating home community (page 3-119).

For the FEIS analysis, the CRC project team has worked to better understand the organization of the floating home communities in the North Portland Harbor. As presented in Chapter 3 (Section 3.5) and Chapter 6: Public Involvement of the FEIS, the team coordinated with floating home owners, moorage owners, Boards and management, to gather address and ownership information for each floating home. The impacts to individual floating homes are described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) of the FEIS and listed in Appendix E.

In the course of conversations with potentially affected property owners, CRC staff received inquiries about the potential for constructing a new marina to accommodate displaced floating homes. To better understand issues related to new marina permitting and construction, project staff conducted research on the development of marinas. This research found likely challenges to developing a new floating home marina, including the challenge of receiving permits through local jurisdictions and environmental resource agencies. The project is not pursuing construction of a floating home marina.

As with any other acquisitions, the CRC will obtain independent appraisals to determine fair market value for each home that must be displaced but cannot be relocated. Qualified acquisition agents will work closely with each floating home owner to try to arrive at mutually

agreeable terms for the purchase of each home. The agents will also provide relocation assistance to all displaced occupants.

N-009-016

JBMI would be compensated for any damages to the corporation. This could include compensation for the loss of payments from displaced homes within the moorage. If such compensation were provided, JBMI would be left to decide how to use these funds. The need for and value of such compensation would be determined during the appraisal process. For more detail regarding the timing of this process, please see Chapter 3, Property Acquisitions and Displacements (Section 3.3) of the FEIS.

N-009-017

The NEPA implementing regulations (40 CFR Part 1508.8) define "Effects" as follows:

"Effects" include:

- (a) Direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place.
- (b) Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.

Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous. Effects includes ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from

actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial.

N-009-018

Though public comments were solicited before and after the formal 60-day DEIS comment period, comments received during the 60-day comment period were especially important. Following the close of the 60-day DEIS comment period and the selection of an LPA, a 10-member governor-appointed panel was formed to advise the Oregon and Washington DOT on project development for the CRC project. The Project Sponsors Council (PSC) was charged with advising the project on completion of the FEIS, project design, project timeline, sustainable construction methods, consistency with greenhouse gas emission reduction goals and the financial plan. The PSC made recommendations after considering technical information, receiving input from relevant advisory groups and reviewing public comments.

N-009-019

Supplemental payments to cover the increased cost of rent or HOA fees at a new moorage could be included as part of the relocation package. The need for and value of these payments would be determined during the appraisal and relocation process.

N-009-020

Please see response to comment N-009-016.

N-009-021

To date, no project construction has occurred. As such, the project has not built in a floating home area. Regarding ODOT, the only floating homes close to ODOT highway facilities are in the Jantzen Beach area.

N-009-022

Please see the response to N-009-0015.

N-009-023

Typically, only real property would be purchased by the CRC project, though in certain circumstances personal property may be purchased. For example, the CRC project could purchase displaced floating homes (considered personal property) if there are not enough slips into which these homes could be relocated. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (as amended) requires that the project pay the costs of relocating any personal property.

N-009-024

Please see response to comment N-009-007.

N-009-025

As discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.11) of this FEIS, to be installed, sound walls must meet a "feasibility" and a "reasonableness" test.

N-009-026

Many different options for addressing the project's Purpose and Need were evaluated in a screening process prior to the development and evaluation of the alternatives in the DEIS. Options eliminated through the screening process included a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River (in addition to I-5 and I-205), an arterial crossing between Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver, a tunnel under the Columbia River, and various modes of transit other than light rail and bus rapid transit. Section 2.5 of the DEIS explains why a third corridor, arterial crossing of the Columbia River, and several transit modes evaluated in screening were dropped from further consideration because they did not meet the Purpose and Need. For a general description of the screening process see Chapter 2 (Section 2.7) of the FEIS. It should be noted that every

proposal received from the public was considered, and many of the proposals that were dropped from further consideration included elements that helped shape the alternatives in the DEIS.

N-009-027

Preliminary indications are that there will be ramp meters for the Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchanges. The State of Oregon is requiring meters in these locations.

N-009-028

Thank you for your comment.

N-009-029

Rent supplement payments may be paid to displaced tenants, not home owners or JBMI, for a maximum of 42 months. Please also see response to comment N-009-016.

N-009-030

Owners of property acquired by the project would be given the opportunity to accompany appraisers during the appraisal inspection.