



WHI Mitigation and Enhancement Subcommittee  
Meeting #5 - Meeting Notes  
2-29-12

**Subcommittee Attendees:**

Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society of Portland  
Sam Ruda, Port of Portland  
Andy Cotugno, Metro  
Eric Engstrom, City of Portland, BPS  
Mike Rosen, City of Portland, BES  
Sam Imperati, Facilitator

*Note: Detailed meeting minutes were not taken at this meeting. Below is a summary of the discussion.*

1. Sam I started the meeting explaining that he had met individually with the subcommittee members to talk about the different approaches to a mitigation plan and get more clarity regarding the topics where there is a very big range in approach.
  - a. There is possibility of agreement on many of the issues, but the large division is related to the forest/woodland mitigation and the value of the Open Space designation.
    - i. The forest/woodland mitigation range is \$25K/year for 10 years on the low end; \$30M on the high end; and the City coming in near the middle at roughly \$19M
2. LCREP presented data regarding mitigation project costs. LCREP has considerable experience doing mitigation projects along the Lower Columbia River. They handed out a table that showed line item costs including design and construction. The average cost per acre was \$29K.
3. Discussion points:
  - a. The City's approach set's \$25M as the total amount that should be spent on forest/woodland mitigation. If \$1.7M (over 30 years) is spent on on-island enhancement, that leave \$23.3M for off-site mitigation.
  - b. The Port's approach is that permanently protecting the 500 acres addresses mitigation needs for development. In addition, spending \$25K per year on on-island enhancements will provide a net lift. The Port is also looking at potential off-island enhancement projects.
  - c. Audubon's approach is to spend an appropriate amount to protect and restore a non-WHI site. The amount is based on talking with other natural resource entities about what it would take to purchase and restore a meaningful project that includes a mosaic of habitats.
  - d. The value of the permanent protection should be credited towards mitigation (agreement by all parties), but how much credit is under discussion.
    - i. The City's approach is that the current zoning (MUF with Special Environmental Concern) and the lack of urban services makes the island not developable. Changing the zoning to OS constitutes roughly a 10% change in value. At the going open space market rate (\$2/sq ft) the value of the OS



- protection is roughly \$4M. This should be subtracted from the amount of forest/woodland mitigation, changing the total from \$23.3 to about \$19M.
- ii. The Port's approach is that the current zoning allows for actions like mining and logging. In addition, Metro had called out 400 acres for marine terminal development (during the UGB expansion) and now we are considering 300 acres. The value of the lost development potential on the 100 acres (400 to 300 acres) plus the permanent protection is worth \$9M.
  - e. The functions associated with the floodplain are not being explicitly addressed. The development footprint is exempt from cut/fill requirements, but if the functions aren't address then we cannot get to net improvement of ecosystem functions.
    - i. One way they could be addressed is by requiring that off-site mitigation be done at one site within the 100 year floodplain.
  - f. It was suggested that instead of taking a dollar approach to forest mitigation, we should be taking the approach of looking specifically at functions impacted and what is needed to mitigate. BES said they would prepare a memo on this topic.

Sam I closed the meeting by restating the range of approaches and dollars for forest/woodland mitigation. There was no agreement reached and the meeting was left at an impasse on this issues.

Next Steps:

Sam I will meet again individually with the parties to continue the discussion. Another meeting will be set. BES will provide a forest function mitigation memo.