



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

West Hayden Island  
Technical Work Session #4 Meeting Summary  
March 23, 2012

Agenda

8:30-10:15am Harbor Lands Analysis  
10:30am-12:00 – Cost / Benefit Analysis  
12:30-1:30pm – Land Management Options

For each report, the layout of the session was to provide a short overview of the report and findings, followed by a discussion among the technical reviewers and advisory committee attendees. If time allowed, there was also public comment.

## Harbor Lands Analysis

ECONorthwest, the consultant for this report provided an overview of the Harbor Lands report. The intent was to answer four questions posed by Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) staff. They reviewed the city's methods for locating vacant and/or potentially buildable lands, reviewed the potential of vacant industrial sites along the Willamette for marine terminal uses, considered the role that Vancouver could play in the regional growth in marine terminals, and considered ways to measure efficiencies of harbor lands.

The report found that the city did an thorough job of considering potential lands, and that the two sites chosen for study, the Atofina and Time Oil sites were the sites with the most potential for marine terminal. Both of these sites were found to have constraints that could make building a terminal challenging. The Port of Vancouver could potentially accommodate a significant portion of terminal growth if land wasn't made available in the Portland Harbor. Finally, the report found a potential benefit in tracking economic output as a way to measure economic efficiency of harbor lands.

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

(F): There are discussion questions listed on the slide. We wanted to first ask if there are any requests for clarification or other key issues.

(TR): (2 questions) Would like a better understanding of the policy framework that this is working under. How is this report linked with State Goal 9?

(S): Motivation to do the report came from 2 sources. First were the City Council questions that came out of the first phase of the WHI study, related to Vancouver. Second was the requirement for a city analysis for the land supply to feed into an economic opportunities analysis that city is doing concurrently. Oregon land use law doesn't allow us to credit lands across the border. However, there are policy decisions that could be made in regards to how the city budgets and/or meets its land demand for specific types of industrial lands.

This document isn't trying to make a policy decision. The city will be making a policy decision on how to satisfy employment demand, and what type of employment to encourage.



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

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

(TR): There was a question on the 3<sup>rd</sup> question (Supply & Demand), and how data was reviewed. Also, did the supply include the Atofina or Time Oil sites?

(C): The demand side used the information from BST, which had a high and low forecast. We also provided a medium range forecast. The above sites and WHI were not included in the supply of land for Question 3.

(AC): Concerned that the interviews included the usual suspects (the Working Waterfront Coalition). Would like to have seen a more balanced group of contacts.

(F): Who should be included?

(AC): Environmental Groups (Audubon), Hayden Island residents.

(C): There were budgetary constraints that limited the amount of interviewing that took place.

(TR): The use of employment figures as a growth measure appears dismissed. Why is this not a good measure?

(C): Employment is a standard measure for economic growth, but may not be the only measure for industrial areas. The city asked us to consider other measures.

(TR): The data in this area was interesting but was only measured under two separate years. It would have been interesting to see other analysis.

(C): Only two year points were looked at because we need to find years that had the comparable data to line up the comparison of efficiencies. There is some information in other years, but not the complete sets. There is some additional information to the methodology in the appendix.

(TR): There could be other metrics for value added. Payroll income could be used as a proxy for value added, if that information isn't easily available.

(TR): Over the years, there has been a frustration with using only employment as the sole measure of economic growth. From a shipping perspective, product moved per employee has really changed.

(F): Any other clarifications?

(TR): Terminal sizes from table 3-7 were based on the Worley Parsons (WP) Operational Efficiencies report. There is a question about how the minimums were determined

(C): The numbers for the minimum were based on the review of WP and ENTRIX work and may work in concept, but might not be practicable. There is a range of new facilities. The number of terminals would be dependent on market conditions, whether a dedicated rail loop or shared rail facilities are needed, etc. The assumptions can pile up quickly.

(TR): If grain and bulk terminals were assumed at 100 acres, would that change the overall number?

(C): We may need to sit down and verify some of these assumptions. The information provided here is more of a simulation than a forecast.

(TR): This is a tough issue. Table C.9 in the appendix provides more context of the terminal size assumptions. However, modern terminals are generally driven by rail requirements. Recent examples are all over 100 acres. ENTRIX and WP work doesn't capture the rail infrastructure for grain and drybulk. Looking at recent examples may provide better estimates.



(AC) I'm wearing two hats as both an AC member and an applicant. The report is a reasonable look at land supply. The port has to consider the whole west coast, including Canada in terms of competition. One point to make is that the period of 2002-2008 is an interesting time for reviewing the numbers. It is a small enough timeframe that it doesn't show potential shifts from one type of cargo to another which happens over longer periods of time. Along with this shift, the overall pie is also getting bigger over the long-term. However individual years often have a lot of volatility, so this might not pick up the longer term trends.

(S): ECONW correctly laid out the multiple steps. This process helps policy makers analyze the assumptions and the potential policy involved in decisions.

(TR): The acreage estimates on the low end are small. The Port of Seattle is so congested in some situations that companies move out. Seven acres is no longer a viable size for any terminal.

(TR): The information on the Operational Efficiencies report is instructional, but should be relevant to North American Port practicalities. Also, a question to the port. What would the level of cargo be if there hadn't been a recession?

(AC): It may be worth adding some commentary about the time horizon and that land use flexibility is not possible with harbor lands, due to their need for water access. There is a larger time frame that needs to be considered.

(TR): Is there an opportunity to inventory the public policy issues, such as the city export strategies, the ODOT freight strategies or other studies about the most environmental way to move goods? There seems to be a separation between the land use analysis and transportation infrastructure.

(AC): Would it be worthwhile to drill down further on the numbers such as auto, and what Vancouver's role may be? Also, there is recent demand for coal terminals in the region. How does that affect area numbers? Regarding the interviews, it seems that, on pages 43 - 44, the report veers from a fact-based reporting to editorializing about potential restraints, Superfund and the River Plan. This seems off-track.

(C): We understand this point about the interviews, and understand the potential feelings of bias.

(TR): Picking up on a previous comment, the harbor lands are unique, and cannot be replicated elsewhere in the region. City's policy to have a river industrial overlay, and requirements for river dependent use are important. Prospective users are not able to go elsewhere in the region. It seems that the report misses this point, or doesn't stress it enough.

(AC): Regarding the comments about the interviews, the comments on the Superfund are accurate, and there is a real hardship to develop on these lands. (Toyota had to build a moat). The cleanup responsibility may make it hard for development anywhere on the river.

(TR) Question about the Port of Vancouver letter. How will those numbers change the analysis on acreage? Also, what about the numbers estimated for Vancouver's T-5?

(C): The report was based on the best available estimates. If some of these estimates change, that will potentially change the supply of land and how much growth Vancouver can accommodate. We will probably have to discuss with BST Associates and the Port of Vancouver to consider how the forecasts estimated the construction for T-5. It can be tough to forecast when there are large up and down triggers.

(AC): The Port of Vancouver not showing up is still huge issue. We need to get them to attend a meeting.

(TR): There are a few points I'd like to make. First, it is important to have practical terminal sizes forecast, and consider how those affect Vancouver. Second, the duration of the study may be an issue. Land use law requires providing adequate land for a time period, but you can't ask for more harbor land.



2060 isn't an unreasonable time frame. Also, it should be stated that development in Vancouver wouldn't pay Oregon taxes.

(AC): I'd like to remind people that Larry Paulson from the Port of Vancouver did testify at City Council in support of this project. There is dialog and cooperation among the ports.

(AC): Speaking from the island perspective, there is a consensus that the preferred alternative is no development. There doesn't seem to be an urgency for considering alternative sites or repurposing land along the harbor.

(C): There are some issues and information that will need to be updated. We'll be working with staff to tighten these up.

(F): Is there a deadline to receiving any additional comments?

(S): We should receive any follow-up comments by Friday, March 30<sup>th</sup>. This will also be discussed at the April 20<sup>th</sup> Advisory Committee meeting.

(F): The facilitator asked if the public had any comments. No additional comments were received. The first session was adjourned

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

(Break)

## WHI Cost - Benefit Analysis

ECONorthwest, the consultant for this report provided an overview of the Cost - Benefit report. The report considered the costs and benefits of two scenarios. The baseline scenario consists of keeping the island in its current state with limited development related to dredge placement, utilities, etc. The development scenario considers the effect of developing 300 acres for marine terminals and providing mitigation, as indicated in the concept plan. The report considered a geography consisting of the Portland Metro area. It was recognized that certain affects such as port benefits extended to much larger areas, while certain local effects impacted the immediate neighborhoods. The report considered a time frame of 100 years with a sensitivity analysis for 50 years. A discount rate of 3% was applied to the costs and benefits.

For natural resources, it was found that on-island mitigation would not result in a large uplift since the existing habitat is of high value. Factoring in mitigation costs, there is a net decrease in natural resource economic benefits. Recreation benefits would be positive or negative depending on the costs to provide the recreation. Local effects were difficult to qualify due to uncertainties of a impacts from different terminals. For the port effects perspective, ECONW looked at the minimum amount of income that would need to be annually generated to offset the costs and reduction in other benefits. This worked out to about \$7-10M per year.

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

(F) The facilitator asked the group to consider the questions that staff have listed as part of the powerpoint (divided into natural resources, recreation, local effects, and port effects).



(TR): This question actually cuts across several subjects. The report seems to exclude the local effects such as jobs to a great extent.

(TR): Scoping question: Why is the national perspective excluded in this analysis?

(C): We acknowledge that there would be national implications related to the development of the facility, but the focus was related to the region as this has the greatest effect on local decision makers.

(TR): I have a question on the base case assumption. Should the analysis have thought of considering the potential of the property, based on existing zoning?

(AC): On the local focus of the costs and benefits versus far-away impacts. Did the Net Present Values (NPV) include the international costs and benefits or not?

(C): The values were focused on the regional effects.

(S): Would like to point out that the costs related to natural resources are currently a moving target and assumptions are being discussed with a subcommittee. These may change in time.

(TR): Question about how to consider other alternatives. Under the no-build base line, are there other factors or potential development that would affect the natural resources?

(TR): It would be helpful to know the range of expectations. Also, it would be interesting to further frame the international benefits versus the local costs. This will ultimately be of value to local policy makers.

(C): We knew this balance would be tough. How these are weighed is important.

(AC): Does the cost analysis include the bridge?

(C): It is in there. We can clarify the report on this.

(AC): The question of the bridge is important, both from a cost standpoint as well as from the effect of traffic on the local community.

(C): The numbers in the report were provided both with, without a bridge option.

(F): I would like to bring the focus back to the natural resource section.

(AC): I'd like to hear more about the natural resource deficit and how to get to a positive number.

(C): The mitigation numbers and costs were based on numbers from BPS (Planning). With existing healthy habitat, there can only be a small amount of overall improvement on site, regardless of the cost, whereas a piece of land with no/little habitat value can incur a great amount of improvement

(AC): How do you monetize something that is relatively unique? How can something of this size be replicated?

(C): There are limited off-site opportunities and to get full credit there needs to be a lot of improvement. The off-site piece considers finding a site that has the potential for a similar suite of functions and values as WHI is currently providing. But there is no good way to quantify going from 800 to 500 acres and trying to recreation 300 acres somewhere else.

(S): The forest needs a long time to ramp up to its full value. A 70 year ramp-up with a discount factor may reduce the monetary value for any new forest. This distinguishes the cost-benefit analysis of ecosystem services from an analysis from an ecosystem functional perspective.



(C): The value wasn't fully sensitive to a time range. The discount rate had some effect. The best way to achieve maximum benefit would be to acquire a high value land site that may have been threatened to be lost.

(S): But a negative cost-benefit number doesn't mean the project is not worth doing, right? The functions are still important.

(C): Correct. We are looking at price and is an off-set available?

(AC): Please talk about the natural resources geography.

(C): This issue was discussed. There are some benefits that, by their nature, have geographically wide implications. However, the analysis focused on the regional benefits. For the costs, our slide 17 includes some comparisons between the cost estimates for this project and the Puget Sound Initiative that focused on water quality improvements. The estimates used in this study were not that far off from the Puget Sound Initiative, but the costs can go much higher than we are using in our study. Therefore, our costs are low. Also to understand the full spectrum of costs and benefits, long-term operations and maintenance (O&M) need to be included.

(TR): Several studies mention that mitigation efforts are often not successful. How does this impact your study?

(C): BPS estimates include higher ratios to try and account for uncertainty.

(AC): How is the degradation of the remaining habitat considered?

(C): The functional loss of the remaining 500 acres of habitat was provided by BPS and was incorporated in our charts through a further loss of acreage.

(AC): It would also be good to clarify the overall acreage and the shallow water area. The reference to the island being over 900 acres is confusing considering most data considers the land mass at a little over 800 acres.

(S): Acres of existing habitat and impacted habitat were provided by WP. BPS gave assumptions on costs and percentage lift. Staff would be interested if anyone has other methodologies to determine environmental lift.

(C): The tables indicate that not much percentage lift was anticipated on-island and most is within the shallow water areas.

(F): On to the Recreation section.

(TR): Recreation is the only area where the term "consumer surplus" is used. This term is often confusing for people to understand.

(C): Consumer surplus and ecosystem surplus are similar measurements. For the recreation piece, the assumption that there were no direct fees paid to engage in the recreation.

(AC): Regarding the value of the amenities, it seems that the value of WHI's long stretch of walkable beach is something that can't be compared within Portland. It may be undervalued.

(C): We compared usage to some other parks in Portland that have water access, but not sure if that truthfully captures the beach value. We can review and confirm that.



(AC): How is this range for recreation benefits considered? It is a wide range.

(C): Overall value is based on surveys. Range based on quantity, quality, and uniqueness of feature.

(AC): What about the methodology used and how that was used to determine users and interest groups?

(C): The analysis was based on facility information given by staff, which was in turn based on the Concept plan that indication specific types of low-level recreation. The numbers for current usage was based on estimates from ENTRIX. This information seemed reasonable, and there was no real data for current WHI usage.

(AC): The beach access may be more akin to the long strands of beach on Sauvie Island

(C): We did also consider the beach on Marine Drive, but didn't have good survey data for use of that beach. The surroundings may also make a difference in value. WHI is surrounded by the industrial harbor, while Sauvie Island is more surrounded by natural environment.

(AC): Accessibility would also be important. With development, the WHI beach would be accessible to a large part of the metro area.

(AC): Increase in usage also affects the maintenance costs and can affect the resource impacts.

(C): This is mentioned in the report, but could be further considered.

(S): The east end of Hayden Island was opened up for a period of time. This area also provides beach/water access. There may be some usage numbers for this area, perhaps by the land owner.

(F): Next is the section on Local Effects.

(TR): This is the only section without quantifiable data. Is it hard to find data? Would a larger budget allow opportunities for this research?

(C): Some of it is based on needing more specific info on the terminal and its impacts. The traffic piece is based upon initial information from PBOT. Noise is so site specific that it is hard to quantify at this point. We understood going in that this would be hard to quantify.

(AC): The overall analysis shows that the net benefits of development are greater than under the baseline condition. The local effects review seems to suffer some from a schizophrenic analysis. The benefits are to far-away people, not locals. Ports that only have local effects, such as ports focused on local logging, are suffering.

(C): Global benefits are real, but from a local perspective, there are real costs and benefits from livability issues, tax liability, etc

(AC): The assumptions that an expanded hinterland increases competition are not complete. It can also expand opportunity.

(C): Yes, but the increased number of players can create downward pressure on profits and prices.

(TR): Local effects listed are narrowly related to residents living in immediate vicinity. There are also local effects that influence others in North Portland. The area includes a large industrial area and the Columbia Harbor and the benefits of investment can be positive on these industrial neighbors.



(C): These last few points are discussed more in the port effects section. There can be positive and negative effects of industrial expansions. Economies of scale can occur, but also increased congestion, costs of doing business, etc.

(S): Question about the references to the Health Impact Assessment (HIA). What would be the timing of this? There is data that is site and use specific. Is the HIA tied to a development timeline, considering we are currently just determining the zoning?

(C): We would anticipate that the HIA would be done once types of development are known, but prior to the occurrence of the development. However, certain impacts such as dust and noise are specific to the proposed use.

(S): But it could be hard to know specific prior to development.

(C): Some level could be possible based upon a specific proposed development. In addition, methods of measurement and mitigation could change. The study assumed that development wouldn't occur for near 10 years, and better analysis could occur down the line.

(AC): Are any of the impacts considered specifically detrimental to public health? There are sensitive receptors, especially in the manufactured home park. It seems we need something to help quantify the risks, especially for health.

(C): There is also ongoing discussion occurring regarding mitigation and changes in policy. It would be beneficial to do additional analysis at a future time. Our analysis considered the fact that there are trends to create policy that results in reduced emissions overall. This policy change may make these issues less of a risk in the future.

(AC): It is important to get a handle on this during the zoning phase, especially considering the limitations imposed by Senate Bill 766. There is information on what Long Beach and LA are doing now.

(C): There are some air quality studies related to LA/Long Beach terminals, but their applicability is limited because of the types of operations and the scale.

(AC): The report should also consider these local effects on wildlife.

(C): These were considered by impacts on the value of remaining resources.

(AC): The bridge seems to have more importance as a community mitigating factor, than as a transportation component, considering the air quality and noise impacts of traffic. Can a bridge be justified from a community impact component.

(C): That wasn't a decision we were tasked to make, but it is something that the policymakers may consider. The analysis would be easier if a better estimate of cost were provided.

(AC): The bridge only works in conjunction with the CRC improvements. Otherwise, there could be impacts from cut-through traffic. The pieces have to fit together. Regarding some previous comments about considering the overall industrial area of North Portland, there really are not many benefits from island development that benefit the island directly. Re-zoning East Hayden Island as industrial would not be consistent with the Hayden Island plan.

(C): Part of the difficulty with this analysis is that several other projects and timelines are moving concurrently with this analysis. It makes it hard to make assumptions.

(F): Port Effects is the last section.



(TR): Economic Analysis can be accurate in short-term, but is harder in the long-term. Analysis and other studies indicate the long-term winners are often global pathway cities. This doesn't seem clear in the report.

(TR): The table on 6-14 is based on the Martin Studies. The information was for the Portland Metro area. Having additional facilities provide the reason for the market to further invest in the area. Studies indicate that coastal port facilities can result in more compact cities with higher incomes.

(TR): Did the analysis look at how the income is expended in the neighborhoods. The spin off of commercial activities in North Portland and Hayden Island would be benefitted from development on WHI.

(C): These effects are considered generally in the economy. There are spinoff effects in terms of jobs and income. This stimulus can expand the economy but might also expand certain costs. Ultimately, our analysis looked at this and concluded that the economic benefit does not have to be very big for this to have a positive impact. \$7-10M across the entire Metro area is a small uptick in the overall value of the economy.

(TR): For the development scenario, what was the basis for considering these specific types of development?

(C): The analysis used the concept plan.

(TR): A follow-up question. Was there any consideration about effects with or without rail loop? The rail loop covers a large land mass and results in rather low jobs/acre results.

(C): There is a little analysis on this, but the concept plan considers the rail loop to be a necessary component.

(TR): It may be beneficial for the report to consider the context of maritime commerce. It has been growing and seems to have some certainty of growth nationally in the future. International trade has tripled in the nation since the 70's. The tone of the report seems a little tentative in this regard.

(AC): Regarding findings on page 6-7, does the report downplay the economic impact of the port. Is it stating that it doesn't take a lot to make a financially viable port? What is meant by the percentages indicated in the report on page 6-15?

(C): The analysis indicates that only a fraction of the benefit from the jobs may need to be distributed locally for the port to have a net benefit. But this depends on how the economy responds. We determined that if half of the benefit indicated by the Martin study was generated by the new port, and if only 5-10% of that benefit was a net increase in incomes that wouldn't otherwise exist, than the port would achieve a benefit. This works out to the \$7-10M figure annually.

(AC): How do we know if that figure is a 'slam dunk' or a 'stretch'?

(C): It is a fairly low estimate of economic benefit. Looking at it from a property value perspective, a very small increase in the regions property values would result in a benefit such as this.

(S): One item that may also be considered is how this type of development encourages investment in our transportation infrastructure. It is important for this to remain a long-term port city and the dynamic relationships that exist from being a port city.

(C): However, roles of ports are very different today, than they were 100 years ago. It is less clear of the direct benefits that a port has on a city.



(TR): We shouldn't downplay the other benefits of trade, including the benefits to traded sectors, exports and the resultant income distribution. Industrial sectors have large effects on income distribution. Should this be part of the long-term analysis?

(AC): So, to clarify the \$7-10M, what is a development scenario that would be comparable?

(C): This would potentially compare to the benefits of locating a factory in the city.

(F): Due to the length of time that this discussion has taken, we need to close the session up at this point, with only a quick break. The second session was adjourned

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

(Break)

## Land Management Options

Staff with the City's Office of the Healthy Working River provided an overview of the report. The intent is to explore options to manage the 500 acres on West Hayden Island that remain as open space and natural resources. The focus was on how to manage a big natural area, and the issues that can arise from this task. Staff researched other opportunities and held interviews with various public agencies and groups to determine the opportunities that could be available. Staff has created a summary table that we would like help in determining the pros and cons of various options.

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

(F): There are some discussion questions listed on the slide. We would also like to go over the headings on the table that were handed out to see if there need to be any refinements or additions to the evaluation goals and/or criteria and the various options listed down the side.

(TR): So the goal is to refine the document on these items?

(F): The first goal is to ensure that the right goals and structure are there.

(S): There are a variety of ownership options in the management of the open space, and this may be especially relevant if the city has a role in the management and cost for maintenance.

(TR): The understanding from the Port's perspective is that options A&B on the left side are the only port options because the Port needs to address their own mitigation obligations. These would seem to be the bounds of the conversation.

(F): Ultimate decision may reside with the Advisory Committee (AC) and decision makers.

(TR): How would this work with other land owners?

(S): The intent is to look at the whole portion of the island that would not be developed with a terminal and work with the other land owners.

(TR): I have a suggestion for Column B. The recreation category should include capital costs, which would include design and construction, along with the listed operations and maintenance.



(TR): Question about other entities that are interested in mitigation and where they factor.

(S): There is recognition that there would be other mitigation projects besides that which is required for WHI development.

(TR): DSL does own a portion of the land and I'm not sure what their response would be. I need to check in with them before providing an opinion.

(AC): In the first column, it seems like there needs to be something related to specific milestones. As an example, the point of annexation may be a milestone, beginning development, etc. Also, NRDA mitigation may factor in as a milestone.

(F): Milestones should factor into the table.

(AC): The NEPA process will require the Port to have control over lands for development and mitigation.

(F): Are there any criteria that should be added across the top?

(TR): Under column H, it may be useful to include an item related to the various land owners goals, restrictions and preferences, since there are several owners on the island.

(AC): Question about the Enforcement column. What does this mean?

(S): There is an enforcement component to protecting the resource versus public safety. This can include addressing trespassing issues and unauthorized recreation. There is a need to protect the resource after it is restored.

(F): Is this more of a caretaking and management issue?

(TR): In the land trust world this issue is called *conservation defense*.

(AC): There needs to be certainty in the protected status of the open space areas to stop further encroachment. We need to know this certainty at the time of annexation.

(F): Do we need a new column that considers the level of protection, from temporary to permanent?

(AC): Regarding the first column with the list of options, is the assumption that the Port of Portland pays for the creation of the enhanced areas and recreation? After that, what is the role of the Port or other players?

(S): The study is not assigning roles at this point. We need to figure out the long term financing requirements and opportunities.

(AC): There was discussion of having an advisory committee as part of the WHI development. Would this committee have a role in this? The report touches on this idea of an oversight committee, but it's not clear what its role is within the table.

(F): That could be considered as part of the options listed on the left-hand side of the table.

(AC): Does this left-hand side also need to include the Native American community? What is their role in this?

(TR): Under the option rows, perhaps the milestone shouldn't be at time of annexation, but should be a more generic timeframe such "at a future time" since Port may wish to retain for some mitigation.



(F): Potentially, there could be some form of a 'decision tree'.

(S): Would like to point out that the tribes are involved in this review as well.

(AC): The idea to have an oversight committee comes up over and over during the overall WHI process. Would this be one committee that has oversight of several topics/issues, or are there going to be several subject specific committees?

(F): This may need further discussion. Some form of ongoing committee is a good idea.

(AC): I wouldn't put too much stock in using committees to make decisions in the future. There isn't always the necessary expertise. Hard decisions need to occur as part of the current planning process. Regarding the discussion on public safety and enforcement, these are separate issues.

(S): Enforcement is intended to be for protecting the Natural Resource while Public Safety is for property maintenance.

(AC): Conservation Districts such as the East Mult Drainage District can often manage areas cost effectively, through the provisions of small grants.

(F): Let's move on to the options columns. These can be altered to be based on milestone activities. We should also add rows to address advisory committees, Native Americans, and Service Districts. Are there others?

(S): There are many entries possible for oversight, including Metro, the City, State Parks, etc.

(TR): Could also include ODF&W. Bonneville Power (BPA) could have a role also, as an owner.

(F): We can update the milestones to be more comprehensive and be related to the different service districts.

(TR): On page 15, there is an estimate of the costs (shown as \$1,750/acre for Operations & Maintenance). I am curious about whether there is a range of costs. Better information might be available from some of the other reviewers, such as the Columbia Land Trust.

(S): We have some Metro numbers as well, but didn't include them.

(TR): Precise numbers can be hard to determine because they are so site specific and related to the goals for management of the space.

(TR): Regarding the management consideration, it would be good to try and clarify the type of entity that would be doing the management, and whether they are the owners, or working on behalf of owners, etc. Having other entities doing the management or enhancement through easements or other mechanisms can often be challenging. There may need to be discussion about whether there should be separate lines depending on the type of transfer, whether it is a conservation easement, fee simple, or other.

(S): We were probably assuming a fee simple transfer.

(AC): There are people in Metro that have cost numbers and can sit down with Ann. The cost will vary by the type of activity. Also, for any new committee, there needs to be a clear definition of their role.

(TR): A conservation easement is tough for a trust to manage. We prefer getting land oversight through simple fee simple transfer.



(F): Listening to the discussion, it seems that a better title for Column C would be “Stewardship”. Another component may be “Monitoring & Enforcement” which could address the trespass and homeless issues.

(TR): DSL can work with easements as long as the proper guidelines are drawn up.

(F): There is a question/comment from the public.

(P): I’m with BES. I’d like to point out that in cases that involve conservation easements, the easement can often be written to provide various guidelines or restrictions, such as no trails.

(AC): In the case of East Multnomah Co, the conservation easements can be designed to provide the guidance.

(S): There will be a zoning component to the open space land that will also restrict uses and development.

The facilitator asked for any additional comments. Hearing none, the session was adjourned

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

End

