

**West Hayden Island Advisory Committee Meeting # 9**  
**Friday, August 19, 2011, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM**  
**1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, Rm. 7A, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor**

**Working Agenda**

**Directions:** The 1900 Building is located at the corner of SW 4<sup>th</sup> & SW Hall in downtown Portland, on the Portland State University Campus. Parking is available on street or under the building (entrance to underground building parking on SW 4<sup>th</sup> at SW College). We encourage you to consider using another mode of transportation. The 1900 Building is easily accessible by walking, bicycling, or transit. There is bicycle parking on the south side of the building. Several bus lines stop within short walking distance of the building. Tri-Met Yellow and Green Line MAX trains stop approximately 3 blocks away, at SW 5<sup>th</sup> & SW Mill. The Portland Streetcar stops just north of the 1900 Building, on SW 3<sup>rd</sup> & SW Harrison. Note: The City of Portland does not validate parking.

**9:00 – 9:15**

**Welcome and Agenda Review**

**Announcements and Follow up from Last Meeting**

- A) New membership**
- B) Tour update**

**Approval of July Meeting Notes**

**9:15 – 9:45**

**Updates**

- A) August 5<sup>th</sup> Technical Work Session Debrief**
- B) Consultant Updates**
- C) Economic Opportunities Analysis update and how it relates to WHI**

**9:45 – 10:15**

**Review of City Scopes of Work : Land Management Options and Vancouver/Port Coordination**

**10:15 – 10:30**

**Break**

**10:30 –11:30**

**Concept Plan Top Issues, Evaluation Criteria, Direction, Timeline**

**11:30 – 11:45**

**Public Comment (Approximate time slot)**

**11:45 – 12:00**

**Wrap-up, Meeting Evaluations, and Announcements**

**AC Meeting Reminder: 9/23, 10/21, and 11/18**

**Joint City Council and Port Commission Meeting: 10/12**

**WEST HAYDEN ISLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #9**  
**FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 2011, 9:00AM - 12:00PM**  
**1900 BUILDING, ROOM 7A, 1900 4<sup>TH</sup> STREET, PORTLAND, OR**

**Meeting Notes**

<b>Advisory Committee Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Susan Barnes	ODFW	X
Andrew Colas	NAMCO	
Andy Cotugno	Metro	X
Pam Ferguson	HILP	X
Don Hanson	PSC	X
Chris Hathaway	LCREP	X
Brian Owendoff	PBA	X
Emily Roth	Parks & Rec	
Sam Ruda	Port of Portland	X
Bob Sallinger Alternate Jim Labbe in attendance	Audubon Portland	X
Bob Tackett Alternate Graham Trainor in attendance	NW Labor Council/AFL-CIO	X
Victor Viets	HiNOON	X

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Mindy Brooks	BPS	X
Melissa Egan	ICM (Facilitation Team)	X
Eric Engstrom	BPS	X
Rachel Hoy	BPS	X
Bob Hillier	PBOT	
Sam Imperati	ICM (Facilitation Team)	X
Phil Nameny	BPS	X
Jonna Papaefthimiou	Mayor's Office	X
Mike Rosen	BES	X
Joe Zehnder	BPS	

<b>Public Attending (name)</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Rose Longoria	Yakama Nation
Jim Owens	COC
Representative	Parsons Brinkerhoff
Greg Theisen	Port of Portland
Chris White	Port of Portland

## **WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW**

*Sam Imperati* welcomed the group and provided an overview of the day's agenda.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FOLLOW UP FROM LAST MEETING**

### **NEW MEMBERSHIP**

*Rachael Hoy, BPS*, said that, given Rich Gunderson's resignation from the Advisory Committee due to health reasons, staff has been working with the Mayor's Office to find a new member who has similar knowledge about parks.

*Jonna Papaefthimiou, Mayor Adams' Office* said that Emily Roth with Portland Parks will be joining the AC, but is not here today. She participated in the August 5<sup>th</sup> technical work session and is getting up to speed on the process.

### **TOUR UPDATE**

*Rachael Hoy* provided an update on the final tour of West Hayden Island. It was held on the evening of August 10<sup>th</sup>. They were hoping to get to the south side, but were unable due to water levels. There were seventeen new people on this tour, a good mix of island residents and local businesses. The tour focused on recreation.

*Sam Ruda*: comment regarding membership; Andy Colas has not been to a meeting lately. Any news?

*Rachael Hoy*: recently spoke with him and updated him on the process. He knows about concept plan meeting on September 23<sup>rd</sup>. He is still on the AC.

### **APPROVAL OF JULY MEETING NOTES**

*Victor Viets*: on page 10, correction to his comment regarding the south shore – should be Oregon "Slough" not Oregon "City."

The July Meeting Notes were approved, with the above correction.

### **UPDATE: AUGUST 5<sup>TH</sup> TECHNICAL WORK SESSION DEBRIEF**

*Mindy Brooks, BPS*, provided a review of the technical work session held on August 5; staff put together a summary, which is in the meeting packet. She said the full meeting minutes will be available soon and will be posted to the website. There were three sessions covering three topics – Recreation, Hayden Island Natural Resources Inventory, and Regulatory Requirements.

*Eric Engstrom*: commented that the place where there is the most amount of healthy debate is issue of the character of dredge spoil. There is active debate among technical folks, and they are likely to continue to disagree for a while.

*Sam Ruda*: Port staff submitted a follow up on that.

*Eric Engstrom*: we can distribute it to the Advisory Committee.

*Sam Imperati:* all this information will be collated and staff will respond.

*Chris Hathaway:* we will have an opportunity to discuss these topics later.

*Sam Imperati:* yes, absolutely.

*Victor Viets:* there is a lot more technical review going on than what is going on in our discussions.

*Don Hanson:* wants to confirm that there is a good set of resource maps. He assumes staff has good maps for the recreation discussions. Also, when will there be concept site plans that people can react to?

*Eric Engstrom:* in September.

### **PORT IGA AND CONSULTANT UPDATES**

Eric Engstrom, BPS, announced that the West Hayden Island IGA between the City and the Port will be on the City Council agenda in the next couple of weeks. The Council is reviewing the agreement with the Port; most of the discussion will be about increasing the budget and an update of the IGA. There will be increased funding from the Port, plus another quarter million for the project from the City for this calendar year.

*Rachael Hoy:* referred the AC to the updated project calendar in the meeting packet. It provides more detail through next June. The City Council session Eric referred to is on August 31st.

*Jonna Papaefthimiou:* said the session will be bureaucratic, they are unlikely to take testimony.

Eric Engstrom said that they Harbor Lands analysis with ECONorthwest is in progress. He anticipates they will have draft report by the end of September. Originally, they were hoping it would be part of summer studies, but the timeline has been pushed back a bit. The reason it has been slower to allow ECONorthwest and WorleyParsons to compare notes. They are learning from the work that has already been done, and ensuring there will be no unnecessary duplications.

Cost benefit analysis work is also in progress. The consultants are working on Task 1, which is a gap analysis. About 90% done – will be out within the next couple of weeks.

Some initial drafts of the concept plan work from WorleyParsons will be available in September. The first task is also about 90% done, which was to look at operational efficiencies research for Port best practices. W-P is looking at clever ways others have been able to minimize footprints and maximize efficiencies. We will have information about different site layouts and provide drawings to discuss.

*Greg Theisen:* when is the next technical meeting?

*Staff:* on September 16. The topics are operational efficiencies and rail.

## **ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES ANALYSIS UPDATE AND HOW IT RELATES TO WHI**

Eric Engstrom continued with information about the relationship of the WHI project to the Economic Opportunities Analysis, referring the AC to the Frequently Asked Questions in the meeting packet. The EOA is a citywide project, an inventory of employment related lands supply, including a subset of the industrial land supply. Draft of EOA was published in 2009, and another one came out earlier this year. They are aiming for a third draft in the fall.

The drafts have concluded that there is a shortage of industrial land. Hayden Island is relevant, because if it is annexed, it is one way for the city to address some of this shortfall. The City is working with their consultant to update the report, and they just finished a phase of review with that AC. There is additional work for the consultant and we hope to have a draft ready by October. Improvements to the document are needed. It is very technical, contains lots of data tables. They are working to clarify it and make sure the numbers are accurate and up-to-date.

*Victor Viets:* how are you are going to count the 300 acres? What does the inventory have in the way of demand for marine terminal facilities, and are these facilities separately defined?

*Eric Engstrom:* that is the point of the report, to explain all of this. Metro has the job of assessing the available land for the whole region; Portland's job is a little different, and we have to break down the Metro numbers into different areas. Sectors are broken down, with projections about the likely job growth and other economic measures.

*Don Hanson:* it stratifies the sectors into markets.

*Eric Engstrom:* yes, and divides them into unique geographies and features, through 2035 (25 year projection).

*Chris Hathaway:* what do you do if there is not enough industrial land?

*Eric Engstrom:* we have a choice of doing a couple different things. One is expand the UGB, but that is not an option for Portland. Mostly we will try to achieve greater efficiencies and make better use of the land we have. Brownfield clean up is an option. You can also increase infrastructure investment to make the land more productive; another option is to re-zone other land to be industrial, which could pertain to WHI.

*Sam Ruda:* not all land that could be designated industrial is created equal. The Superfund site for example, needs a huge amount of money for development. How do you handle brownfields?

*Eric Engstrom:* State Goal 9 requires analysis to get at this. That rule is designed to prevent cities from zoning unsuitable land. With a brownfield, we have to show why it is economically feasible to develop.

*Brian Owendoff:* about a year ago, they did a review of parcels under twenty-five acres. Their analysis showed we have less than a five-year land supply. There is another survey being done on large parcels greater than 25 acres. So much comes down to speed of delivery. A lot of brownfields are so expensive they will never be developed. We are losing business opportunities in our area. The quickest feet win. His fear is that we will not act quickly enough. At the end of the day, the built environment impacts all of us.

*Don Hanson:* when you do your survey, you will find that a lot of the large sites are gravel quarries. So, they may not be polluted, but there is twenty years of rock to dig out.

## **REVIEW OF CITY SCOPE OF WORK: LAND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS**

*Mike Rosen, BPS,* reviewed the scope of work for land management options. They are looking at how to pay for this long term, including remediation and mitigation opportunities, and whether we can create an endowment. They need to show how we can permanently protect the 500 acres. The open space activities report and concept plan will take into account the work that has been done on the city's recreation analysis and regulatory requirements memo. Expect that some of the 500 acres will be for mitigation. Part of analysis will be to look at ESEE and what it recommends for mitigation. The timeline for developing this is mid to late January. Elements already exist, but putting a team together to implement the scope. Staff will come back with more information and a refined timeline as they develop.

*Sam Ruda:* the Port has some questions for clarification. He wonders what is intended by the phrase regarding potential mitigation needs for the "passive recreation."

*Mike Rosen:* The scope acknowledges that recreation may have impacts, and that we will mitigate for it.

*Sam Ruda:* so the 500 acres counts for nothing? Seems like double jeopardy. Not sure what the applicable standard is in this case.

*Mindy Brooks:* in other parts of the city, if you have a conservation overlay, and you want to put in a trail, then you have to mitigate. If you cut down trees for the trail, you have to plant trees.

*Mike Rosen:* the 500 acres is for mitigation and natural resources.

*Victor Viets:* if we enhance the 500 acres - for example, there is been talk of opening up new waterways through the 500, that has to be mitigated too.

*Mindy Brooks:* we dealt with this in Airport Futures; there are ways to deal with this.

*Sam Ruda:* his next question is regarding current planning efforts. The reference to "remediation" is not clear to him.

*Staff:* will look at that and clarify the text.

*Sam Ruda:* confused about the nexus between this and the River Plan/North Reach, Kelley Point Park, Superfund, Bonneville Power Administration and FEMA.

*Mike Rosen* on the Superfund, as he understands it, they have had an ongoing discussion regarding the mitigation opportunities.

*Mindy Brooks:* we want to look at how land options are being addressed, reviewing what has been done; it is more how it has happened in the past so we can learn from it. River Plan and Kelly Point Park are past projects that may be referenced.

*Staff:* will look at it and make it clearer.

*Sam Imperati:* this memo is what is going to be discussed. Certainly, process can impact substance, but at the end of the day, this is just a list of tasks. Staff wants to know for sure if we have a complete list of things.

*Victor Viets:* our study area is in some way looking at eighty acres east of the railroad, as an entry to recreation facilities and natural resources. He thinks options for paying for it and managing it should be added to the 500 acres. He thinks we will end up with many interesting potential options, and we need to know what the management options are.

*Sam Imperati:* this memo talks about the traditional 500/300, and your point is that there is this additional chunk of land to think about. This should be added to the memo.

*Brian Owendoff:* what can we learn from Airport Futures?

*Sam Imperati:* there are some similar issues, but also fundamental differences. We can give you some background.

*Sam Ruda:* he was just wondering what the City was thinking and appreciates the information.

#### **REVIEW OF CITY SCOPE OF WORK: VANCOUVER/PORT COORDINATION**

*Phil Nameny, BPS,* said that the City Council requested that staff look at opportunities for greater coordination with the Port of Vancouver. The Council wanted to know what they specialize in, where we compete, how they operate, their charter system, and any other aspects that are interesting or run differently. Phil reviewed the Scope of Work memo, noting the tasks:

- Task 1: Background of Ports
- Task 2: Current Governmental Structure
- Task 3: Current Coordination Efforts
- Task 4: Additional Coordination Efforts
- Task 5: Joint State Port Authorities

They are looking to see if there are existing IGAs that can be expanded, and they want to compare new ideas with the current structure. He noted the Great Lakes ports have a non-profit entity that works on advocacy and coordination for all the ports on the Great Lakes. They report will also look into the feasibility and steps required for forming a joint Port Authority here.

*Brian Owendoff:* the Great Lakes Port Authority - more environmental and best practices work. The Ports are very competitive. We need to be cognizant of that. A joint Port Authority does not mean there is no competition.

*Victor Viets:* comment relative to Task 5 and bi-state activities. There will be a bi-state agreement set up for CRC and some sort of a management team who will be concerned with looking at growth management activities. If there is going to be an agency there, it may be helpful to see what the states are going to go through to do that, when looking at WHI.

This also pertains to possible future development, such as high-speed rail. He is simply making a request to have discussion with the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) to see if there is a way to link them together in terms of management and operations.

*Eric Engstrom:* for the record, the reason we put an asterisk next to the Joint Port Authority task is to stress that there isn't a specific direction proposed in the report.

*Sam Imperati:* to the AC, moving forward to the next task after the break, please review W-P memo and the version with track changes during break.

*Rachael Hoy:* the memo with the track change bubbles in the right margin is Bob Sallinger's comments/suggestions; he is unable to be here today.

## **BREAK**

Sam Imperati welcomed the group back from the break, noting that we will make a concerted effort in the future label documents more clearly. We will do our best to review the proposed edits as a group.

Sam introduced *Jim Labbe* from the Audubon Society; he arrived at the break. He is here today in place of Bob Sallinger.

## **CONCEPT PLAN TOP ISSUES, EVALUATION CRITERIA, DIRECTION, TIMELINE**

Sam had the WorleyParsons memo "Top Issues from Identification Table (re: Advisory Committee)" up on the screen. We will go through the proposed edits and comments, make any necessary changes, and finalize this today.

*Sam Ruda:* why are we doing this?

*Eric Engstrom:* issue identification is for the benefit of W-P; they must be sure they have as thorough an understanding of the AC's issues and concerns as possible.

What follows is discussion about the WorleyParsons memo, both the staff proposed edits and Bob Sallinger's proposed edits.

*Don Hanson:* re: #3, page 2 – is a loop a given?

*Staff:* no.

*Don Hanson:* proposes removing "loop", and using another term such as rail access.

*Jim Labbe:* noted #2, page 2, Sallinger comment, "and maximize habitat patch size in remaining natural areas."

*Sam Ruda:* what does "patch" mean in this context?

*Eric Engstrom:* a "patch" is the minimum preferred dimensions of a parcel of land.

*Victor Viets:* there are other impacts we need to consider, rather than focusing on patch size. Maybe a more general comment would be better?

*Don Hanson:* fine with the concept, but does not think it is the right place. See #1 under environmental planning.

*Susan Barnes:* suggested text.

*Sam Ruda:* thinks these comments belong in the environmental planning section.

*Jim Labbe:* Bob probably put it in there because considering these together is important.

*Sam Ruda:* comment regarding shallow water habitat, there is a nexus with docks.

*Sam Imperati:* these are not mutually exclusive. This document will be taken, as a whole.

*Andy Cotugno:* recommends we do not omit any reference to environmental impacts in the first section.

*Sam Imperati:* to clarify, you are proposing they should each be mentioned in all sections?

*Brian Owendoff:* thinks that may be redundant. This is organized by buckets - economic, environmental, and social impacts.

*Victor Viets:* the intent is to be creative in looking for solutions.

*Andy Cotugno:* intent is that we are not going to do a sea wall type of development.

*Don Hanson:* leave #2 the way it is and leave the "patch" for the next section.

*Sam Imperati:* does anyone want to suggest language for these topics for Section 2?

*Susan Barnes:* will think about it and make suggestion.

The group continued reviewing document, line-by-line, picking up at #4, in the Economic and Terminal Planning section.

*Victor Viets:* from his read, there are two objectives in #4, minimizing the footprint and maximizing the functionality, and would like to see it more diversified in the objective.

*Don Hanson:* suggests starting #4 with "Maximize marine terminal ..."

*Sam Ruda:* regarding #6, he does not think we need to mention labor.

*All:* Agree. Remove: "Concern among labor organizations."

The group continued reviewing document, moving on to the Environmental Planning section.

*Susan Barnes:* suggests adding: "other existing habitat functions and values."

*Jim Labbe:* noted Bob's comment, "Buffers should be inside the 300 acres of development."

*Don Hanson:* to be clear, you are saying buffers could go into the 300 acres?

*Jim Labbe:* yes.

*Don Hanson:* he has a little trouble with this; it does not seem like an equitable approach.

*Brian Owendoff:* agrees with Don. Also, in general, he thinks we are getting too specific today. We cannot reduce the 300 acres anymore.

*Chris Hathaway:* question for clarification regarding Bob's idea. He is not sure this is the right time or document to have this discussion.

*Jim Labbe:* we, the Audubon Society, think the standard should be really high. Too often, we accept that the habitat should accept the impacts.

*Rachael Hoy:* following on Chris' comment regarding the location of buffers. Another, more suitable place we can talk about this is in the Evaluation Criteria document.

*Chris Hathaway:* that was his point - this does not seem to be the right place.

*Sam Imperati:* this document will not resolve what is in the 500 and 300. Restated, to not accept the proposed edit does not mean either side wins or loses.

*Susan Barnes:* focusing on the buffer statement, it should be retained. Recommends keeping it as it is. Question: what was the significance of calling out the raptor nest sites?

*Don Hanson:* suggestion to put period after "habitat." Intent of edit is to make it more generic.

*Andy Cotugno:* are we saying there needs to be a buffer along the whole 500, or just some important/special habitat that needs a buffer?

*Sam Ruda:* reminds the AC that with the end result of this editing process, we do not want to box in W-P; we want to give them flexibility.

*Susan Barnes:* For #2, propose to retain buffer areas to reduce impacts to important habitat (strike rest of sentence).

*Jim Labbe:* change # 3 to Bob's suggested text: Mitigate "all natural resource impacts associated with marine industrial development including but not limited to impacts to shallow water habitat, floodplains, wetlands, forests, and grassland areas."

*Susan Barnes:* agree with comment.

*Victor Viets:* the problem is that it says mitigate, "all." The consultant is not coming up with mitigation measures off-site. The objective is to go into the community section and mitigate all community impacts on nearby residents. We need to talk about people that live here if we are going to go down this road.

*Don Hanson:* recommends to never use the word "all," suggest we broaden the language—start by minimizing – do not use mitigate.

*Susan Barnes:* from the state and federal perspective, the word, "mitigation" is appropriate.

*Sam Ruda:* we are assuming here we mitigate for everything – from his experience this does not seem accurate.

*Sam Imperati:* nobody has ever said we would not use/have the standard of “avoid/minimize/mitigate.” We do not need to make this a legal document.

*Eric Engstrom:* suggestion to replace “mitigate all” with “compensate for the unavoidable.”

*Sam Imperati:* from a practical perspective, does not think “unavoidable” is the right term.

*Sam Ruda:* we are not asking W-P to develop a mitigation work scope with this document.

*Jim Labbe:* likes Don’s suggestion.

*Sam Imperati:* “avoid/minimize/mitigate impact” should be in the document. It covers everything, and should apply to everything.

*Andy Cotugno:* the point about this contract for off-island mitigation, we want overall to meet that objective, so the concept plan for the island needs to provide that direction. It is in someone else’s work scope. This work scope needs to do the best it can to distinguish between on-island and off-island.

*Don Hanson:* The concept plan scope is for on-island only.

*Andy Cotugno:* if this is an on-island scope, we need on-island direction.

*Jim Labbe:* that gets to Bob’s next comment.

*Don Hanson:* don’t you have to do on-island first, to know what you need to do off-island? So, they would need to be developed sequentially.

*Andy Cotugno:* let’s write this as the portion dealing with the concept plan for on-island only.

*Eric Engstrom:* this is not their scope of work, this is the list of issues we want them to be aware of while doing work.

*Mike Rosen:* suggests “avoid/minimize/mitigate natural resource impacts” and slashing “all.”

*Sam Imperati:* suggests that something generic, and not too detailed, is preferred.

*Mike Rosen:* add “including but not limited to.” There is a tendency to overemphasize shallow water habitat. Suggest adding “avoid/minimize/mitigate” and take out “all.”

*Susan Barnes:* can live with that, and would add “and passive recreation.”

*Pam Ferguson:* that is referred to in #8.

*Sam Imperati:* thinks those are covered. There are two motions in the table: general or laundry list.

*Mike Rosen* agrees with “avoid/minimize/mitigate.”

*Don Hanson:* agree.

*Victor Viets:* has concerns about impacts and being overlooked.

*Sam Imperati:* Mike's motion, "avoid/minimize/mitigate natural resources impacts." And then in the social section, we can have the same statement there.

*Mike Rosen:* was not proposing to cut off "include but not limited to."

*Don Hanson:* thinks we should keep that language as well.

*Sam Imperati:* proposed language: "Avoid/minimize/mitigate natural resource impacts associated with marine industrial development including but not limited to impacts to shallow water habitat, floodplains, wetlands, forests, and grassland areas."

Sam took a vote on the language suggested above:

- 1 – Pam, Don, Graham, Sam, Victor, Susan, Mike, Eric
- 2 – Chris, Andy
- 3 – Jim

*Susan Barnes:* suggested, "impacts to natural resources...."

*Andy Cotugno:* since this is a memo to the consultant developing the concept plans, we want to tell them to do a net increase to the environment.

*Chris Hathaway:* one of the hurdles with mitigation is there is a huge clamor for sites, if there are not enough off-island sites available, that could throw a wrench into plans. We need to know this info.

*Mike Rosen:* does the contractor have scope to look off-island?

*Eric Engstrom:* no. Staff is preparing a memo for the work that has been done in this area.

*Mike Rosen:* identify what you can do, and be clear about what you cannot.

*Eric Engstrom:* they were told to design the best open space to increase functional values. It will be later in the process to decide what is on- or off-site.

*Mike Rosen:* you have to show net increase.

*Eric Engstrom:* agree, but W-P is not looking at regulatory issues.

*Chris Hathaway:* so there is parallel work going on.

*Eric Engstrom:* yes.

*Sam Ruda:* off-site mitigation will be required. This is understood by the Port.

*Mike Rosen:* proposed language?

*Andy Cotugno:* try to make this appropriate to what contractor is tasked to do. Suggests, “seek to accomplish net increase in environmental function by identifying opportunities in 500 acres; recognizing that further off-island mitigation may be necessary.”

*Mike Rosen:* suggests, “identify” instead of “seek”

*Sam Ruda:* from the Port’s perspective, this not an issue. Any development that the Port is doing today, we are also building into the design, water quality treatment. It is just how you do things today, given the geography and rivers. All water is treated. The idea of treating water quality is already happening as a standard component of facility design.

*Jim Labbe:* noted Bob’s comment, to improve water quality – delete.

*Sam Imperati:* #5, “avoid impact to shallow water habitat from marine terminal development and improve/create shallow water habitat in the 500 acres of open space.”

*Eric Engstrom:* should stay, this is a key concept.

*Don Hanson:* should stay.

*Jim Labbe:* noted Bob’s suggested edit.

*Sam Ruda:* his edit waters down the statement.

*Jim Labbe:* proposed language: “develop opportunities for nature-based recreational uses that enhance natural resources protection and restoration objectives.”

*Susan Barnes:* what’s an example of that? Suggests, “Design nature-based recreational uses that enhance natural resources protection and restoration objectives.”

*Mike Rosen:* comments that access can come from doing restoration activities. We will have to explain this better to W-P.

There was additional discussion regarding mitigation and restoration.

*Jim Labbe:* looking for a net positive. This is not a big issue. We do not need to belabor it any further.

*Don Hanson:* would like to go with the language you came up with. Please re-state.

*Jim Labbe:* “develop and design nature-based recreational uses that enhance natural resources protection and restoration objectives.”

*Susan Barnes:* regarding #8, we can use same language, “avoid/minimize/mitigate” recreation impact to natural resources.

*Jim Labbe:* Bob’s #10; it would be nice if it could be incorporated and passed on to the consultants.

*Sam Ruda:* understands Bob's ideas, but thinks it is too much for the purpose of this document, too directive to W-P. Also, he thinks we have these issues covered by what is already in the document.

*Eric Engstrom:* if we keep it, suggests adding a period after "ecosystem function."

*Rachael Hoy:* wants to point out again, the Evaluation Criteria document will capture the specifics that have come up in this conversation.

*Susan Barnes:* if and when ODF&W comments on concept plans, we do comment on direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. She thinks the previous statements will capture this.

*Sam I* summarized that #10 would be kept but without the specifics, i.e. "Design development to reduce indirect impacts to ecosystem function.

Sam moved the group to the Community Planning section.

*Pam Ferguson:* #1, re: terminal types. Community will be impacted differently based on different types of terminals.

*Andy Cotugno:* thinks it was taken out because all the other things are directions to the consultants, that one was just an observation.

*Mike Rosen:* so is it covered in the new #1?

*Sam Imperati:* we can add, "avoid/minimize/mitigate livability impact, same as we did for the other sections.

*Sam Ruda:* not sure "mitigate" is appropriate.

*Chris Hathaway:* like in Airport Futures, you could add in something similar.

*Pam Ferguson:* still likes original #1

*Sam Ruda:* agrees with Pam that it is a true statement, but does not think it is relevant for this memo.

*Victor Viets:* we want to consider terminal types, site design, and facility operation to minimize the impacts. We want all of those words in there. It is not just facility development.

*Victor Viets:* after the last meeting, we had the follow-up session. His comment is regarding traffic planning for the CRC. He was recently asked by a state legislator what the island would think with no interchange. He would like to get some kind of integrated thinking here, with respect to the CRC. If we plan this assuming it will be there, it is a completely different alternative.

*Eric Engstrom:* the City is operating with the assumption that the CRC will be there. It is in our Transportation Plan.

*Andy Cotugno:* interesting point. If you do not have a CRC, then the argument for another WHI bridge is strong. If you do have the CRC, then it is weak.

*Eric Engstrom:* also, current performance of Marine Drive is not good, that would have to be addressed.

*Sam Imperati:* we need some language in here about being aware of PBOT's work re: CRC

*Don Hanson:* "coordinate with CRC work," or something like that.

*Victor Viets:* "Address public desire to access beaches." Strike "desire."

#### **WRAP-UP, MEETING EVALUATIONS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Sam Imperati wrapped up the editing process, saying unfortunately we did not have time to get to "Frame work for Concept Plan Development" and "WHI Issues Criteria Table." He explained those documents. Sam said that he and staff will work on developing a better process for handling these documents in the future and we will get documents to the AC sooner.

Pam Ferguson announced HICCUP 2011 (Hayden Island Community Clean Up), this weekend on East Hayden Island and West Hayden Island. There will be a community litter pick up effort and beach cleanup. She thanks the Port and Metro for their support.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

John Marshall, private citizen, said it was interesting watching a word-smithing process. He believes that "avoid/minimize/mitigate" is doublespeak. He thinks we mean "compensate" instead of "mitigate." He thinks this will come up we get to the hearings for annexation. John notes no one has gone through the NEPA process, and no one has proven purpose and need. He will be there to speak about this, as well.

#### **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

- AC Meeting Reminder: 9/23, 10/21, and 11/18
- Joint City Council and Port Commission Meeting: 10/12

#### **ADJOURN**

Meeting adjourned at noon.

*Notes respectfully submitted by the ICM, Inc. facilitation team.*

## AUGUST 19, 2011 WHI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION

### Six evaluation forms returned

<b>1. OVERALL MEETING QUALITY:</b>	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>2. PACING:</b>		Too Slow		Just Right	Too Fast
		<b>1</b>		<b>4</b>	
<b>3. CLARITY PRESENTATIONS:</b>	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>4. DOCUMENTS:</b>	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>5. DISCUSSION:</b>	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	

**6. MOST USEFUL?**

- Ample coffee.

**7. LEAST USEFUL?**

- Bob Sallinger’s changes to WorleyParsons memo of 6/30/11. It should have been provided ahead of time. Caused discussion to take longer than it should.
- Re: documents; everyone unfortunately struggled with version confusion. A rare occurrence for sure!
- Some folks are talking a very “expansive” view as to what triggers mitigation. This layering of mitigation requirements outside of any federal, state, local law or land-se requirements is dangerous.

**8. COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, OR QUESTIONS?**

- Good discussion.



## Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

### West Hayden Island Technical Work Session #1

August 5, 2011

#### Meeting Results - Key Points

The purpose of this memo is to highlight some of the key points discussed at the West Hayden Island Technical Work Session held on August 5, 2011. Full meeting notes, as well as all comments received from the technical reviewers and staff responses, will be available in the next couple of weeks.

#### Session 1: Recreation

1. Limiting “boots on the ground” – Many technical reviewers suggested limiting on the ground recreation on the 500 acres of open space on WHI. Options discussed included:
  - a. Only provide visual access from non-motorized water crafts
  - b. Use a trail to control access on WHI – without a trail people will trespass and could cause more damage
  - c. Provide access only via guided tours and structured restoration/educational activities
  - d. Provide a nature center east of the rail as a gateway to WHI
2. Beach access – All land below ordinary high water and land owned by Department of State Lands is public and accessible. Comments regarding beach access included:
  - a. EHI residents want walking access from EHI to WHI on the north beach
  - b. Design the terminal to allow access under docks, similar to Terminal 6
  - c. Use a constructed natural feature, such as a channel, to define beach access to a certain point and restrict access beyond.
3. Boating – Motorized and non-motorized were discussed:
  - a. There is no public boat launch on Hayden Island and there is need for both motorized and non-motorized, but motorized and non-motorized should be at separate facilities
  - b. A motorized launch would need to be on EHI and motorized is more appropriate for the Columbia River main channel
  - c. Non-motorized is appropriate for the Oregon Slough.
  - d. Could the no-wake zone be extended the full length of the Oregon Slough?

General comment - The memo needs to be more specific and look at the existing needs and opportunities of the island and surrounding area (Smith/Bybee, Kelly Point Park, Vancouver)



## Session 2: Hayden Island Natural Resources Inventory

1. The Dredge Deposit Management Area (DDMA) is a Special Habitat Area
  - a. Grassland-associated wildlife species and “at risk” wildlife species use the area on more than an incidental basis because 1) it is part of an island in the Columbia River floodplain and 2) it is a very large, relatively flat area with the right vegetation structure.
  - b. The on-going use and management of the DDMA maintains the sparse, low structure vegetation that supports grassland-associated species
  - c. Grassland-associated wildlife species are also found at other large, vacant properties with sparse low structure vegetation located in the historic Columbia River floodplain – Rivergate, St. John’s Landfill, Portland International Center, the Airport and WHI.
  - d. Designating the DDMA as Special Habitat Area provides information but does not predetermine future management; there are no regulatory requirements associated with the SHA designation.
2. The Bottomland Hardwood Forests are Self-Sustaining
  - a. Overall cottonwood forests in the Lower Columbia River are declining due to reduced flooding and changes in land use, but the forest on WHI is regenerating as evident by young cottonwood and ash within the forest
  - b. The WHI forest represents roughly 4% of the forest between the Bonneville Dam and Astoria; the WHI forest is larger than the Smith/Bybee Lakes forest
  - c. Bottomland hardwood forests area strategy habitat in the Oregon Conservation Strategy and ODFW recommends preservation of these forests

## Session 3: Regulatory Requirements

This was a Q&A session between the Advisory Committee members and the regulatory experts in attendance.

1. Is there a sequence to the regulations? Not necessarily, it depends on the purpose/need of the projects and the alternatives considered.
2. Metro exempted the Dredge Deposit Management Area and land around it from floodplain balanced cut and fill. A map is needed.
3. DSL owns a portion of land within the 500 acres and has jurisdiction over land below ordinary high water. That may impact how restoration/mitigation and recreation can occur. A map is needed.
4. The Natural Resources Damage Assessment (NRDA) Trustees identified WHI as a potential mitigation site, but there are no formal commitments to use WHI for Superfund mitigation.
5. The memo needs more about NEPA – what are the options for review, when can NEPA review occur?
6. It should be noted that the project goal is net improvement in ecological function, which is greater than meeting regulatory requirements.





**Bureau of Planning and Sustainability**

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA)

August 3, 2011

### What is the EOA?

Oregon's land use planning system requires cities to provide adequate capacity for employment growth. Statewide Planning Goal 9 requires a city to prepare an "economic opportunities analysis" (EOA). The EOA must be adopted by the City Council as part of Portland's new Comprehensive Plan.

The EOA has four general parts:

- an analysis of community growth trends and opportunities
- a forecast of 20-year demand for employment land in the city
- an inventory of existing developable land supply and estimate of any unmet 20-year needs
- a summary of policy choices to provide adequate employment land capacity

### What is the Comprehensive Plan?

Portland's Comprehensive Plan describes the city's growth management strategy, desired land use pattern (where various types of uses would go, such as industrial, residential, open space, institutional) and the infrastructure systems necessary to support that pattern (e.g., roads, utilities, parks, transit). The state of Oregon periodically requires local governments to examine and update their comprehensive plans. Portland is currently updating its Comprehensive Plan (which was originally created in 1980), and the EOA report is one of the state-mandated tasks required for that update. The new Comprehensive Plan will be one of the implementation tools of the City's new strategic plan, the Portland Plan.

### Why is the 2009 report being updated? What are some of the issues being addressed in the new draft?

The EOA report was first released in November 2009, as a draft, and has been available for public review since then. Based on feedback received to date, BPS has identified a number of refinements that should be made, including:

- Clarify the methods used to identify vacant and underutilized land.
- Provide better data to support assumptions about "constraints" that limit the use of some vacant and underutilized employment land, such as the impact of various environmental zoning regulations.
- Explain more thoroughly how areas that allow both employment and housing (such as the Central City, commercial corridors and town centers) will factor into meeting employment and residential land needs.
- Update growth forecasts coordinated with Metro, incorporating more recent data.
- Describe in greater depth the relationship between land needs and job density, cargo volumes and economic output.



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | [www.portlandonline.com/bps](http://www.portlandonline.com/bps)

1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

### Why is an EOA important?

Creating more living wage jobs is a top priority for Portlanders. The Portland Plan strategic plan established Economic Prosperity & Affordability as a key strategy to expand economic opportunities to support a socially and economically diverse population by prioritizing business growth, a robust regional economy and broadly accessible household prosperity.

Portland plays a major role as a regional employment center. Even though the city has competitive advantages due to its location, past infrastructure investments and workforce capacity, recent trends show that Portland is capturing a declining share of the region's new jobs. At the same time, the city has captured an expanding share of the region's housing.

Portland has limited options to "create" more land for employment, which poses new challenges for economic growth. In Portland, the challenge is to increase economic activity and jobs within a largely developed land supply. This can be affected by a variety of public choices, particularly in land use policy, infrastructure investments and development incentives.

### What are Portland's economic growth trends?

National and regional job growth since 2000 has been sluggish, compared to the 1980s and 1990s. The Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region (7-county MSA) added jobs at an average annual rate of almost 1% from 2000 to 2008, compared to a long-term annual growth rate of 2.1% from 1980 to 2008. This slowing trend has been even sharper in Multnomah County. Historically, Multnomah County captured about 28% of regional job growth in the 1980s and 31% in the 1990s, but employment actually declined by 8% from 2000 to 2008. It is not clear whether slower post-2000 job-growth trends are an exceptional period or will continue as the "new normal." It is clear, however, that Portlanders expect City planners to take a more proactive role in encouraging job growth.

The current draft of the EOA assumes a 1.7% average annual job growth rate in the seven-county region from 2010 to 2035. This is consistent with Metro's most recent forecast (2009). The draft also assumes that Portland will capture 27% of the regional growth during that same time period, a rate that is similar to the period from 1980 to 2000, but higher than the past decade.

### Are some business sectors growing faster than others?

Yes. There are some sectors of the Portland economy that have experienced stronger growth in recent years. Healthcare and education have been the city's leading job growth sectors since 2000. In addition, office sector expansion has generated a healthy rate of job growth in the Central City. Economic activity in the region also continues to rely on Portland's harbor and rail infrastructure.

Portland's industrial sector represents a relatively large proportion of our economy, though the industrial sector has generally experienced "jobless growth" since 2000. Freight volume and manufacturing output has grown, and the Portland region is a leader in export income per capita, but the number of industrial jobs in Portland (city) has decreased.

### What are the preliminary findings?

Comparing forecasted 25-year land demand with current developable land capacity, the draft EOA found substantial shortfalls of industrial land, primarily in the Portland harbor and airport districts, and campus institutional land. The draft EOA identifies potential actions to overcome these shortfalls, such as incentives to encourage brownfield cleanup and redevelopment, or infrastructure investments to allow more efficient use of the existing land supply. These ideas and others will be considered as the Comprehensive Plan is updated over the next two years.



**Where can I find the EOA Report?**

A 2009 draft of the EOA report is on the Portland Plan website:

[www.pdxplan.com/backgroundreports](http://www.pdxplan.com/backgroundreports)

The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability is working with a consultant (E.D. Hovee & Company) to refine the draft report. A stakeholder advisory committee has also provided detailed technical comments. A new draft is underway and will be complete by October 2011.

**How can I comment on the anticipated October 2011 draft?**

Once the new draft is available, it will be published on the [www.pdxplan.com](http://www.pdxplan.com) website. There will be a 30-day public comment period. The Planning and Sustainability Commission will hold a public hearing on Nov. 8, 2011. Later in 2011 the report will be presented to City Council.

**How does the River Plan relate to the EOA?**

In April 2010, the Portland City Council adopted the River Plan / North Reach, a plan for the industrial Willamette River. While the River Plan struck a balance among its various objectives, three industrial groups appealed the decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) and later, to the Court of Appeals. The appeals raise concern about the potential impacts of environmental regulations on the city's supply of industrial land.

In adopting the River Plan / North Reach, the City relied on land supply information in an older adopted EOA report, and the 2009 (not yet adopted) EOA draft. The courts ruled that the City's adopted EOA was out of date and that Portland's City Council must adopt the new EOA.

**For more information, please contact:**

Tom Armstrong  
503-823-6053  
[Tom.armstrong@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Tom.armstrong@portlandoregon.gov)

Steve Kountz  
503-823-4551  
[Steve.kountz@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Steve.kountz@portlandoregon.gov)

Phil Nameny  
503-823-7709  
[Phil.nameny@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Phil.nameny@portlandoregon.gov)





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

## **LAND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK TO ADDRESS CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

The City Council directed the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, in conjunction with other City Agencies, to take several steps toward addressing the future of West Hayden Island, including developing a legislative proposal for annexation of West Hayden Island to the City.

The Council specified that the legislative proposal would include alternatives for how natural resource lands could be managed over the long term including proposals for long term land ownership and strategies to pay for land management activities. The resolution provides the following additional guidance to the City relevant to this scope of work:

- The proposal should include an analysis of options for restoration and long term care of the proposed natural areas, models for financing both be developed.
- The analysis should include evaluation of ownership of the natural areas, remediation and mitigation opportunities, and the creation of an endowment for operations and maintenance of the land.
- The primary feature of the proposal should be permanent protection and enhancement of at least 500 acres as open space, to be permanently managed primarily for the benefit of the regional ecosystem

Introduction: The purpose of this memo is to provide alternative land management options, including ownership patterns and funding sources, for 500 acres of open space and natural resources on West Hayden Island.

There are multiple reports that will address activities within the 500 acres of open space on WHI:

- The Concept Plan will produce a preferred alternative for restoration and recreation. This will be based, in part on the City's recreation analysis.
- The Regulatory Requirements memo will summarize potential mitigation needs associated with 300 acres of marine terminal and passive recreation amenities
- The ESEE Analysis will recommend natural resource protection and mitigation needs

It is anticipated that some of the area within the 500 acres of open space will be used to mitigate for impacts of marine terminal development.





Bureau of Planning and Sustainability  
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

### Scope of Work:

**Task 1 :** Review and summarize past and current planning efforts for West Hayden Island as they relate to restoration options, enhancement and remediation and mitigation opportunities

- Map current ownership patterns and easements – Port, PGE, DSL, City, etc.
- Meet with BES, Parks and OHWR representatives to discuss past and current restoration and mitigation efforts that could affect WHI including River Plan/North Reach and Kelley Point Park
- Meet with Port representatives to discuss mitigation plans for WHI that may be associated with non-WHI projects
- Document uncertainties including Superfund, Bonneville Power Administration, climate change (flood regimes?) and FEMA lawsuit
- Deliverable: memo summarizing past and current plans and uncertainties; map of current ownership patterns

**Task 2:** Draft near-term and long-term ownership scenarios based on the Concept Plan preferred alternative for restoration and recreation; and considering mitigation needs for 300 acres of marine terminal development

- Outline options for future near-term and long-term ownership of the open space (Port, DSL, City, Metro, Conservancy or endowment)
- Analyze the ownership, management, and funding of other large natural areas in the Lower Columbia and Willamette River systems. Document any “lessons learned.” Include City’s current experience with Ross Island, Elk Island and the state’s experience with Government Island.
- Document pros and cons, and feasibility, of the ownership alternatives; consider relationship to DSL in-water management
- Make a recommendation for near-term and long-term ownership patterns that would maximize goals for natural resources and recreation
- Deliverable: memo and map documenting the alternatives, analysis and recommendation

**Task 3:** Ongoing funding for operations and maintenance

- Outline options for financing future enhancement/restoration and long-term care of the area
- Discuss how various management and mitigation strategies may affect financing options
- Consider the creation of an endowment for operations and maintenance
- Deliverable: memo



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | [www.portlandonline.com/bps](http://www.portlandonline.com/bps)  
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

*Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.*



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability  
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

Timeline: This work will be performed after the concept planning process and will use the preferred alternative as the base for land management discussions.

NOTE: specific land management organizations may include, but are not limited to:

The Nature Conservancy

Columbia River Land Trust - <http://www.columbialandtrust.org/our-work/conservation-projects>

McKenzie River Trust – they hold Green Island – a 1000 acre property with several islands and some active farm use with significant shoreline at the confluence of the McKenzie and Willamette)

<http://mckenzieriver.org/protecting-land/owned-properties>



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | [www.portlandonline.com/bps](http://www.portlandonline.com/bps)  
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

*Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.*



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability  
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

## **PORT COORDINATION DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK TO ADDRESS CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

The City Council directed the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, in conjunction with other City Agencies, to take several steps toward addressing the future of West Hayden Island, including developing a legislative proposal for annexation of West Hayden Island to the City.

The Council specified that the legislative proposal would supplement the recently completed Foundation Studies with an update of the cargo forecasts, additional analysis of the expected cost/benefits to the City, analysis of operational efficiencies that allow more compact deep water marine terminal facilities, and *an evaluation of opportunities for increased coordination with the Port of Vancouver.*

Introduction: The purpose of this memo is to evaluate existing coordination between the Port of Portland and the Port of Vancouver, and illustrate opportunities for greater coordination. This paper does not make a policy recommendation, but includes the following:

- Review background and structure of each of the Ports.
- Review port niches, competition, and existing coordination efforts.
- Look at opportunities for increased coordination, and identify barriers.
- Consider potential tools and mechanisms to increase coordination ranging from IGA's up to a joint authority
- Review existing Joint Port Authorities within the U.S. and list benefits and obstacles to formation and management.
- Outline process steps required to create a single Interstate Port Authority (including identifying government requirements, barriers, and logistics)

### Scope of Work

#### **Task 1: Background of Ports**

- a. Provide overview on the establishment and history of the Port of Portland and Port of Vancouver
- b. Review the goals of the two ports and the niches that they fill (Portland-container/Vancouver: break bulk) and their historical responsibilities over the years.
- c. Consider how market forces have determined roles of the two ports.

#### **Task 2: Current Governmental Structure**

- a. Review port and port commission's current governmental structure. How are they appointed, where is their charter located, etc
  - Creation of Charter or operating document



- # of commissioners
  - Appointed or Elected
  - Local or State Representation
- b. Explain the similarities and differences between their operational and government structure.
- Consider the same standards as above.

**Task 3: Current Coordination Efforts**

- a. Review current agreements between Vancouver and Portland Ports
- Marketing Agreements
  - IGA's
  - Channel Deepening Efforts
  - Non-compete agreements
  - Other specific examples
- b. Consider areas where the ports actively compete with each other and also different functions they fill that complement each other.
- c. Consider how market conditions have guided and shaped coordination opportunities.
- d. Consider infrastructure improvements, land inventory and operating environment on coordination efforts.
- e. Consider effects of Harbor Lands and Cargo Forecast consultant work on potential coordination efforts.
- f. Research into any other agreements for ports in the Lower Columbia River Estuary.

**Task 4: Additional Coordination Efforts**

- a. Consider opportunities and tools to enable additional coordination
- Increased IGA's
  - Land Use Coordination and land supply including mitigation opportunities.
  - Operational Coordination
  - Sharing of resources and/or revenue
- b. Consider advantages and barriers to further coordination
- c. Other potential coordination efforts short of merging the ports.

**Task 5: Joint State Port Authorities \***

- d. Overview of Joint Authorities
- e. Steps Required to form Joint Authorities
- Local Requirements
  - Amending Port Charters
  - Bi-state Amendments
  - Congressional Authority
- f. Existing Joint Authorities
- g. Other Attempts to form new Joint Authorities

- Savannah GA & South Carolina

\* Note: Any discussion of a bi-state port authority is purely hypothetical, and is driven by the Portland City Council's interest in understanding the full range of coordination that is possible. There is no proposal at this time to form a joint port authority and any attempt to form such an authority would require local, state and federal government legislative actions, as well as potential changes to the state constitutions.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability  
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

## Framework for Concept Plan Development

### Goal:

- Get to the best planning base to inform zoning and annexation

### Sequence of Activities:

- Develop top issues that are relevant to the design/layout (*in progress, to be completed at August 19 meeting*)
- Develop evaluation criteria to evaluate different concepts (mix of quantitative and qualitative ) - (*August 19 and Sept 23 meetings*)
- Review and discuss concept plan layouts and evaluate elements utilizing the evaluation criteria (*further refine evaluation criteria as needed*) - (*Sept 23 and Oct 21 meetings*)
- Create evaluation matrices (Worley Parsons) to examine and absorb different aspects of the discussion: quantitative and qualitative in order to compare different concept plan elements (*Late October - November*)
- Review quantitative and qualitative information provided by the Advisory Committee for each evaluation criteria --which site plan alternatives or elements do a better job at meeting CWG principles? (*December 9 meeting*)
- Refine plans (Worley Parsons) to help city define zoning and annexation requirements (*December - January*)

### Goals for today's meeting:

- Final review/comment on Top Issues document
- Preliminary review and comment on the Issue Criteria list - is there anything missing, what should be removed?





**MEMORANDUM : UPDATED BASED ON COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**DATE** 7/29/11

---

**TO** Erik Engstrom, Rachael Hoy, Phil Nameny

---

**FROM** Matt Laccinole

---

**COPY** Loren Hettinger, Bill Dunlap, Le Griffin, Jenny Carlson

---

**PROJECT NAME** West Hayden Island (WHI) Conceptual Studies and Related Studies

---

**PROJECT NO.** 80551

---

**SUBJECT** Top Issues from Identification Table (re: Advisory Committee)

---

**FILE NO.** 80551-00-MEM-0001

---

Deleted: Five

Updated on 7/29/11 based on feedback from the Advisory Committee:

In summary, the CWG Working Group Principles relating to multiple aspects of the project are:

1. A net increase in ecosystem function.
2. A positive contribution to regional economic health (e.g., jobs, wealth).
3. An economically viable port facility.
4. A positive contribution to the local community (e.g., health, transportation, property value, recreation facility, and opportunity).
5. An addition to, not competition with, the regional port system.
6. Public access opportunities to WHI.
7. Sustainable scale for any use included as part of the option.
8. Flexibility to accommodate the unknown future.
9. Taking advantage of the unique aspects and opportunities on the site.
10. Consideration of impacts on multiple time periods (i.e., current, mid-range and future).
11. Consideration of impacts on multiple geographies (i.e., local, sub-regional and regional level).

Deleted: land

Deleted: .

Deleted: ¶

Based on the CWG principles and issue identification table provided, WorleyParsons believes the following issues are keys to **economics and terminal planning**:



**MEMORANDUM (CONTINUED)**

1. Plan for development, including supporting infrastructure, that fits within the 300 acres defined by the City.

2. Consider terminal type(s) (esp. marine structures) which minimize impact to/preserves shallow water habitat.

3. Incorporate a rail loop into the terminal design per the Council resolution that can maximize intermodal rail transport.

4. Identify marine terminal operational efficiencies that can reduce the overall footprint (e.g. incorporates advanced technology).

5. Provide flexibility in terminal design, to meet potentially changing market demands

6. Plan for commercially viable, market-driven development, recognizing that this may lead to:

- environmental mitigation
- the application of advanced technology
- concern among labor organizations.

7. Propose terminal development that is well-balanced and includes considerations for the environment and community

8. Provide for safety considerations and terminal security (Homeland Security Act)

Based on the CWG principles and issue identification table provided, WorleyParsons believes the following issues are keys to **environmental planning**:

1. Maintain as much of the habitat patch volume as possible (high surface area: edge ratio).
2. Develop buffer (transition) areas to reduce impacts to important habitat, such as multi-storied forest and raptor-eagle nest sites.
3. Mitigate water quality impacts associated with marine terminal development.
4. Improve water quality within the 500 acres of open space.
5. Avoid impacts to shallow water habitat from marine terminal development and improve/create shallow water habitat in the 500 acres of open space.
6. Consider effects to wetlands and if mitigation is required, explore opportunities to improve functionality.
7. Integrate nature-based recreation uses with habitat value to reduce conflicts.
8. Mitigate any recreation impacts to natural resources, as for other development impacts.

Based on the CWG principles and issue identification table provided, WorleyParsons believes the following issues are keys to **community planning**:

- Deleted: Terminal
- Deleted: boundary
- Deleted: should be
- Deleted: as
- Deleted: <#>Ultimate terminal development is market driven/commercial base (that means the type(s) of proposed terminal should be the one that is well supported by the market, even if it requires some level of environmental mitigation and the application of advanced technology and may be of concern in relation to labor issues).¶
- Deleted: mainly
- Deleted: ) that has less
- Deleted: and is able to utilize at maximum intermodal rail transport.
- Deleted: Potential
- Deleted: could
- Deleted: Terminal type that allows the use of advance
- Deleted: <#>Flexibility of terminal design and the viability of terminal operations will ensure the long term, short term job creation for the region.¶ Proposed
- Deleted: must be
- Deleted:
- Deleted: include other requirements of:
- Deleted: <#>Safety¶¶ <#>Public access to the beach, limit access for resident¶¶ <#>Creation of buffers between marine site and others land-uses¶¶ <#>Sufficient mitigation measures to mitigate/eliminate impacts of terminal operations and cargo movements ¶¶ <#>Other restoration and recreation areas and activities¶¶
- Deleted: aspects
- Deleted: <#>Consider means to improve water quality and shallow water habitat.¶¶ Consider
- Deleted: whether an opportunity exists
- Deleted: (related to previous item).
- Deleted: **social aspects**
- Deleted: MCE



**MEMORANDUM (CONTINUED)**

1. Consider site design options to minimize/mitigate short and long term impacts from increases in emissions; dust, noise, and traffic and overall health concerns.
2. Consider traffic mitigation measures such as a WHI Bridge to reduce/eliminate terminal traffic on Hayden Island Drive.
3. Consider access roads and a new WHI bridge as another egress for island residents.
4. Preserve vegetation around edges to provide buffer to neighboring development.
5. Consider local and regional recreational needs and desires, considering passive, nature-based, and active uses (east of the BNSF rail alignment).
6. Address public desire to access beaches.

Deleted: <#>Terminal types can have livability impacts on nearby residents.¶  
Depending on terminal type/use there could be increase

Deleted: <#>Consider the second Bridge and access roads for terminal access and connectivity.¶  
Preservation of natural areas

Deleted: edge is important

Deleted: both

Deleted: .

Deleted: MCE

## WHI Issues Criteria Table ~ 8/18/11

Draft criteria are listed in the following table to evaluate means to reduce impacts to each issue from port development or to establish metrics for enhancement through planning. The criteria also are designed to measure potential impacts either directly from facility footprint or indirectly from facility intrusion for each alternative. The criteria were developed to be quantitative wherever possible so that the effects of the alternatives on the issues or the results of enhancement/mitigation can be more easily measured in making comparisons.

I. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	CRITERIA	COMMENTS
<b>A) Habitat Patch Volume</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ratio of surface area to edge (measured in patch area to edge distance; higher ratios increase habitat value)</li> <li>2. Structural complexity of tree-shrub- herbaceous composition, with more strata having higher value</li> <li>3. Amount of interspersion of the patch (habitat complexity) near the edge, increasing habitat diversity and proximity to water (drainage ways, wetland)</li> </ol>	
<b>B) Buffer Areas for Important Habitat</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Distance across buffer area from habitat to proposed development/disturbance</li> <li>2. Distance across buffer; factored (reduced) if habitat that of “at risk” species</li> <li>3. Composition of buffer area and amount (length) of forest, shrub, herbaceous cover (e.g., greater length of forest provides a higher buffer value)</li> </ol>	
<b>C) Water Quality Impact Mitigation at Marine Terminal</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acres or % impervious area within the 300 acre development footprint</li> </ol>	
<b>D) Improve Water Quality within Open Space</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Possible mitigation measures to reduce concentrations of key parameters (e.g., TSS, TDS, Nitrates, Phosphorus, O2); may be in conjunction with next two items)</li> </ol>	

<p><b>E) Avoid Shallow Water Habitat at Marine Terminal and Improve/Develop Shallow Water habitat in Open Space</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amount of shallow water habitat avoided by footprint</li> <li>2. Amount of area available and amenable to adding or improving shallow water habitat with features conducive to habitat conditions (temperature, substrate, water velocities)</li> </ol>	
<p><b>F) Wetland Mitigation Potential</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amount of area available to establish wetlands or extend existing wetlands</li> <li>2. Amount of area available to establish complex wetland habitats (e.g., forest, shrub [riparian], graminoid)</li> <li>3. Amount of area available for water quality enhancement, flood storage, and nutrient input functions</li> <li>4. Elevational profile and hydrology of areas as a measure of suitability for wetland development.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>G) Integrate Nature-based Recreation Uses With Habitat Value to Reduce Conflicts</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish buffer areas to reduce recreational impacts on valuable habitat</li> <li>2. Acres of habitat impacted by on-the-ground recreational activities</li> <li>3. Screening buffers (e.g., forest) used to site recreation in relation to sensitive habitat</li> <li>4. Distance from sensitive habitats to recreational uses (e.g., siting wildlife viewing areas in a way to focus use to minimize random disturbance).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>H) Mitigate any Recreation Impacts to Natural Resources, as for Other Development</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of natural buffers to minimize habitat-recreation conflicts</li> <li>2. Width of vegetated buffers between development and interior/sensitive habitat areas</li> <li>3. Timing restrictions for life-functions that are likely to be affected by recreation (e.g., "at risk" species)</li> <li>4. Buffer distances to habitats at certain key life-function periods (e.g., rearing of young, winter feeding)</li> <li>5. Distance from recreational uses to sensitive habitats</li> </ol>	

II. COMMUNITY ISSUES	CRITERIA	COMMENTS
<p>A) Consider site design options to minimize/mitigate liveability impacts including emissions, dust, noise, traffic and overall health concerns.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluate liveability impacts and differentiate site designs and uses that minimize impacts</li> <li>2. Changes to intersection level of service ratings (same as below).</li> <li>3. Decibel increases to nearby neighbourhoods during evening/night/early morning hours</li> </ol>	
<p>B) Consider traffic mitigation measures such as a WHI Bridge to reduce/eliminate terminal traffic on Hayden Island Drive.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Compare Level of Service predictions among design alternatives.</li> <li>2. Compare order of magnitude costs for Bridge and Offsite Road improvements.</li> <li>3. Compare acres and types of natural resources impacted with WHI Bridge verses improvements to Hayden Island Drive.</li> </ol>	
<p>C) Consider access roads and a new WHI bridge as another egress for island residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify offsite traffic impacts based on Level of Service measurements from new bridge in accordance with PBOT standards. Compare emergency service response times for bridge verses no bridge.</li> </ol>	
<p>D) Preserve vegetation around edges to provide buffer to neighbouring development.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Width of and typed of vegetated area between development and neighbourhoods</li> <li>2. Proximity (distance) of terminal development to neighbouring community for each proposed type of terminal</li> </ol>	
<p>E) Consider local and regional recreational needs and desires, considering passive, nature-based, and active uses (east of the BNSF rail alignment).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many of the local recreational needs identified in the previous work (including staff work) are met? Beach access, human powered/motorized boat launches, nature based, passive recreational trails...</li> <li>2. Effectiveness of site design to provide recreational access to residents while limiting effects on natural resources.</li> </ol>	
<p>F) Address public desire to access beaches.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pedestrian and boat access to beaches, compare ease of public access to beaches and trails.</li> <li>2. Compare extent of access to all beaches, disabled, vehicular, pedestrian, boat.</li> </ol>	

III. ECONOMIC ISSUES	EVALUATION CRITERIA	COMMENTS
<p>A) Plan for marine terminal development, including supporting infrastructure, that fits within the 300 acres defined by the City</p>	<p>1. Total required terminal development area inclusive of terminal supporting infrastructure within the boundary limit of 300 acres as stated in the Council Resolution.</p>	
<p>B) Consider terminal type(s) (and particularly marine structures) that minimize shallow water impacts and that help preserve shallow water habitat.</p>	<p>1. Acres of shallow water habitat impacted by required marine structure development. 2. Volume of dredging material required to meet water depths (draft) for different terminal types.</p>	
<p>C) Incorporate a rail loop into the terminal design in order to maximize intermodal rail transport</p>	<p>1. Length (ft) of rail loops and lead tracks can accommodate unit train anticipated in future operations per Council Resolution 2. Number of types of commodities that can use the rail loop. 3. Rail configuration able to situate receiving dumper(s) so as to minimize conveyor system requirements. 4. Rail configuration that provides sufficient rail spur length for load buffering and storage of bad orders.</p>	
<p>D) Identify marine terminal operational innovations that reduce the overall operational footprint of the terminal</p>	<p>1. Terminal layout that provides more storage capacity (tonnage) for given footprint 2. Terminal that has ability to provide direct loading from rail to vessel 3. Terminal that uses innovative storage structure (vertical space) that allows the use of high-capacity automated equipment</p>	
<p>E) Provide flexibility in terminal concept layout design, allowing operations to meet changing market demands</p>	<p>1. Terminal layouts capable of handling multiple commodity types and that can be developed in phases 2. Has larger terminal area and flexibility to accommodate additional terminal features and that can be re-configured for short, medium and long term terminal land uses 3. Terminals that have flexible storage structures (easy to add on or modification when needed) 4. Has direct and efficient link to boarder transportation corridor (especially rail)</p>	

<p><b>F) Plan for commercially viable, market-driven development</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Terminal sizing and capacities consistent with market forecasts (sufficient available land to accommodate terminal development in the long term) that helps to balance public/private risks</b></li> <li><b>2. Optimization of layout that in spacing and orientation of terminal docks, storage and receiving and loading areas that allows the use of automated operating systems.</b></li> <li><b>3. Utilization of market supportable technology innovations in the design</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>G) Propose terminal development that is well-balanced and includes considerations of the environmental and community considerations regarding safety and homeland security</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Acres of buffer between terminal operating areas and community.</b></li> <li><b>2. Location of buffer between terminal operating areas and community.</b></li> <li><b>3. Land use plan developed with broad community and environmental participation</b></li> </ol>	

## Updated (8/16/11) WHI Calendar of Upcoming Meetings/Activities

August	September	October	November	December	January
5 <sup>th</sup> WHI Technical Works session: 1 <sup>st</sup> round project reports (Recreation, Regulatory, NRI)	14 <sup>th</sup> Port Commission: IGA update	12 <sup>th</sup> Joint Council/Port Commission Update/Discussion of concept plans	10 <sup>th</sup> WHI Technical work session: 3 <sup>rd</sup> round project reports (Harbor Lands, Port/Vancouver Coordination, Transportation Analysis)	9 <sup>th</sup> (one week earlier) WHI AC meeting: Review of draft preferred base concept plan / discussion of zoning options	20 <sup>th</sup> WHI AC meeting: Concept planning document & presentation of public input on preferred base concept plan)
	16 <sup>th</sup> WHI Technical work session: 2 <sup>nd</sup> round project reports(Operational Efficiencies, Rail)	13 <sup>th</sup> Public Open House (Concept Plan Review & Input) 5-8pm Park Room, Jantzen Beach	18 <sup>th</sup> WHI AC meeting: Discussion of planning principles: forming basis for zoning/annexation discussion, mitigation approach/confirming principles. Final public input report.	10 <sup>th</sup> - 20 <sup>th</sup> Public engagement activity (around preferred base concept plan) -TBD	
10 <sup>th</sup> Public Tour (south side of WHI) 6:30-8:00pm	23 <sup>rd</sup> (one week later) WHI AC Meeting: 9-12noon (review draft concept plans and refine evaluation criteria )	15 <sup>th</sup> Public Open House (Concept Plan Review & Input) 9-12noon (Location : TBD)	30 <sup>th</sup> Consultant completes preliminary preferred base concept plan		
Consultant Working on Concept Plans		Wk of 17 <sup>th</sup> Staff Office Hours on HI			
19 <sup>th</sup> WHI AC Meeting: 9-12noon Issue Discussion and Evaluation Criteria Development	30 <sup>th</sup> Public Comment Due on Natural Resources Inventory	21 <sup>st</sup> WHI AC Meeting: 9 - 2pm Presentation of public input received to date & evaluation of concepts			
31 <sup>st</sup> City Council: Update IGA with Port (consent agenda)		Wk of 24 <sup>th</sup> Staff Office hours on HI 31 <sup>st</sup> Deadline for Public comments on concepts			

**Updated (8/16/11) WHI Calendar of Upcoming Meetings/Activities**

February	March	April	May	June
<p>17<sup>th</sup> WHI AC Meeting: Mitigation discussion/Evaluation drafts: ESEE, Cost/benefit</p>	<p>16<sup>th</sup> WHI AC: Zoning proposals/draft plan district</p>	<p>20<sup>th</sup> WHI AC: Zoning proposals/draft plan district</p>	<p>18<sup>th</sup> WHI AC Meeting</p>	<p>18<sup>th</sup> WHI AC Meeting</p>
<p>21<sup>st</sup> WHI Technical Work Session: 4<sup>th</sup> round project reports (ESEE, Land Mgmt Options, Public cost/benefit, Cargo update, mitigation/restoration)</p>			<p>Target 1<sup>st</sup> hearing: Planning &amp; Sustainability Commission (no date set)</p>	