

**West Hayden Island Advisory Committee Meeting # 14**  
**Friday, January 20, 2012, 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 – 10:00**

**Welcome and Agenda Review**

**Announcements and Follow up from Last Meeting:**

- A) Approval of December Notes**
- B) Technical Work Session Debrief**
- C) Review and Update Remaining Technical Panel Lists**
- D) Land Management Options Update**
- E) Mitigation Subcommittee Meeting Update**

**10:00 – 11:30\***

**Plan District/Zoning Approach Discussion**

**11:30– 11:45**

**Public Comment (Approximate time slot)**

**11:45 – 12:00**

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

**AC Meeting Reminder: 2/17, 9am -1 pm at Oxford Suites on Hayden Island and 3/16 (BPS, 7A)**

**2012 Technical Work Session(s):**

**March 12, 2012 8:00am- 12:00pm – BPS, room 7A Topics Harbor Lands Inventory, Public Benefit/Cost,**

**March 23, 2012: 8:30am – 12:30pm – BPS, room 7A ESEE, Land Mgmt Options**

**\* Break will be provided**

**WEST HAYDEN ISLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING # 14****FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 2012, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM**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	
Chris Hathaway	LCREP	X
Brian Owendoff	PBA	X
Emily Roth	Parks & Recreation	X
Sam Ruda	Port of Portland	X
Bob Sallinger	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	X
Sam Imperati	ICM (Facilitation Team)	X
Phil Nameny	BPS	X
Jonna Papaefthimiou	Mayor's Office	
Mike Rosen	BES	X
Joe Zehnder	BPS	

<b>Public Attending (name)</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Joe Bennett	
Heidi Berg	Office of Healthy Working Rivers
Sylvia Ciborowski	Lewis & Clark
Mike Connors	
Marla Harrison	Port of Portland
Scott King	Port of Portland
Mollie Koett	PSU Student
Danielle Lafayette	PSU Student
Barry Manning	BPS
John Marshall	Citizen
Donna Murphy	Hayden Island
Janna Stevens	PSU Student
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**

### Approval of December WHI AC Notes

Approved as written.

### Technical Work Session Debrief

Phil Nameny of BPS provided a brief review of the 12/16 Work Session on Port Coordination. In the work session, they reviewed the history of the Ports of Portland (POP) and Vancouver (POV), their operating structures, and past coordination efforts such as Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) and legislative acts, the latter of which generally have not moved forward. Over the last twenty years, the Ports have largely been working under IGAs, e.g. the dredging project in the Columbia River.

There was discussion about some steps needed to enhance Port coordination, such as local agreements and state agreements, which could result in statute change. Phil said the issue would need a champion to move it forward politically. In addition, there are other aspects of state and regional regulations to be explored to find ways to allow for better collaboration between the states. Phil said a final draft of the report likely to be out by the next WHI AC meeting.

*Sam Ruda*: the City did great job on the report and presentation. Announcement: next week the Port of Vancouver will have a special Commission meeting at which a fairly substantial bulk export announcement will be made. The size of facility contemplated will take a large piece of land. Specific details will be released next week. Additional announcement: there is interest in possible new coal facilities out of the Powder River Basin and two facilities in St. Helen's. One is a very typical bulk export facility. The other is a rail line going to Boardman. He is mentioning this not to debate about coal, as the two facilities not likely needed at this time, but rather to note that with all these endeavors, there continues to be a lot of interest in this area as a gateway.

*Brian Owendoff*: did Port of Portland compete for that business?

*Sam Ruda*: no.

*Brian Owendoff*: how often do POP and POV compete for facilities?

*Sam Ruda*: occasionally. It is lessening over time. What really drives shipper choice now is facilities.

### West Hayden Island Transportation Modeling Analysis: Phase 1 Network Analyses

Bob Hillier, PBOT, provided an update on the traffic analysis reported on at the 12/16 Technical Work Session. PBOT contracted with BPS to model the traffic both with and without a new bridge facility. There will be a complete policy assessment with this analysis. Bob distributed a summary memo, West Hayden Island Transportation Modeling Analysis: Phase 1 Network

Analyses, with key highlights from the traffic analysis. Bob reviewed the memo and described the modeling of a high-impact development scenario (two auto terminals and one bulk facility).

**Key Phase 1 Traffic Analysis Findings:**

- The “high impact” development scenario adds **360 vehicles** (20% trucks) to Hayden Island streets during PM 2-hour peak (about 5% of total Hayden Island demand).
- The ‘high impact’ development is comparable to the **300 vehicles** assumed in the CRC FEIS.
- There is little variation in traffic demand between the future scenarios compared to the growth in regional traffic by 2035, indicating that **regional growth has a much greater impact on future demand than the incremental increase from a Port development.**
- **All network links operate at V/C <0.9 or better for all future scenarios.**
- With WHI Bridge, 11% of Port traffic (**40 vehicles**) use Hayden Island streets. Without WHI Bridge, 24% of Port traffic (**100 vehicles**) use CRC local arterial bridge (8% of total bridge traffic).
- With new Hayden Island/Marine Drive Interchanges, no Rivergate to I-5 cut-through traffic would use a new WHI bridge (**2-4 minute difference**). Without the new Interchanges, one third of the east to northbound traffic (**200 vehicles**) would use a new WHI Bridge as a through route due to projected congestion at the Interchanges.
- Hayden Island local streets are projected to experience the worse traffic conditions during the weekend noon period compared with the typical weekday PM peak period, due to traffic associated with the Janzen Beach Shopping Center.
- Port development adds **8 vehicles** to local St Johns streets during 2-hour PM peak, compared to **140 (non-Port)** Hayden Island vehicles using St Johns streets

Bob said they received comments and recommendations from the Technical Work Session, which included looking at what level of traffic congestion would trigger the need for a new WHI bridge and how many additional trucks would travel past the manufactured home park on North Hayden Island Drive. They are working to address questions regarding capacity and cost and hope to have that information by the end of the month.

Bob noted they are projecting a lot more housing and less retail space on the island. So, even without the Hayden Island development, there will still be a lot of growth that is going to happen there, separate from Port activities.

*Pam Ferguson:* the traffic analysis would be different based upon the different products at the new Port facilities. How did you handle that in your modeling and analysis?

*Bob Hillier:* they created what they felt was a reasonable high-impact scenario; that was the rationale used to choose a bulk terminal and two auto terminals with some associated light manufacturing on site. This was based on conversations with the City and the Port to determine a scenario that would have a higher traffic impact.

*Eric Engstrom:* the Advisory Committee needs to think about what policy to adopt regarding a new bridge. 300 cars is a pretty small number for such a large investment.

*Bob Hillier:* yes, there are other things you can do to mitigate additional trucks.

*Eric Engstrom:* the City is really thinking about this. Also, Bob, you noted “what if there is no CRC.” If that happens, more than just this project would have to do new traffic analysis, as it is in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and is thus a foundation for the planning that has been going on locally and regionally.

*Bob Hillier:* it makes a big difference; it changes our assumptions quite a bit. At this point, we are moving forward with the analysis assuming the CRC will be built.

*Sam Imperati:* question for clarification regarding the table, with Volume and Capacity (V/C) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) rates. Looking ahead at 2035, we see improvements because the CRC is in the analysis. What you are saying is those numbers would change with no CRC.

*Bob Hillier:* correct. The CRC makes a big difference to the overall network.

*Bob Sallinger:* described a bad traffic scenario example; question: how does your modeling capture anomalies and find the pinch points in the system?

*Bob Hillier:* the model looks at the shortest route, including time and distance. It cannot really mimic human thought and behavior, like choosing to take a different route because of a traffic jam.

*Bob Sallinger:* Hayden Island is challenging because it is an island; when the traffic is bad it is horrible.

*Bob Hillier:* agreed. But it is like planning the size of a shopping mall parking lot based upon the amount of cars during Christmas season.

*Andy Cotugno:* the analysis is based upon average conditions; you could artificially lower the capacity to simulate a wreck.

*Bob Hillier:* agreed; we could do “what if” scenarios.

*Victor Viets:* his understanding is we are not considering manufacturing options on the site which may require deep water shipping. So, the scenarios PBOT is looking at are very narrow, the results of the analysis could be very different from what eventually occurs, especially if we do not get a lot of marine terminal business and get manufacturing sites instead. The traffic generation potential is quite different.

*Bob Hillier:* agreed.

*Sam Ruda:* to clarify Victor’s point, it is important to reaffirm that the manufacturing concept in the concept plan is complimentary to marine development. One would not happen without the other.

*Eric Engstrom:* use the Toyota facility as an example of the worst case scenario; to a reasonable level, he thinks it was built into the model.

*Bob Hillier:* Yes. This was built into the model. Another way to do modeling is by acres of industrial land. Here, we have something more focused, an auto terminal and bulk terminal, so they used that instead of national averages.

*Pam Ferguson:* question regarding priority truck routes and the interface with island residents and pedestrians.

*Bob Hillier:* all streets have a functional classification. Hayden Island is a truck access street, which means local access and deliveries. A priority truck route is one of the highest level streets. It is a policy question.

*Victor Viets:* read the Oregonian today about changes with the CRC and is confused about what is going on up there. He has not seen any maps.

*Bob Hillier:* what we know is they are serious about moving forward. We could see some interchanges eliminated. It will be a phased project with a thirty year horizon. He is confident that something will be built on I-5. CRC is such a dynamic process. Is it reasonable to think that in ten years, we will have a bridge with light rail and tolling? Yes, to him that seems reasonable.

*Victor Viets:* which new project gets done first will have big impacts.

*Bob Hillier:* agreed.

#### **LAND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS UPDATE**

Heidi Berg, Office of Healthy Working Rivers, has been working with several different bureaus including Parks and BES around managing the 500 acres. She has been conducting interviews with groups that have land management activities and responsibilities, finding out what different agreements currently exist between land managers and land owners, how the Goals are being managed, and funding mechanisms. She is in the middle of the interview process now. A draft memo is due out in March.

*Bob Sallinger:* who are you interviewing?

*Heidi Berg:* Portland Parks, Metro, Oregon Parks and Recreation, McKenzie Land Trust, the Port, possibly Clean Water Services, and others.

#### **REVIEW AND UPDATE REMAINING TECHNICAL PANEL LISTS**

Rachael Hoy, BPS, updated the AC on the remaining studies. A few months ago, the AC helped recommend folks to review and provide comments on the studies being done to inform the concept planning. She asked AC members to check the handout that lists the potential reviewers, and see if we should reach out to anyone else. Folks have not been contacted yet except for the Harbor Lands study. Please respond by January 27<sup>th</sup> with additional names. She will send out a reminder email.

In addition, Rachael noted that the project team has rolled the Cargo Forecast Study into Harbor Lands, which is one reason it has been delayed.

*Sam Ruda:* when is the technical session for this?

*Rachael Hoy:* referred the AC to the calendar included in today's meeting packet. March 12<sup>th</sup>. There will be no session in February. The session on March 23<sup>rd</sup> will address the ESEE.

*Sam Imperati:* deadline for nominations is 1/27.

*Phil Nameny:* the Harbor Lands reviewers have been contacted and we will be adding the Cargo Forecast reviewers.

*Bob Sallinger:* please make sure you get appropriate representation in the pool of reviewers. Example: the Inter-Port Cooperation Committee ended up with no Port of Vancouver representative. Getting the right people involved is important to not waste time and effort. Also, make sure there is balance in representation. If you have over-representation on any side, it just becomes an echo chamber.

*Rachael Hoy:* good point, thanks.

#### **MITIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING UPDATE**

Sam Imperati announced that the Mitigation Subcommittee, which is Andy Cotugno, Sam Ruda, Bob Sallinger, Eric Engstrom, and Mike Rosen, met on Tuesday, January 17 to discuss mitigation work. They reached an evolving agreement on geography: Columbia River/Sandy River confluence to the downstream Columbia River/Multnomah Channel confluence (Oregon and Washington included), and the Willamette River to mile 3. In addition, they discussed that the 500 acres of open space on WHI needs a Master Plan and long term management. Regarding zoning, the OS base zone can be used to help determine appropriate and inappropriate actions within the 500 acres – no dog parks, for example.

The Subcommittee feels that some combination of an Annexation Agreement, a Plan District, and an IGA are the appropriate tools to implement the Mitigation and Enhancement package. NRDA will factor into the discussion, but it is unclear what will be required at this point.

Sam Imperati is now doing shuttle diplomacy. It is likely that the next meeting will be the end of January to look at straw proposals. The last Subcommittee meeting will be in late February and a report will be brought to the AC on March 16.

*Sam Ruda:* it was a good first meeting. He is confident we will be able to deliver a product to the AC.

*Chris Hathaway:* question regarding geography – did you talk about how far north and south from the river?

*Sam Imperati:* we looked primarily at the Oregon side, but also tried to look holistically, and think of what may be happening in Washington.

*Chris Hathaway:* Columbia Slough?

*Sam Ruda:* referred to his Port colleague Marla Harrison to address that question.

*Marla Harrison, Port of Portland, from the audience:* the focus is the Oregon side of the watershed. It is an environmental context where we can do things that will fit with the watershed. It is typically where NRDA is doing its activities, and the Slough is in that.

*Bob Sallinger:* for Audubon, there is an interest in Columbia River mainstem improvement. If we get to net improvement, there could be other opportunities.

*Eric Engstrom:* details will be worked out as we discuss types of mitigation.

## **PLAN DISTRICT/ZONING APPROACH DISCUSSION**

Phil Nameny reviewed the PPT called “WHI Planning Zoning/IGA Issues Update.” With this brief presentation, he will review material previously presented to the AC in June 2011, just to frame up the discussion.

### Slide 2: Metro’s Regional Policy Issue: Balancing Goals

- In 1983, Metro incorporated WHI into the Urban Growth Boundary for marine industrial uses. In 2004, Metro designated the site as Regionally Significant Industrial.
- In 2005, Metro identified WHI as a moderate habitat conservation area.

Phil noted that in order to annex, there must be Comprehensive Plan designations, which Hayden Island does not have yet. It will have to be part of this process.

### Slide 4: WHI Zoning / Plan

- Base Zones for the island
- Overlay Zones may be applied
- Specific regulations implemented through a plan district.
- Other oversight through IGAs, ongoing citizen review, etc?

*Sam Ruda:* question for clarification: Overlay Zones – what are they?

*Phil Nameny:* there will be more detailed information later in presentation. (See Slide 5.)

### Slide 5: Portland’s Zoning Code

#### Zoning – Map and Codes

- Mapping the boundaries spell out geographically where different city zoning apply
- Base Zones dictate the underlying uses and development standards that apply (IH and OS zones considered for base zones)
- Overlay Zones provide a second layer of regulatory authority over the land (aircraft height (h) and noise overlays (x) will apply, environmental conservation (c) and protection (p) overlays to-be-determined.
- Plan District regulations can create tailored use and development standards to a geographic area and create specific sub-areas. Examples of industrial focused PDs include Guilds Lake, Col. S.S. Airport Futures

Phil said that environmental protections in Overlay Zones tends to be more restrictive. The Subcommittee will be looking at this and how it may apply. Thus, we have to ask, do we use a Plan District to further refine the zoning?

#### Slide 6: Alternatives to Zoning

- IGAs / Legal Agreements (Airport Futures - mitigation)
- Land Management options (Title Transfer, Conservation Easements)
- Creation of ongoing advisory committees or working groups to discuss issues and oversee non-regulatory processes.
- Transportation Implementation Strategies and Funding
- Coordination of restoration programs through BES

Phil referred the group to the WHI Issues and Implementation Summary Under Code Regulations or Other Agreements. Sam Imperati explained this is the equivalent of a table of contents for the end result of the work of this committee. It shows what can be done and what is prohibited. It is the table of contents for all of the deal points that need to be addressed over time.

The 11x17 memo provides greater detail, burrowing down into the issues. Each of the issues and their resolution will be memorialized somewhere, either in a Plan District/Zoning/City Regulations, or an IGA/Other Agreement.

Sam Imperati asked if anyone sees anything missing and outlined the process for discussion.

*Sam Ruda:* knows you sent it earlier, but the Port has not reviewed it thoroughly. Can this be homework? He cannot answer today if anything is missing.

*Victor Viets:* one thing that is missing is the federal process. We do not know what it will be right now. Wonders where the federal process overlap and where does it supersede the local process?

*Sam Imperati:* noted a couple areas.

*Eric Engstrom:* we can make a note on this memo regarding which areas may be impacted by a federal process.

#### **BREAK**

*Victor Viets:* When will this information be taken back out to the public? How does public process figure into the rest of the projects?

*Eric Engstrom:* We will have similar open house events like we did for the concept plan to review the draft plan district and zoning recommendations.

*Bob Sallinger:* from our perspective, the protection of the 500 acres only through zoning is insufficient.

*Sam Imperati:* referred the group to #10, Land Management and Open Space.

*Bob Sallinger:* he is looking for a binding legal instrument that cannot be undone by the next City Council.

Sam Imperati explained that there is a placeholder for that topic and read the text of the draft document under #10, Land Management and Open Space:

“City staff are working on a document to consider various options for the open space areas on WHI regarding ownership, operations and maintenance. There will need to be guidelines for preservation and management of natural areas and access to recreational areas.”

*Brian Owendoff:* how are we going to build flexibility into this plan? Sam Ruda does not know who his customer is going to be. Parks do not know where the trails will be. We do not want to paint ourselves in a corner.

*Eric Engstrom:* good point, and agrees that the need for flexibility is woven into many of these issues. They are striving for balance of flexibility and placing boundaries on it.

*Susan Barnes:* question for clarification regarding #10, Land Management and Open Space, why is the PD/Zoning column not checked?

*Sam Imperati:* the checks in those columns are placeholders for now.

*Phil Nameny:* you can use regulations to manage what happens, but the other column is more of the process piece. That is why we think it would be part of an IGA.

*Bob Sallinger:* we always hear from industry that they need certainty. We need that for the environment, too. Flexibility and certainty cut both ways.

Sam Imperati confirmed with the AC that, for now, there are no major topics missing. Hearing none, he turned attention to the larger memo. For discussion purposes, he suggested they be triaged in order of complexity.

*Bob Sallinger:* would add marine industrial impacts noted under “Community Impacts.” He would also like to see them in Environmental Impacts.

*Sam Imperati:* first big topic under 2.1, Mapping Boundaries of Zone Designation (Base Zones). Sam read section A.2 of the document. He said staff is looking for thoughts on the topics, and explained that we are not writing code at this point.

*Sam Ruda:* this will be impacted by how the geography gets incorporated into the text. What aspects are precisely incorporated and what is a range. Concept A.2. is 280 acres, but he is not sure if it translates to the development footprint. He sees a downward acreage constraint. It is a concern.

*Eric Engstrom:* from City perspective, they need flexibility, and do not want such a precisely drawn map. At the same time, this committee said they want it as far to the east as possible.

*Bob Sallinger:* has concerns about letting go of some things in the spirit of collaboration, such as Concept B, and then seeing things change after he thought there was an understanding.

Sam Imperati mapped out a process diagram at the white board, showing how the committee can work toward developing a recommendation with both specificity and flexibility.

*Bob Sallinger:* we were having discussion about Concepts A.2 and A.3, and dropped B. Now he is hearing it could be any of the A options. This is what he is concerned about. We dropped B and now all the As are back. This type of thing is what plagued the River process. He disagrees with the options on the table.

*Eric Engstrom:* following on Sam's demo, we will need to draw the zoning line boundary somewhere and we want to provide flexibility for a future development, but disincentives can be placed to encourage development in the area closest to A.2 plan.

*Bob Sallinger:* the priority is to protect as much forest as possible. Now we are hearing that there was no deal. Maybe we should leave B on the table.

*Chris Hathaway:* agrees. He does not like the idea of buying your way out of impacts and compromising on the impacts.

*Sam Imperati:* question to AC: is it a matter of yes or no, or degree of concern? Referring to the projected map, he pointed out Concept A.2 that WorleyParsons has been working on. What level of concern are we really dealing with?

*Bob Sallinger:* we want certainty. It will keep creeping. 10 feet is a big deal. He wants a line in the sand, and no debate about the forest in ten years.

*Chris Hathaway:* agrees. He also wants a clear line, providing certainty for both Port and habitat.

*Victor Viets:* what is the acreage now in the revised A.2 that WorleyParsons has been working on?

*Eric Engstrom:* 280 for development.

*Victor Viets:* in fairness, we were looking at 300 acre options, and even if folks like the smaller one, he does not understand how we got there. He thinks we do have to draw a line, and prefers 300 acres.

*Sam Ruda:* for any language proposed for a PD, the Port is ok with "up to 300 acres." It feels like the Port is being put into a trap, as we are having to compare it to the B Option, which was already outside the Council Resolution. There were good reasons for looking at it, but it is outside the framework. The issue is how literal do we want to take the A.2 Concept Plan. He just cannot find any examples of a City dictating to a landowner like that. There is already agreement that this committee prefers it far to the east.

*Brian Owendoff:* agrees with Bob regarding the need for both certainty and flexibility. If we queue this up with so many restrictions, nothing is ever going to happen. Question: wonders if has Metro ever brought land into the UGB, designated it industrial, and then it was never developed?

*Andy Cotugno:* all land in the UGB has limitations regarding natural resources. Comment: agrees with Victor. He also wonders if the calculation includes the bridge.

*Eric Engstrom:* the acreage is calculated with a bridge.

*Andy Cotugno:* I think you optimize the concepts and get them to 300 acres, then draw a hard line.

*Eric Engstrom:* from his experience in development review, WP has done some work, but not detailed engineering. It is unwise to so tightly draw line so as to be overly constrained when it comes to engineering.

*Sam Ruda:* want to reaffirm the agreement that the Port is ok with up to 300 acres.

Sam Imperati focused the discussion on 2.2.C, Overlay and requested some explanation from the City.

*Eric Engstrom:* those are two zoning designations, and then there is the desire for a PD. The off-the-shelf conservation zone includes a two-track process. The standard conservation zone is more suited to residential lands. So, it probably not appropriate to use them here, unless there is a protection overlay. To develop in a protection zone, you have to have a strong reason for development. From his perspective, they are in the toolbox, but not sure they are the best tools for WHI.

*Sam Ruda:* the mitigation subcommittee and the AC can put more restrictions on zones. The subcommittee quickly agreed that you could have further restrictions on Open Space. The Port wants to preserve the opportunity to do mitigation banking, NRDA activities, etc. In summary, he thinks there is a lot of unanimity regarding the environmental enhancement.

Sam Imperati continued facilitating the discussion, referring the AC to page 3, topic 5 E. It has already been covered but he asked if there were additional comments.

*Chris Hathaway:* considering this question and looking at concept plan map, can we have WP draw the curves that Andy and Victor mentioned, (bringing acreage to 300).

*Eric Engstrom:* if the bridge is still in the plan, it represents 5 or 6 acres.

*Bob Sallinger:* City Council said up to 300 acres, doesn't see why we are struggling to get to 300. We have to also ensure that at least 500 acres are protected.

Sam Imperati continued facilitating the discussion, referring the AC to 7.A, Community Impacts. He asked for any comments, in addition to adding Bob's comments.

*Eric Engstrom:* noted some Community Impacts such as noise, vibrations, odor, and glare. Regarding noise, with industrial zoning, a higher level of noise is allowed. He is unsure if the Port believes the City's code is the best tool for this.

*Sam Ruda:* does not have the technical ability to say for sure at this time; does know that light impacts can be minimized with design.

*Eric Engstrom:* on the light piece, can be handled through some kind of agreement with the community. The City has put light in zoning codes before, to specify directional lighting, etc.

*Bob Sallinger:* does not think the noise ordinance is anywhere near sufficient. We will need another mechanism. Also, light is a big concern, and provided examples (Smith & Bybee) of light sources and natural resource impacts.

*Victor Viets:* agrees that noise is a big issue and there are different types than a normal industrial site. He hears the bridge operator sound the horn from his place, a mile away.

*Eric Engstrom:* there are also existing noise levels, which should be measured so we know where we are starting from.

*Pam Ferguson:* also concerned about health impacts. They live with constant noise. In general, need attention to the cumulative health impacts.

*Bob Sallinger:* he would add dust.

Sam Imperati continued facilitating the discussion, referring the AC to topic 7.b. and asked the City to comment.

*Eric Engstrom:* there is the potential to form an ongoing group as an additional tool to help with issues and conflict resolution. To Sam Ruda, does the Port have any experience with this?

*Sam Ruda:* we are open to anything that works.

*Sam Imperati:* AF has an ongoing group.

*Eric Engstrom:* comment regarding Community Benefits funding; this is to mitigate any ongoing issues.

*Bob Sallinger:* the City provided Community Benefit funds for the neighborhoods which were greatly impacted by the big pipe project, for example.

*Sam Imperati:* parks? Is that missing from Community Benefits?

*Eric Engstrom:* there's an interest and sees it in this potentially.

*Chris Hathaway:* Parks could be a part of New Infrastructure under Item #8.

*Sam Imperati:* add this as a place holder on both docs.

Sam Imperati continued facilitating the discussion, referring the AC to topic 8.a., Master Street Plan

*Eric Engstrom:* this goes back to the bridge issue. It is a public ROW, and if there is no bridge, roads on WHI could be private or just for development. Thus, it goes back to this committee and what it wants to recommend about the bridge.

*Bob Sallinger:* feels we need professional feedback from the City and Metro on the bridge. He does not see \$150M materializing, as the need is not there. And we do not want to saddle the Port with the whole bridge. Maybe this committee needs to develop conditions and triggers. He wants to ground truth this.

*Eric Engstrom:* the Port has said it is a tough business case to justify a bridge. The City concurs. If there isn't a bridge, then a slightly different standard would apply to Hayden Island Drive. It is hard to quantify, as it is a policy decision as well as a traffic analysis issue. If he had to bet, he does not see anyone finding the \$150M for it.

*Sam Imperati:* what he is hearing Bob say, on a practical level, is let's flip the assumption – let's do the remaining planning without the bridge.

*Andy Cotugno:* we have talked about thresholds with traffic. Thinks Bob is being practical, flipping the assumption. So, the threshold without a bridge would then limit the development, vis à vis traffic.

*Bob Hillier, PBOT, from the audience:* also consider new roads, truck routes, overall transportation network on Hayden Island. We have to consider that a lot of the roads on the island are private, as well.

Sam Imperati noted that the discussion above were the yellow (more complex) topics. Now, he said the AC will have time to comment on the rest of the memo.

*Sam Ruda:* can we go back, read this and submit comments?

*Eric Engstrom:* comment on how we intend to evolve this spreadsheet. January – outline month; Feb – solve the easy questions; March – address the harder questions. It is fine that folks need more time to consider this as homework, but do want to get it done roughly on that schedule.

*Sam Ruda:* just need a couple days.

*Andy Cotugno:* something we have talked about at the Subcommittee is the off-island mitigation activities. Some mitigation may not be related to the island, superfund site, etc. How does this plan coordinate with other plans and how do we integrate? He knows we are not doing a comprehensive regional look, but do need some coordination.

*Sam Imperati:* yep, need holistic view.

*Victor Viets:* could the feds take Hayden Island for themselves? What are the long range possibilities?

*Eric Engstrom:* not aware of any desire or motivation from federal government.

*Victor Viets:* clarification: they have not been studying it?

*Susan Barnes:* what do you mean take?

*Sam Imperati:* eminent domain.

*Victor Viets:* everyone is competing for mitigation sites

*Bob Sallinger:* there have been areas designated for superfund NRDA, so this poses problems for industry. Need to know where to find land as we develop out.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Jim Howell, AORTA**, wonders if the AC got a copy of the AORTA letter. (No; he will email it to Sam.) He wants to talk about zoning, rail access and a passenger rail bypass. Can you put a limitation on prohibiting the Port from using the site for coal under zoning? A freight rail junction is totally unworkable on the corridor with passenger trains. It is bad enough now, with future development there will need to be mitigation and a bypass. We recommend a passenger rail bypass, a multimodal facility, which would help solve the road access issues. Considering what happened with CRC yesterday, that crossing will be even more important for truck traffic.

*Bob Sallinger:* to Jim, you have been raising the capacity issue, and he appreciates it. How do you recommend we do it? Do we ask WP to analyze it?

*Jim Howell:* there needs to be a study to look at options for crossing the river in congested areas in North Portland. This should have been done years ago, but ODOT's rail division has not pushed it.

*Sam Imperati:* is ODOT is convening a group?

*Jim Howell:* yes, they are.

*Eric Engstrom:* this issue emerged in the fall. We have had several follow-up meetings. We need to share our findings from our informal investigation. Preliminary findings are that historically there have been two bottlenecks, and there are efforts to work on them. It is on the railroad's priority list to resolve. So, there are some near-term solutions and we do not think there is an inherent issue with the bridge. But long-term, if we are going to have high-speed rail, it will not likely be on the existing tracks.

*Jim Howell:* the passenger rail issue still has not been addressed and needs to be done.

**Donna Murphy, Hayden Island resident.** Comment regarding Christmas traffic, it is a parking lot. Also, three times a day, there is incredible traffic, a constant stream of traffic. You take your life in your hands to cross on foot. If there is no bridge, there will be more trucks and that is a big problem. Maybe it can be rerouted to the other side, the south end behind home depot? There is a big problem with getting on and off the freeway. If there is no bridge, she believes they will be negatively impacted.

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

AC Meeting Reminder: the 2/17 meeting will be at the Oxford Suites. It will be a longer meeting to allow time to dive into the concept plan with some specificity.

2012 Technical Work Session(s):

- March 12, 2012 8:00am- 12:00pm – BPS, room 7A Topics Harbor Lands Inventory, Public Benefit/Cost,
- March 23, 2012: 8:30am – 12:30pm – BPS, room 7A ESEE, Land Mgmt Options

Sam thanked everyone for a good meeting.

*Notes respectfully submitted by the ICM Facilitation Team.*

**WHI AC Meeting Evaluation Summary  
JANUARY 20, 2012**

**3 Evaluation Forms**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
<b>1) OVERALL MTG QUALITY</b>			2	1	
<b>2) PACING</b>		Little Slow	Just right	Little Fast	
			1	1	
<b>3) CLARITY PRESENTATIONS</b>		1	1	1	
<b>4) DOCUMENTS</b>		1	1	1	
<b>5) DISCUSSION</b>		1		2	

**6. MOST USEFUL?**

**7. LEAST USEFUL?**

- Topics were scattered – not clear how things fit together

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

- Thank you!
- Was not clear on what base case for mitigation will be and how mitigation plan will relate to ESEE analysis?

**Updated (1/18/12) WHI Calendar of Upcoming Meetings/Activities**

January	February	March	April	May	June
<p>Mitigation Subcommittee Meeting  <b>17<sup>th</sup></b>: 1pm-3pm: BPS, 2500B</p>	<p>Mitigation Subcommittee Meeting (TBD)  <b>7<sup>th</sup></b>: 9:30 am-11:30am: BPS, 7A  OR <b>Feb 10<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup></b></p>	<p>Advisory Committee Meeting  <b>16<sup>th</sup></b>: 9am-12noon: BPS, 7A: Agenda: Framework for zoning proposals/plan district, Mitigation package discussion, Benefit/Cost</p>	<p>Advisory Committee Meeting  <b>20<sup>th</sup></b>: 9am-12noon: On Hayden Island (location: tbd): Agenda: Discussion of initial draft plan</p>	<p>Advisory Committee Meeting  <b>18<sup>th</sup></b>: 9am-12noon: BPS, 7A  Agenda: Final DraftPlan, Review of agreements</p>	<p>Advisory Committee Meeting  <b>18<sup>th</sup></b>: 9am- 12noon: BPS, 7A  Agenda: Prep for PSC hearing</p>
<p>Advisory Committee Meeting  <b>20<sup>th</sup></b>: 9am-12noon, BPS, 7A: Agenda: Mitigation Subcommittee Report out, Plan District/zoning approach discussion, Technical Panel process update</p>	<p>Advisory Committee Meeting  <b>17<sup>th</sup></b>: 9am - 1pm: On Hayden Island, Oxford Suites:  Agenda: Concept Plan and Benefit/Cost Reports, Draft Mitigation package, Zoning/Plan District Approach</p>	<p><b>Technical Work Session (#4):</b>  <b>12<sup>th</sup></b>: 8:30 am – 12:30 pm: BPS, 7A:  Public Benefit/Cost, Harbor Lands Inventory</p>	<p>Public Open House  <b>25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup></b>  Public event to share initial draft plan</p>		<p>Target 1<sup>st</sup> hearing: Planning &amp; Sustainability Commission (no date set)</p>
<p>Mitigation Subcommittee Meeting (TBD)  <b>31<sup>th</sup></b>: 9:30 am-11:30am: BPS, 7A  OR <b>Feb 1</b></p>	<p>Mitigation Subcommittee Meeting (tentative)-  <b>(TBD) - Feb 28<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup>?</b></p>	<p><b>Technical Work Session (#5):</b>  <b>23<sup>rd</sup></b>: 8:00 am – 12:00 pm: BPS, 7A:  ESEE, Land Management Options</p>			



*Note: this handout contains the names of technical experts suggested by city staff and the Advisory Committee for upcoming technical papers and reports. In the case of the Harbor Lands Study, the initial contacts have been made. For the other studies, we will provide a chance for additional Advisory Committee input at our next meeting.*

Technical Panels for Upcoming Worksessions		
Harbor Land Study <i>(contacts made and responses received)</i>	Cargo Forecast Update <i>(work now folded into ECONW Harbor Lands work, contact to be made)</i>	Public Cost/Benefits Report
Carly Riter or Bernie Bottomly - PBA Representative <i>(Carly accepted)</i>	(Contact) - Regional Economist, ODOT or USACE (Christian Kaylor, from State of Oregon?)*	(Contact) - Environmental Economist *
Katy Brooks - Port of Vancouver <i>(contacted, participation dependent on workload)</i>	Monica Isbell - Global Trade Expert	Christian Kaylor - Economist
(Contact) - Vancouver Planning Dept * <i>(contact made, department declined)</i>	Dennis Yee - Metro	Dennis Yee - Metro
<del>Alan Spott</del> Larry Harvey or Jeff Swanson - Working Waterfront Coalition (Schnitzer Steel) <i>(both have accepted)</i>	Jeff Smith - ILWU	Steve Kountz - BPS Economic Planner
Steve Kountz - BPS Economic Planner <i>(accepted)</i>	Paul Sorenson - BTS	Ann Beier - OHWR
Dennis Yee - Metro <i>(contacted, no response)</i>	Paul Bingham - Wilbur Smith consultant	Jeff Smith - ILWU
Jeff Smith - ILWU <i>(contacted, no response)</i>	Mike Fischer +/- Donald Ludlow - Cambridge Systematics consultants	Paul Riggs - Columbia Pacific Building Trades
Paul Riggs - Columbia Pacific Building Trades <i>(contacted, no response)</i>	Paul Riggs - Columbia Pacific Building Trades	Eric Hovee - ED Hovee Co. consultant *
<del>Kevin Johnson</del> Bruce Allen w/ Andy Reed (backup) - PDC <i>(accepted)</i>	(Contact) - PoPMarketing staff *	David Leland
Jerry Johnson - Johnson Reid Consultants <i>(accepted)</i>	Solon Webb - retired (former EVP of American Present Lines, APL)	Jeri Williams - ONI
Mark Clemons - Group MacKenzie Consultants <i>(accepted)</i>	Bill Kruse - Transystems consultant	Joe Cortwright - Impresa Consulting
Bill Bach +/- Steve Wells - Trammel Crow Co. <i>(Bach declined, Wells no response)</i>	Scott Drumm - PoP	(Contact) - City Club of Portland *
Keith Leavitt - PoP <i>(accepted)</i>		Rich Read - Oregonian
		Glenn Vanslow - PNWA
		John Mitchell - U.S. Bank, Chief Economist



Technical Panels for Upcoming Worksessions		
ESEE	ESEE (contd)	Land Management Options
<u>Economic</u>	<u>Environmental (subset of NRI TAC)</u>	Emily Roth - Parks
Noelwah Netusil - Economist, Reed College	Jennifer Thompson - ODF&W	Nancy Hendrickson - BES
Fletch Beaudoin (PSU Sustainability) or Paul Manson (Parametrix) - Ecosystem Services	Michael Murphy - PSU	Kevin Kilduf - OHWR
Dennis Yee - Metro	(Contact) - NOAA Rep (check w/ Nancy Munn)	Megan Hilgart +/-or Nancy Munn - NOAA Fisheries
Joe Cortwright - Economist Impresa Consulting	Lori Hennings - Metro	(Contact) - Native American Community *
Corky Collier - Columbia Corridor Assoc.	Randy Moore - OSU	Katy Weil +/-or Kathleen Hunter - Metro
Paul Riggs - Columbia Pacific Building Trades	(contact) - Superfund Representative ( <i>and Social</i> )	Jeff Smith - ILWU
Jeff Smith - ILWU	<u>Energy</u>	Paul Riggs - Columbia Pacific Building Trades
John Mitchell - US Bank Chief Economist	(Contact) - Carbon footprint expert	Susan Barnes - ODFW
<u>Social</u>	(Contact) - global trade, export/import transportation expert	John Marshall
(Contact) - Recreation Rep *		Jennifer Thompson - USFWS
(Contact) - Environmental Education, CSWC*		Bob Altman
(Contact) - Native American Community *		Glenn Lamb +/-or Scott McEwen - Columbia Land Trust
(Contact) - Air Quality, DEQ/Columbia Gorge AQ/NGO *		Brian Lightcap - W Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District
(Contact) - Noise/Light/Vibration; impacts on human health/livability/property values *		Mark McCollister - Freshwater Trust
(Contact) - Healthy Economy, Mental Health*		Bobby Cochran - Willamette Partnership
Travis Williams - Willamette Riverkeepers ( <i>and Envir.</i> )		Brett VandenHeuvel - Columbia Riverkeeper
Brett VandenHeuval - Columbia Riverkeepers ( <i>and Envir.</i> )		Greg Theisen - PoP
Mike Houck - Urban Greenspaces ( <i>and Envir.</i> )		(Contact) - SOLV *
Jerri Williams - ONI		
(Contact) - Metro, Transportation Emphasis		

\* if a name is not provided, these will be eliminated from the list



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

West Hayden Island  
Technical Work Session #3 Meeting Summary  
December 16, 2011

Agenda

10:15-11:15 – Ports of Portland and Vancouver Coordination

11:30-12:30 – WHI Transportation Modeling Analysis

## Ports of Portland and Vancouver Coordination

Staff gave a brief presentation of the subject and discussed City Council's resolution to consider opportunities for increased coordination between the two ports. The presentation reviewed the history and organizational structure of the two ports, their current coordination activities and the potential for greater coordination, and the steps required to form a joint bi-state authority. Staff stated that the report is not intended to provide a recommendation but to provide information for decision makers. Since there were very few comments that came in ahead of the session, the discussion was focused generally on whether there were any errors, omissions or items that were misleading. The comments are provided in this order.

Comments from Technical Reviewers (TR), Advisory Committee (AC) members and the Public (P).  
Facilitator indicated as (F):

### Errors of Information

(AC): Did not see anything wrong or an error.

(TR): It should be noted that the Port did have a coal terminal set up in the 1960's and 1970's but it was never actually used. Somewhere in the report it states that a coal terminal was never built. The terminal equipment was dismantled in the 80's.

(TR): In reference to the Port of Vancouver, there are 76 port districts in Washington. They are formed and operate more like economic development districts, although shipping and freight are important components. Also, the report states that both ports have a minimal amount of property taxes that cover their operation. I believe that the Port of Vancouver has a higher proportion of their operations covered by property taxes.

(AC): To clarify on the coal terminal, although the infrastructure may have been built for a possible coal terminal, it was never operated as one. This is also the site of the current T5 Potash terminal which has been a successful terminal. Not sure what the reason is for having this brought up.

(Staff): To help clarify any confusion, on page 6 of the report, under Past and Current Coordination efforts, at the end of the last paragraph on the page, there is mention of a movement in 1981 to consider merging the Ports of Astoria and Portland to help aid in the construction of a coal terminal. The report states the bill was not passed and the coal terminal was never built. We can clarify that statement to include the information that the Port of Portland had infrastructure for a coal terminal.

## Missing Information

(AC): The comment on the Port of Portland increasing their real estate holdings over time may be misleading. All ports on the Lower Columbia have had increases over time due to property acquisition.

(AC): There are three areas of potential missing information. 1) Information from those outside of port operations could have been useful. Critics of the port's relationships may have shed insight. 2) The report would have been stronger if it looked at the 1999 process and the lack of inter-port coordination during that process. Evidence from the first phase of WHI indicates that not a lot has changed, (plans for additional auto terminals made by both ports). What has changed since then? Not including this history is a significant omission. 3) The report seems skewed toward looking at the joint authority option which is admittedly hard. What about other ways to share land use resources and planning? Are there opportunities worth exploring through state regulations to allow greater coordination?

(AC): Portland is subject to many regional and state goals and regulations through Metro and ORS. As a result, it is hard to expand planning consideration across the river. Vancouver is outside of the UGB. We're statutorily precluded from considering Vancouver to satisfy our land needs. The state statutes and regional codes will need to change for the city to be able to consider this option.

(AC): Regarding past events, it's the city's discretion to consider the events of the 1990's and incorporate that into the paper. However, the two ports currently endorse each other's development plans. Ultimately the market is the determining force for where development goes. We're working on a land use planning process to determine whether more land should be made available for this type of development, not the exact siting of where development will go. Forecasts do show robust growth predicted along the river. It is a region of growing volumes.

(AC): I would like to echo the comment about the goals and regulations. It may be the current land use planning structure that inhibits coordination between the entities. Should the paper have a section that indicates how state planning should be amended to allow holistic planning that crosses state lines?

(F): Is there anything unnecessary in the report?

(AC): Even though the report is intended to be a non-partial reporting, the tone of the paper makes it pretty clear that we shouldn't pursue a joint port authority as it lists all the hurdles to this approach. The memo may need a more objective consideration of joint authorities, or at least of other regulatory ways to get coordination across state lines.

(F): Open the session up to any public comments.

(P): From the Port of Portland's perspective, there are some additional areas of cooperation that weren't fully listed. There has been considerable coordination over the past 10 years. These include coordinated freight and cargo forecasting between the ports. Also, the complexity of the channel deepening may not have been captured. There is an agreement for current maintenance of the channel, there was joint coordination of beneficial use planning for dredge material placement, which resulted in much of the dredge materials getting placed on potential building sites such as Vancouver's Gateway area rather than on WHI. There were actually 28 dredge placement sites, owned by the six ports, worked out through the deepening project. In addition, mitigation measures for the deepening were coordinated between the ports.

(P): I have a couple issues. First, do the improvements have the potential to raise property taxes? Also, was there any input from the Port of Vancouver on this report? More importantly, how does sustainability factor into this? What does it mean to BPS or to the Port. There isn't much mention of environmental stewardship in the report.

(P): In response to the above, there are collaborative agreements between the ports to work on Best Management Practices (BMP)s, and this is continuing by exploring the potential to achieve LEED certification on infrastructure. There are additional IGA's covering this.

(AC): Also, development would not create additional property taxes.

(P): I would like to re-enforce the idea of using the Columbia River as a linking element, instead of as a dividing element, which is how many regulatory and organizational structures consider it. The dividing silo effect has problems with the consideration of high-speed rail. The regulatory environment should be structured to be more positive to consider collaboration of networks and improvements that span the river.

(AC): There is a feeling of déjà-vu with the previous 1999 process. Do we want a report that provides a long list of how the two entities coordinate and cooperate? Or do we want to determine how the two should coordinate in relation to WHI development. The editorial in the Business Journal from 1999 still sums up the issues (reads from the editorial). Has there been the effort for the ports to team up their land use planning?

(F): Moving forward, are there any comments or concerns that the report is misleading in any way? (No comments). Since there are no comments, this session is adjourned.

*Note, the draft report will be edited and staff will consider and respond to the issues that were raised during the technical session.*

(Break)

## Transportation Modeling Analysis

Staff from Portland Transportation (PBOT) provided an overview of the purpose of the modeling exercise, a description of the modeling assumptions, the different scenarios that make up the base case and high impact development options, and a summary of some of the initial findings from the model. It was noted that Hayden Island is expected to have a large increase in traffic by 2035, but this increase is mostly from new development on East Hayden Island, not potential terminal development on WHI. The discussion format, similar to the last session, focused on whether there were any errors, omissions or misleading information in the initial analysis.

Comments from Technical Reviewers (TR), Advisory Committee (AC) members and the Public (P). Portland Transportation indicated as (PBOT) and (F) is the facilitator:

(TR): The list of assumptions includes the Columbia River Crossing (CRC), a WHI bridge, and the Hayden Island Street network, all of which are future developments. However, there are no assumptions about high speed rail. Considering that the scenario is set to predict levels out to 2035, it seems that high speed rail should be considered. Also, if there was a multi-modal rail/road bridge as has been shown on the high-speed rail alternative, this could have a large effect on the road network by providing a potential link between N Portland Blvd and Mill Plain in Vancouver. (Handouts were provided to the group.)

(PBOT): The transportation model was developed based on the future transportation system improvements and land uses currently adopted in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and the Hayden Island Community Plan. High speed rail is not identified in the currently adopted plans.

(TR): The WHI bridge is a large development. Is there a threshold to trigger the new bridge, especially from a strict road capacity ratio.

(PBOT): This is best answered through a cost/benefit analysis. The results from the traffic model show that future operating capacity is within an acceptable range with and without a new WHI bridge. A cost/benefit analysis could help answer the question, at what level of development on WHI would require transportation system improvements that would exceed the estimated \$100 million cost for a new bridge?

(TR): I have some clarification questions. First, what is the source of the trip generation for the distribution?

(PBOT): The auto/truck trips generated and distributed from the High Impact development scenario were based on traffic count data taken at the Toyota facility at Terminal 4 provided by the Port.

(TR): Second, what is meant by the bridge tolling “penalty” mentioned on page 6?

(PBOT): This is a modeling term to help translate the dollar amount into a time consideration for the model. In the model, I-205 does not have a toll. This will be defined within the report.

(TR): On page 8, the model considers an option 2A and 2B for the base. These two scenarios are different from each other in key elements, and the selection of one or the other for a base could impact the model. I’m not sure why 2A would be used for a base model since it includes a WHI bridge and some assumptions for WHI buildout already in it. 2B is a much cleaner base model to use.

(F): What do people think on this? Does option 2B make better sense to use as a base model?

(TRs): There is general agreement that 2B is the better base case option.

(TR): There is some general confusion about the components that make up the different scenarios, and their comparables. It may help to have better documentation and descriptions of the differences. For background, the ITE manual was checked for terminal operations, and the numbers were similar to the T4 numbers provided. I have a question about the tolling assumption, and whether tolling is considered for I-205? (*Note, another TR stated that federal action is required to propose tolling on an existing facility.*) My last comment is with the ‘trips per link’ number on the one slide. Is that total or average? It states average, but it is not clear.

(PBOT): These points are understood, and we will provide better documentation and clarification in the next draft.

(TR): How does transit use figure into these scenarios? It seems that there needs to be more specific assumptions for transit usage to help determine mode split. Just using current split doesn’t get at potential changes due to investments such as light rail.

(PBOT): This analysis is based on traffic generation and mode split data from Metro’s future land use and transportation assumptions, as well as the CRC mode split assumptions.

(TR): Is there a consideration for cut-through traffic?

(PBOT) A cut-through traffic analysis is included in this report. The modeling analysis shows that with the proposed Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchange improvements, no traffic would use a new WHI bridge as a cut-through route between I-5 and the Rivergate district, due to a 2-4 minute time difference. Without the Marine Drive and Hayden Island interchange improvements, about 1/3 of the eastbound to northbound traffic (about 200 vehicles) would use a new WHI bridge as a cut-through route between I-5 and Rivergate.

(AC): Will there be any information or data on the noise and sound generation, especially where it crosses into the natural area? Any info will be helpful from a mitigation standpoint, plus we need to know the traffic impacts on the manufactured housing community.

(PBOT): Noise analysis would be addressed as part of the NEPA process and is outside the work scope for this analysis.

(AC): It should be noted that there is much greater impact from the future development expected on EHI. I have a question about scenario 3D that mentions mitigation measures. What are those? Could they include things such as alternative transit options like terminal shuttles between the development and light rail?

(PBOT): Mitigating measures will be based on transportation system improvements such as signalization and additional turning lanes.

(TR): I mostly had some language changes which I've already forwarded to PBOT. I do want to mention that the analysis should use similar land use assumptions as the CRC.

*At this point the discussion was turned over to public comment.*

(P): Is there a legal authority to base the analysis on an unfunded project (i.e. the CRC)? It seems an omission for the analysis to rely on this. Why isn't there a scenario to consider the impacts to development considering the CRC doesn't get built?

(AC): For planning purposes, not every project needs to be funded to be considered for the model. There needs to be a reasonable expectation for future funding, which is provided as part of the financially constrained RTP. .

(PBOT): PBOT's transportation model is based on the future land use and network assumptions in Metro's adopted RTP which include the CRC project. If the CRC is not built, there would be a lot of other transportation issues that would need to be resolved besides WHI.

(P): Is one phase of analysis to look at freight movement? There is a concern that this is not addressing all the impacts for congestion. Previous WA studies have shown the need for additional rail crossings of the Columbia. If a project similar to the multi-modal rail/road bridge were to be placed along the rail line between Portland and Vancouver, this would change the traffic conditions quite a bit and get much of the freight traffic off of I-5 in this area.

(PBOT): PBOT's transportation model is based on the surface roadway network and does not include a freight rail component, so these alternatives are not included in this analysis. These alternatives are also not included in the adopted Transportation System Plan, whereas the CRC is.

(P): At what level are streets considered to be congested?

(PBOT): This occurs when the V/C (vehicle to capacity) ratio reaches 1.00 or above.

(P): Perhaps instead of constantly changing the assumptions as some commenters want, it may be better to run a sensitivity analysis on these variables to see at what level a feature might break down with the change.

(PBOT): This can be considered in the next phase of the transportation analysis.

(F): If there are not any more questions, the meeting is adjourned since we have run over our time.

*Meeting adjourned*

## West Hayden Island Transportation Modeling Analysis: Phase 1 Network Analyses

The purpose for conducting transportation modeling analysis for West Hayden Island is to:

- Provide the basic assessment of traffic conditions on Hayden Island and the surrounding facilities with the combined effects from the following projects:
  - Columbia River Crossing (CRC)
  - New West Hayden Island Bridge
  - West Hayden Island Port Development Plan
  - Hayden Island Community Plan.
- Provide an analysis of the cut-through traffic impacts from a proposed West Hayden Island Port Development.
- Provide a tool to evaluate a “high impact” development scenario for West Hayden Island in respect to transportation system impacts.
- Provide the analytical basis for preparing state TPR and city TSP policy analysis.

### “High Impact” Development (2 auto, 1 bulk terminal): PM2 Peak Vehicles and Distribution

Vehicle Type	Trip Distribution Patterns					
	Two-Hour PM Peak Vehicles (In/Out)	I-5 North	I-5 South	North Portland and US 30	Columbia Corridor East of I-5	Columbia Corridor West of I-5
Autos	287 (80%)	30%	35%	15%	15%	5%
Trucks	71 (20%)	40%	25%	5%	15%	15%
<b>Total Vehicles</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>25</b>

### Traffic Conditions: All Project Links

Scenarios:	2005 Base	2035 PM2 Base		2035 PM2 High Impact			2035 Weekend (noon)	
	1	2A	2B	3A	3B	3C	2B	3B
<b>Vol. NB/SB</b> (2005 % Chg)	20,700	27,400 (30%)	27,300	27,500	27,500	27,500	18,900	18,900
<b>Vol. EB/WB</b> (2005 % Chg)	9,200	17,000 (85%)	16,900	17,000	17,400	17,100	16,200	16,400
<b>V/C highest link</b>	1.23	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.86
<b>GHG (tons)</b>	178	47	47	47	48	48	13	14

Scenarios:

- 1: Existing conditions
- 2A: WHI Bridge and Port Option 2
- 2B: No WHI Bridge and no Port Option 2
- 3A: WHI Bridge
- 3B: No WHI Bridge
- 3C: WHI Bridge w/o connection to East Hayden Island

### Key Phase 1 Traffic Analysis Findings:

- The “high impact” development scenario adds **360 vehicles** (20% trucks) to Hayden Island streets during PM 2-hour peak (about 5% of total Hayden Island demand).
- The ‘high impact’ development is comparable to the **300 vehicles** assumed in the CRC FEIS.
- There is little variation in traffic demand between the future scenarios compared to the growth in regional traffic by 2035, indicating that **regional growth has a much greater impact on future demand than the incremental increase from a Port development.**
- **All network links operate at V/C <0.9 or better for all future scenarios.**
- With WHI Bridge, 11% of Port traffic (**40 vehicles**) use Hayden Island streets. Without WHI Bridge, 24% of Port traffic (**100 vehicles**) use CRC local arterial bridge (8% of total bridge traffic).
- With new Hayden Island/Marine Drive Interchanges, no Rivergate to I-5 cut-through traffic would use a new WHI bridge (**2-4 minute difference**). Without the new Interchanges, one third of the east to northbound traffic (**200 vehicles**) would use a new WHI Bridge as a through route due to projected congestion at the Interchanges.
- Hayden Island local streets are projected to experience the worse traffic conditions during the weekend noon period compared with the typical weekday PM peak period, due to traffic associated with the Janzen Beach Shopping Center.
- Port development adds **8 vehicles** to local St Johns streets during 2-hour PM peak, compared to **140 (non-Port)** Hayden Island vehicles using St Johns streets

### Comments and Recommendations from Technical Work Session:

- What level of traffic congestion would trigger the need for a new WHI bridge?
  - PBOT will prepare a technical memo showing the remaining “reserve” capacity on the Hayden Island transportation network with a WHI Port development. This information will help inform the decision process for determining the need for a new WHI bridge, which will be addressed in a more detailed cost/benefit analysis prepared by the project consultant.
- How many additional trucks would be traveling past the manufactured home park on N. Hayden Island Drive every hour from a potential Port development?
  - Based on the estimated 70 trucks trips during the 2-hour PM peak period (35 trucks during the 1-hour PM peak period) – about one truck every 2 minutes.
- The scenarios recommended for conducting the Phase 2 operational level analysis are:
  - *Scenario 2B - 2035 Future Base* - Assumes **no WHI bridge**, 2035 RTP and land use, CRC, Hayden Island Plan, **no Port Option 2 development.**
  - *Scenario 3B - 2035 Future High Impact* - Assumes **no WHI bridge.**

### Next Steps:

- The Phase 1 network analysis will be used as the basis for a more detailed Phase 2 operational level analysis at the intersection level for the selected future scenarios. A subsequent Phase 3 analysis will identify mitigating measures and state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) findings for the preferred plan selected for the West Hayden Island Concept Plan.

**WHI Issues and Implementation  
Summary Under Code Regulations or Other Agreements**

<b>Issue/Standard</b>	<b>Zoning/PD other City Codes</b>	<b>IGA/Other Agreements</b>
1) Boundaries of Annexation		X
2.1) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designations (Base Zones IH & OS)	X	
2.2) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designations (Overlays “h”, “x”, “c” & “p” zones)	X	X
3) Plan District Purpose Statements	X	X
4) Allowed, Limited and Prohibited Uses		
New Uses (deep water marine terminal(s) and rail connections, related manufacturing, recreation)	X	
Existing Uses and Development (dredge material placement, utilities, environmental mitigation)	X	
Exemptions for ongoing operations and maintenance of facilities, etc.	X	
5) Development Standards		
Development Triggers or Thresholds	X	X
Standards for Recreational development (trails, trailheads, beach access, etc.)	X	
Environmental management standards (such as controlling nuisance plants, vegetation planting lists, herbicide use, etc.)	X	
Shallow Water Habitat / In-water work (performance standards for)	X	X
Existing Forest area east of powerlines	X	X
Buffers (around the terminal)	X	
Setbacks (between development and north shoreline)	X	
Fill and excavation standards	X	
6) Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement		
For development of the 300 acres	X	X
Impacts within the 500 acres (recreational impacts, related roads, utility expansions/maintenance.	X	
Environmental Restoration, ongoing monitoring/maintenance	X	X
Impacts from potential bridge (if needed)	X	
7) Community impacts and related mitigation)		
Marine Terminal Impacts regarding noise, traffic, light, dust, etc.	X	X
Other, and ongoing community conflict resolution process		X
Community benefit agreement (proposal to compensate for any unavoidable livability impacts)		X

8) New Infrastructure		
Master street plan, right of way dedication	X	X
Bridge – Triggers for construction and responsibility	X	X
Other infrastructure on-site (Sewer, water, stormwater, streets)		X
Other infrastructure off-site (improvements/ extensions to existing EHI roads, sewers etc)	X	X
Timing of Development/Infrastructure		X
9) Future Land Use Reviews		
Environmental Reviews – Special Triggers?	X	X
Transportation/Infrastructure Reviews (applicable if development exceeds a certain measurable threshold)?	X	X
Master plan process for the open space?	X	X
10) Land Management of Open Space		X

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
1) Boundaries of Annexation	a) We will assume that the entire island is annexed into city and have city zoning				X
2.1) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designation (Base zones)	a) Boundaries between base industrial and open space zoning and placement of overlay zones (see below).	The placement of the base zoning boundaries on the island is a major component of the ultimate plan, as they establish the base range of uses, and the geographic limits of those uses.		X	
	b) The industrial area will likely have an IH (Heavy Industrial) zone applied to that area.	IH zone is the zone generally used in the Portland Harbor and at T-6.		X	
	c) IH zone will be focused on the area identified in the Council resolution which includes the Dredge Deposit Area. Exact boundaries will need to be determined based on the details.	A.2. limited total development to approx. 280 acres. Council resolution boundary followed powerlines, but was greater than 300 acres. Base zoning boundaries will need to provide some flexibility for other terminal alternatives, but also need to be sensitive to the concept plan considerations		X	
	d) The open space area will likely have the OS zone applied, and the boundary dependent on decision for IH boundary.	The OS zone is usually applied to areas owned by the City or Metro, but can also apply to Port properties with agreements. It is the most appropriate zone for the recreation and natural areas.		X	
	e) Existing uses/development may need consideration when applying base zoning	Applying a new zone could make an existing use or development nonconforming such as the utility corridors, electrical substation and dredge maintenance areas.		X	
2.2) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designation (Overlays)	a) WHI is within envelope of Airport Height overlay zone	City's airport height overlay map extends past the current city limit and covers all of WHI		X	
	b) WHI is within envelope of Airport Noise overlay zone	City's airport noise overlay map extends into WHI. Most of island is within the 62 DNL or 55 DNL (decibel level).		X	
	c) The City's standard environmental overlay zones could be applied as a mechanism to avoid impacts to identified resources where practical and mitigates for unavoidable impacts. Other more specific tools will also be appropriate in this case.	The city has an environmental conservation ("c") and protection ("p") zone that has generally applied to areas of environmental sensitivity. This tool could be used on WHI, and/or other tools like environmental performance standards or IGA conditions could be directly placed in the plan district. Policy questions would be discussed to inform how these tools might be applied. Specifically, what are the pros and cons of determining impacts and mitigation upfront vs. determining impacts and mitigation at the time of development (pros/cons may vary depending on the type of action proposed).		X	X
3) Plan District Purpose Statements	a) Purpose Statement will be needed for implementation of Plan District and key sections	The purpose statement provides a summary of the goals and justification for the regulations and also can factor into land use reviews		X	X

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
4) Allowed, Limited and Prohibited Uses	a) New Uses: The IH base zone allows many industrial uses as well as some non-industrial uses, parks and open space.	Council resolution limits the development to deep water marine terminals and related infrastructure, natural resource protection and low impact recreation. The standard IH and OS base zones may allow a greater variety of uses than is allocated through the resolution. A Plan District can be used to refine the standard list of allowed uses.		X	
	b) New Uses: The OS zone allows certain other uses, and also includes limitations to uses not in alignment with proposal.	See previous cell about Council resolution. The OS base zone allows a greater range of uses than considered through the resolution, including more active recreational uses such as ball fields and boat ramps (through a Conditional Use Review). Code does not define boat ramps. Not clear if a canoe launch would be considered a boat ramp		X	
	c) Natural Resource Protection: The need to protect certain specific areas and resources may further limit uses where they could conflict with protection goals.	Within the 500 acres of open space, subareas may be identified solely for natural resource restoration, where all other uses or specific development (such as trails) are prohibited.		X	
	d) Existing Uses and Development: (Dredge area and utility corridors)	The island currently includes uses and development that should be accounted for and may, or may not, be aligned with the zone map (see above entry on mapping boundaries). Some activities may be limited by the OS zone.		X	
	e) Other Exemptions	Are other exemptions or conditions needed for operations and maintenance of facilities? Are any exemptions needed for environmental enhancement activities, that won't get covered through the environmental overlay zones?		X	
5) Development Standards	a) Development Triggers or Thresholds	1) If IH zone boundaries exceed 300 acres, there may need to be a maximum development threshold of 300 acres to limit ultimate development. 2) It may be necessary to include thresholds above which the development needs to go through a review (transportation review), or requires additional infrastructure to be built.		X	X
	b) Standards for recreational development (trails, trailheads, parking, beach access)	Current base and overlay zoning includes standards for recreational development that could be applied. More specific standards for these facilities on WHI may need to be applied to address trailheads, parking and location.		X	
	c) Environmental management standards	Ongoing natural resource management, such as controlling nuisance plants, application of herbicides, and the planting of new vegetation needs to be addressed.		X	

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
	d) Shallow Water Habitat & In-water Work – Performance Standards	Local regulations for in-water work, both for terminal development and for potential resource enhancement will need to be considered in conjunction with the state and federal rules.		X	X
	e) Existing Forest Area East of Powerlines	This area is within the potential envelope for development as stated in the Council resolution, but is partially outside the footprint of concept plan. There is a need for some flexibility in the location of the (up to) 300 acres of future development and desired resource protection		X	X
	f) Buffers (around the terminal)	Buffers should to be considered around the terminal between development and recreational activities, natural resources and nearby communities. Existing buffer overlay regulations may be insufficient in moderating impact and do not address situations with changes in grade		X	
	g) Setbacks between development and north shoreline	Concept plans considered a minimum 100-foot setback from ordinary high water. A codified setback would ensure the protection of the riverbank and allow a informal recreational beach trail.		X	
	h) Fill and Excavation Standards	1) Fill will be required for industrial development, and may be required for recreational development or environmental enhancement. Metro has exempted much of WHI from the region’s balance cut and fill requirement. 2) Related to setback question above, special standards could be considered for the transition area between the filled development areas and adjoining open space (old proposed WHI PD had fill slope standards)		X	
6) Environmental Mitigation and Restoration	a) For development of the 300 acres	Mitigation of the impacts of development will need to occur both on and off the island. Mitigation needs to consider the principles of net increase in ecosystem function.		X	X
	b) Impacts within the 500 acres such as recreational uses, expansion/maintenance of utilities and/or roads, edge effect from terminals	Council resolution requested that the primary feature of the 500 acres be permanent protection and enhancement. Some existing and proposed uses (utilities, recreation, etc) could negatively effect this open space, especially if not done in a sensitive way.		X	
	c) Environmental restoration and ongoing monitoring and maintenance	Environment restoration can have negative impacts to the environment during construction activities. For example, excavation and grading to improve wetland hydrology. Restoration must be monitored and managed to ensure long-term viability.			X

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
	d) Impacts caused by any potential new bridge	The bridge and approach would cross the Oregon Slough and impact sensitive shorelines on either side. Would the bridge be subject to a future land use review, or would performance standards be identified in the plan district?		X	
7) Community Impacts and related mitigation	a) Marine Terminal development can have an impact on adjoining residential areas as well as on natural areas.	Council resolution included consideration of community impacts such as noise, light, dust and traffic. City regulations have general standards that apply to nuisances such as noise, vibration, odor and glare (light), but may not meet community desires.		X	X
	b) Other and/or ongoing community conflict resolution process	There may be a need to consider a forum for community livability impacts and ways to mitigate these impacts in the future.			X
	c) Community Benefit agreements	Similar to above, it may be necessary to establish a program for considering potential community amenities that could mitigate development impacts. These could include street impacts/improvements, utility expansions, parks development, etc			X
8) New Infrastructure	a) Master Street Plan and Right-of-way dedication	Master Street plan, and right-of-way dedications will vary depending on potential bridge location and on location of recreational opportunities provided on WHI and how they are accessed.		X	X
	b) Bridge – Triggers for construction and responsibility	If a bridge option is considered for the plan, an outline will need to be developed for triggers, phasing and responsibility		X	X
	c) Other Infrastructure on-site – Sewer, Water, Stormwater, Streets	Infrastructure requirements are heavily dependent on whether facilities (i.e. streets) are public or private. If public, they are often built by the developer and deeded over to the city. If private, they would stay under the control of the land owner. For larger projects, there may be negotiations between the entities to determine responsibility or phasing.			X
	d) Other Infrastructure off-site and street extension/dedication – Improvements and payment	Improvements may be required to public facilities off-site such as sewers or roads (Hayden Island Drive), with or without a new bridge. Hayden Island Drive does not currently reach the port's property, and access is over an easement across private property. This will need a resolution prior to development		X	X
	e) Timing of Development / Infrastructure	The timing of mitigation and enhancement measures with development of the terminal and potential recreation and infrastructure development is important to the success of the overall project. Zoning code generally is reactive to development proposals, so this would likely be specified in IGA.			X

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
9) Land Use Reviews	a) Environmental Reviews – Special Triggers and approval criteria for any of the development?	Much of the mitigation and enhancement for marine terminal development may be pre-determined as part of the policy decision whether to annex the site into the city for development. Other areas may depend on future decisions. Are there other special reviews or approval criteria that will be specific to the PD?		X	X
	b) Transportation / Infrastructure Reviews (applicable if development exceeds a certain measureable threshold)	Traffic and infrastructure studies are being based on a specific terminal development scenario. Is there a need to trigger additional studies if a more intense terminal development gets proposed (based on traffic, employment or size as examples)?		X	X
	c) Master Plan Process for Open Space	It is TBD if the property will remain under Port management or if management will get transferred to another entity (or multiple entities). Parks has their own master planning process when they acquire responsibility for properties. A Comprehensive Natural Resource Plan process could be considered in conjunction with a parks master plan.		X	X
10) Land Management of Open Space	a) Ownership of open space and resource lands and the operations and management of those lands	City staff are working on a document to consider various options for the open space areas on WHI regarding ownership, operations and maintenance. There will need to be guidelines for preservation and management of natural areas and access to recreational areas.			X

**WHI Issues and Implementation  
Summary Under Code Regulations or Other Agreements**

<b>Issue/Standard</b>	<b>Zoning/PD other City Codes</b>	<b>IGA/Other Agreements</b>
1) Boundaries of Annexation		X
2.1) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designations (Base Zones IH & OS)	X	
2.2) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designations (Overlays "h", "x", "c" & "p" zones)	X	X
3) Plan District Purpose Statements	X	X
4) Allowed, Limited and Prohibited Uses		
New Uses (deep water marine terminal(s) and rail connections, related manufacturing, recreation)	X	
Existing Uses and Development (dredge material placement, utilities, environmental mitigation)	X	
Exemptions for ongoing operations and maintenance of facilities, etc.	X	
5) Development Standards		
Development Triggers or Thresholds	X	X
Standards for Recreational development (trails, trailheads, beach access, etc.)	X	
Environmental management standards (such as controlling nuisance plants, vegetation planting lists, herbicide use, etc.)	X	
Shallow Water Habitat / In-water work (performance standards for)	X	X
Existing Forest area east of powerlines	X	X
Buffers (around the terminal)	X	
Setbacks (between development and north shoreline)	X	
Fill and excavation standards	X	
6) Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement		
For development of the 300 acres	X	X
Impacts within the 500 acres (recreational impacts, related roads, utility expansions/maintenance.	X	
Environmental Restoration, ongoing monitoring/maintenance	X	X
Impacts from potential bridge (if needed)	X	
7) Community impacts and related mitigation)		
Marine Terminal Impacts regarding noise, traffic, light, dust, etc.	X	X
Other, and ongoing community conflict resolution process		X
Community benefit agreement (proposal to compensate for any unavoidable livability impacts)		X

8) New Infrastructure		
Master street plan, right of way dedication	X	X
Bridge – Triggers for construction and responsibility	X	X
Other infrastructure on-site (Sewer, water, stormwater, streets)		X
Other infrastructure off-site (improvements/ extensions to existing EHI roads, sewers etc)	X	X
Timing of Development/Infrastructure		X
9) Future Land Use Reviews		
Environmental Reviews – Special Triggers?	X	X
Transportation/Infrastructure Reviews (applicable if development exceeds a certain measurable threshold)?	X	X
Master plan process for the open space?	X	X
10) Land Management of Open Space		X
11) Other Issue?		

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
1) Boundaries of Annexation	a) We will assume that the entire island is annexed into city and have city zoning				X
2.1) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designation (Base zones)	a) Boundaries between base industrial and open space zoning and placement of overlay zones (see below).	The placement of the base zoning boundaries on the island is a major component of the ultimate plan, as they establish the base range of uses, and the geographic limits of those uses.		X	
	b) The industrial area will likely have an IH (Heavy Industrial) zone applied to that area.	IH zone is the zone generally used in the Portland Harbor and at T-6.		X	
	c) IH zone will be focused on the area identified in the Council resolution which includes the Dredge Deposit Area. Exact boundaries will need to be determined based on the details.	A.2. limited total development to approx. 280 acres. Council resolution boundary followed powerlines, but was greater than 300 acres. Base zoning boundaries will need to provide some flexibility for other terminal alternatives, but also need to be sensitive to the concept plan considerations		X	
	d) The open space area will likely have the OS zone applied, and the boundary dependent on decision for IH boundary.	The OS zone is usually applied to areas owned by the City or Metro, but can also apply to Port properties with agreements. It is the most appropriate zone for the recreation and natural areas.		X	
	e) Existing uses/development may need consideration when applying base zoning	Applying a new zone could make an existing use or development nonconforming such as the utility corridors, electrical substation and dredge maintenance areas.		X	
2.2) Mapping boundaries of Zone Designation (Overlays)	a) WHI is within envelope of Airport Height overlay zone	City's airport height overlay map extends past the current city limit and covers all of WHI		X	
	b) WHI is within envelope of Airport Noise overlay zone	City's airport noise overlay map extends into WHI. Most of island is within the 62 DNL or 55 DNL (decibel level).		X	
	c) The City's standard environmental overlay zones could be applied as a mechanism to avoid impacts to identified resources where practical and mitigates for unavoidable impacts. Other more specific tools will also be appropriate in this case.	The city has an environmental conservation ("c") and protection ("p") zone that has generally applied to areas of environmental sensitivity. This tool could be used on WHI, and/or other tools like environmental performance standards or IGA conditions could be directly placed in the plan district. Policy questions would be discussed to inform how these tools might be applied. Specifically, what are the pros and cons of determining impacts and mitigation upfront vs. determining impacts and mitigation at the time of development (pros/cons may vary depending on the type of action proposed).		X	X
3) Plan District Purpose Statements	a) Purpose Statement will be needed for implementation of Plan District and key sections	The purpose statement provides a summary of the goals and justification for the regulations and also can factor into land use reviews		X	X

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
4) Allowed, Limited and Prohibited Uses	a) New Uses: The IH base zone allows many industrial uses as well as some non-industrial uses, parks and open space.	Council resolution limits the development to deep water marine terminals and related infrastructure, natural resource protection and low impact recreation. The standard IH and OS base zones may allow a greater variety of uses than is allocated through the resolution. A Plan District can be used to refine the standard list of allowed uses.		X	
	b) New Uses: The OS zone allows certain other uses, and also includes limitations to uses not in alignment with proposal.	See previous cell about Council resolution. The OS base zone allows a greater range of uses than considered through the resolution, including more active recreational uses such as ball fields and boat ramps (through a Conditional Use Review). Code does not define boat ramps. Not clear if a canoe launch would be considered a boat ramp		X	
	c) Natural Resource Protection: The need to protect certain specific areas and resources may further limit uses where they could conflict with protection goals.	Within the 500 acres of open space, subareas may be identified solely for natural resource restoration, where all other uses or specific development (such as trails) are prohibited.		X	
	d) Existing Uses and Development: (Dredge area and utility corridors)	The island currently includes uses and development that should be accounted for and may, or may not, be aligned with the zone map (see above entry on mapping boundaries). Some activities may be limited by the OS zone.		X	
	e) Other Exemptions	Are other exemptions or conditions needed for operations and maintenance of facilities? Are any exemptions needed for environmental enhancement activities, that won't get covered through the environmental overlay zones?		X	
5) Development Standards	a) Development Triggers or Thresholds	1) If IH zone boundaries exceed 300 acres, there may need to be a maximum development threshold of 300 acres to limit ultimate development. 2) It may be necessary to include thresholds above which the development needs to go through a review (transportation review), or requires additional infrastructure to be built.		X	X
	b) Standards for recreational development (trails, trailheads, parking, beach access)	Current base and overlay zoning includes standards for recreational development that could be applied. More specific standards for these facilities on WHI may need to be applied to address trailheads, parking and location.		X	
	c) Environmental management standards	Ongoing natural resource management, such as controlling nuisance plants, application of herbicides, and the planting of new vegetation needs to be addressed.		X	

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
	d) Shallow Water Habitat & In-water Work – Performance Standards	Local regulations for in-water work, both for terminal development and for potential resource enhancement will need to be considered in conjunction with the state and federal rules.		X	X
	e) Existing Forest Area East of Powerlines	This area is within the potential envelope for development as stated in the Council resolution, but is partially outside the footprint of concept plan. There is a need for some flexibility in the location of the (up to) 300 acres of future development and desired resource protection		X	X
	f) Buffers (around the terminal)	Buffers should to be considered around the terminal between development and recreational activities, natural resources and nearby communities. Existing buffer overlay regulations may be insufficient in moderating impact and do not address situations with changes in grade		X	
	g) Setbacks between development and north shoreline	Concept plans considered a minimum 100-foot setback from ordinary high water. A codified setback would ensure the protection of the riverbank and allow a informal recreational beach trail.		X	
	h) Fill and Excavation Standards	1) Fill will be required for industrial development, and may be required for recreational development or environmental enhancement. Metro has exempted much of WHI from the region's balance cut and fill requirement. 2) Related to setback question above, special standards could be considered for the transition area between the filled development areas and adjoining open space (old proposed WHI PD had fill slope standards)		X	
6) Environmental Mitigation and Restoration	a) For development of the 300 acres	Mitigation of the impacts of development will need to occur both on and off the island. Mitigation needs to consider the principles of net increase in ecosystem function.		X	X
	b) Impacts within the 500 acres such as recreational uses, expansion/maintenance of utilities and/or roads, edge effect from terminals	Council resolution requested that the primary feature of the 500 acres be permanent protection and enhancement. Some existing and proposed uses (utilities, recreation, etc) could negatively effect this open space, especially if not done in a sensitive way.		X	
	c) Environmental restoration and ongoing monitoring and maintenance	Environment restoration can have negative impacts to the environment during construction activities. For example, excavation and grading to improve wetland hydrology. Restoration must be monitored and managed to ensure long-term viability.			X

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
	d) Impacts caused by any potential new bridge	The bridge and approach would cross the Oregon Slough and impact sensitive shorelines on either side. Would the bridge be subject to a future land use review, or would performance standards be identified in the plan district?		X	
7) Community Impacts and related mitigation	a) Marine Terminal development can have an impact on adjoining residential areas as well as on natural areas.	Council resolution included consideration of community impacts such as noise, light, dust and traffic. City regulations have general standards that apply to nuisances such as noise, vibration, odor and glare (light), but may not meet community desires.		X	X
	b) Other and/or ongoing community conflict resolution process	There may be a need to consider a forum for community livability impacts and ways to mitigate these impacts in the future.			X
	c) Community Benefit agreements	Similar to above, it may be necessary to establish a program for considering potential community amenities that could mitigate development impacts. These could include street impacts/improvements, utility expansions, parks development, etc			X
8) New Infrastructure	a) Master Street Plan and Right-of-way dedication	Master Street plan, and right-of-way dedications will vary depending on potential bridge location and on location of recreational opportunities provided on WHI and how they are accessed.		X	X
	b) Bridge – Triggers for construction and responsibility	If a bridge option is considered for the plan, an outline will need to be developed for triggers, phasing and responsibility		X	X
	c) Other Infrastructure on-site – Sewer, Water, Stormwater, Streets	Infrastructure requirements are heavily dependent on whether facilities (i.e. streets) are public or private. If public, they are often built by the developer and deeded over to the city. If private, they would stay under the control of the land owner. For larger projects, there may be negotiations between the entities to determine responsibility or phasing.			X
	d) Other Infrastructure off-site and street extension/dedication – Improvements and payment	Improvements may be required to public facilities off-site such as sewers or roads (Hayden Island Drive), with or without a new bridge. Hayden Island Drive does not currently reach the port’s property, and access is over an easement across private property. This will need a resolution prior to development		X	X
	e) Timing of Development / Infrastructure	The timing of mitigation and enhancement measures with development of the terminal and potential recreation and infrastructure development is important to the success of the overall project. Zoning code generally is reactive to development proposals, so this would likely be specified in IGA.			X

## WHI Zoning and Plan District Issues and Implementation Code and Agreements

Main Issue	Discussion Topics	Details	Implementation Measures	PD/Zoning/ City Regs	IGA/Other Agreement
9) Land Use Reviews	a) Environmental Reviews – Special Triggers and approval criteria for any of the development?	Much of the mitigation and enhancement for marine terminal development may be pre-determined as part of the policy decision whether to annex the site into the city for development. Other areas may depend on future decisions. Are there other special reviews or approval criteria that will be specific to the PD?		X	X
	b) Transportation / Infrastructure Reviews (applicable if development exceeds a certain measureable threshold)	Traffic and infrastructure studies are being based on a specific terminal development scenario. Is there a need to trigger additional studies if a more intense terminal development gets proposed (based on traffic, employment or size as examples)?		X	X
	c) Master Plan Process for Open Space	It is TBD if the property will remain under Port management or if management will get transferred to another entity (or multiple entities). Parks has their own master planning process when they acquire responsibility for properties. A Comprehensive Natural Resource Plan process could be considered in conjunction with a parks master plan.		X	X
10) Land Management of Open Space	a) Ownership of open space and resource lands and the operations and management of those lands	City staff are working on a document to consider various options for the open space areas on WHI regarding ownership, operations and maintenance. There will need to be guidelines for preservation and management of natural areas and access to recreational areas.			X
11) Other Issue?					