

West Hayden Island Advisory Committee Meeting # 19
Friday, June 15, 2012, 9:00 AM – 2:00 PM
1900 SW 4th Ave, Rm. 7A, 7th Floor

Working Agenda

Directions: The 1900 Building is located at the corner of SW 4th & 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 4th 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 5th & SW Mill. The Portland Streetcar stops just north of the 1900 Building, on SW 3rd & SW Harrison. Note: The City of Portland does not validate parking.

9:00 – 9:45

Welcome, Agenda Review and Announcements

- A) Approval of May Notes
- B) Timeline/Calendar Review:
 - 1. Discuss open house formats
 - 2. Discuss topics for June 27 and July 20 AC meetings
- C) Background Reports – update on changes and availability of final versions

9:45 – 12:00

Walk through elements of the preliminary draft plan package and issues

(With Breaks)

- A) Draft Plan District
- B) Draft IGA
- C) Draft Comp Plan amendments

12:00 – 12:15

Pick Up Lunch

12:15 – 1:30

Above Discussion Continued

1:30 – 1:45

Public Comment (Approximate Time)

1:45 – 2:00

Wrap Up, Next Steps and Meeting Evaluation

AC Meeting Reminder: 6/27 (Time: A) 9-12 noon B) 5-8pm), 7/20, 9/14

Public Open Houses:

June 20: Comment on Preliminary Draft
July 17: Proposed Draft Plan

WEST HAYDEN ISLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING # 19

FRIDAY, JUNE 15, 2012, 9:00 AM – 2:00 PM

BPS, 1900 SW 4th Ave, Rm. 7A, 7th Floor

Notes

Advisory Committee Member	Affiliation	Present
Susan Barnes	ODFW	X
Andrew Colas	NAMCO	X
Andy Cotugno	Metro	X
Pam Ferguson	HILP	
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	NW Labor Council/AFL-CIO	X
Victor Viets	HiNOON	X

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

Public Attending (name)	Affiliation
Rose Longoria	Yakima Nation
Barry Manning	
Carly Riter	PBA
Greg Theisen	Port of Portland
Chris White	Port of Portland

WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND FOLLOW UP

Sam Imperati welcomed the group and provided an overview of the day's agenda. He acknowledged the challenge of the documents just having been distributed this morning, leaving almost no time for review. Kaitlin Lovell was substituting for Mike Rosen. Several members mentioned that they would need to leave early.

Approval of Draft May AC Meeting Notes

The Draft May AC Meeting Notes were approved as written.

Timeline/Calendar Review

Sam reviewed the calendar for the remainder of the process, which has changed several times.

- Advisory Committee Meeting
June 15th 9am-2pm: BPS, 7A
Agenda: 1) Release and Discussion of Preview Draft
- Public Open House
June 20th 6-9 pm, presentation at 7pm
Public event to share AC preview draft plan at Oxford Suites on Hayden Island.
- Advisory Committee Meeting (Special Meeting)
June 27th (NOT 20th)
Time based on polling results: A) 9:00 to Noon or B) 5:00 to 8:00.
Agenda: 1) Discussion: public comments on draft and additional AC comments
- Planning and Sustainability Briefing: 26th 7:30pm:1900 SW 4th Ave., 2500A,
Topic: Health

Bob Sallinger: lengthy comments about the calendar, which he finds unacceptable. Meetings are being changed on short notice, materials are not being provided in advance, there is inadequate time for review and comment and multiple meetings are being scheduled in rapid succession. He is particularly concerned that the committee is seeing the annexation documents for the first time as the city is about to enter the planning commission adoption process. This is the planning bureau; they need to plan out a reasonable schedule for the final phases of this process. The Advisory Committee did not get materials with any time for review, especially considering the Open House next week. It is a joke. In response to statements regarding the importance of getting this done before the current council: He does not care whether it goes before the current or future council, the important thing is to have a fair, transparent process and address issues. His goal is not to pick one council over another--he doesn't know whether the current or future council would be more sympathetic to environmental concerns. It is a matter of equity and fairness to give adequate time to review and comment on documents. Audubon public supported the process earlier on in terms of the quality of the consultants and the information being distributed but the process has been good to date and it has gone to s**t at the end. It is unacceptable; he is pissed we are in this predicament.

Victor Viets: agrees with Bob. Keeping up with this schedule is almost impossible for him. Pam has a new position, so now he is the sole representative for the island. It is almost impossible for him to manage all the information, changing schedule, and keeping his community informed.

Chris Hathaway: we talked about this at the last meeting, and he totally agrees with Bob and Victor. To rush this at the end for no real purpose makes little sense to him. He does not understand why it actually matters when it goes to Council. To the average citizen, it does not matter. To honor this public process, it is a real shame and a sham to jam so much in these last couple months, wrecking the integrity of a lengthy public process. There are no good feedback loops to hear what public is saying. It is frustrating.

Brian Owendoff: what are the issues the group feels are being railroaded? What are the outstanding issues?

Victor Viets: the health impact assessment (HIA). It was not something the island residents knew about, and he does not recall it being discussed in the last process. It came up in ECONorthwest's report. There is no information about the health impacts, and no way to monetize the community impacts. If you read the Port of Oakland's HIA, their consultant talked about the interactions of the factors (noise, emissions, etc.) that created greater cumulative impacts than each individually. This hasn't been studied here. We were told staff was going to pull information together, but in reality, it will take actual monitoring that covers a broad range of impacts. For example, there is a big change in impacts with the change in seasons. The Planning Commission is going to meet, and he hopes they will call for a more comprehensive HIA. We cannot finish the first round until you know the baseline and you cannot finish the last until you know what type of development is going in.

Chris Hathaway: in response to Brian, noted the calendar, lack of time to prepare, lack of time to give proper input. Early on in the process, there was much longer time to take in the materials and the staff did a lot more to help the AC members understand. Right now it is the truncated schedule that he does not understand.

Bob Sallinger: when we did the development footprint, there was time to work through issues. We actually came to consensus through the feedback loop. There are so many pieces in play; we do not have enough time to thoughtfully analyze the full package. The package is going quickly to the planning commission and it is not realistic to think that we will be able to address so many unresolved issues via the adoption process. The City is putting Audubon in a position where there is so little time for review, such an unrealistic schedule, and so many unresolved issues, that the only choice they have is to go to their constituents and tell them that the process is being railroaded. He is not going to be here on the 27th, and Audubon will miss some other key dates. Unlike the Port of Portland which can throw multiple publicly funded staff at this process, groups like Audubon and the community stakeholders are effectively excluded from the process by scheduling multiple back to back meetings, constantly changing schedules and minimal time for review and comment.

Eric Engstrom: to Chris' comment, notice about the open houses was sent to the public last week.

Bob Sallinger: he has not received notice or documents yet.

Eric Engstrom: usually the purpose of the Open House is information sharing, getting the word out, answering questions; it is not a decision-making event. It's the public's opportunity to learn about the project. Also, we moved the first PSC meeting back to September, which allows the proposed document to be on the street for a longer period. We knew we needed more time to have the draft out there for a thoughtful response. How can the AC have meaningful feedback? One thought is we could move release of draft to July 27. The July open house would still be on the preliminary draft.

Victor Viets: the last Open House worked pretty well because it was graphically supported. He does not think a pile of text is as useful in an Open House setting. He is concerned about having a meeting on the 20th without useful graphics.

Eric Engstrom: staff is hard at work on the maps and graphs. The Code is very text heavy, you are right.

Chris Hathaway: for the June 20 Open House, a big part of discussion is the environmental mitigation; how will that discussion take place, without having resolution of the issues?

Eric Engstrom: we will have information about the proposals and we will have to explain the lack of resolution. There would be a presentation mid-way so folks could understand the full context.

Chris Hathaway: so you will have Port, City and Audubon proposals? He is not even sure he knows what the City proposal is.

Eric Engstrom described that the Open House would include the reports, major components of zoning, major issues in the drafts, visual information on the proposed site plan, and an explanation of the local street and transportation concerns.

Bob Sallinger: feels disenfranchised after four years of participation in this process. It is all from the staff, nothing from this committee. It does not make any sense that the City and Port have a preferred package, and we do not even know fully what it is. Is each one of us going to have the opportunity to present our alternatives?

Emily Roth: there are a lot of things that are not settled. We have not decided much, there is a lot of uncertainty remaining. The Land Management memo is an example. Trying to resolve this by October seems unlikely. At Parks, we do not run many Open Houses or public processes in July and August. She is concerned that you will put out a lot of time and effort for a public Open House on July 17, and realistically how many are going to attend? Having something like this in middle of summer is not a great idea.

Brian Owendoff: agrees with Victor that the HIA has got to get done in a parallel process with the project. His question is how to we do that when we do not know what is going to get built.

Sam Imperati: everyone agrees, you have to know the baseline and you have to know what is being proposed. It is a question of timing and commitments.

Susan Barnes: will any comments from ODFW be part of the Open House? She requests their comments and perspective be part of WHI Open Houses on the conceptual mitigation package. It is an important component for the public to hear. As part of the Open House presentation, we want the public to be aware of ODFW's opinion on the Port's mitigation proposal.

Eric Engstrom: we will be happy to include it. And back to what is driving the calendar, BPS is responsible to carry out the Resolution. They gave us a timeframe and a budget. He does not have the power to override it. This Council passed a Resolution to give them something to consider. We are already six months past the deadline, December 2011. We are to the limits of the timeline.

Bob Sallinger: understands and has heard that before, but from the very first meeting, he has expressed concerns about the environmental and community issues getting truncated at the end. We spent a lot of time on the Ports concerns and we have run out of time when it came time to address community and environmental concerns. The City cannot make a credible argument that the timeline you have on this is reasonable. It is not. We have been raising concerns about the community and environmental concerns for months. The city had plenty of warning about leaving these concerns for the end. In response to Jonna regarding how to improve the process, please give the Mayor a call and ask him to put a reasonable timeframe in

place.. He heard Eric, at the last Planning Commission; say to hold off on deciding on the HIA, we have more information. So where is it?

Chris Hathaway: appreciates the position that Eric is in, but at some point, he hopes these messages are being conveyed to those who can make the decisions. It would be great to know that the Advisory Committee's concerns are being relayed, and in turn what their response is. You are hearing from the committee and public, "don't rush this." It would be great to hear from them what they think.

Eric Engstrom: the reasons we moved PSC to September is because of these sorts of conversations. By the time the City Council votes, the draft will have been on the street for a number of months. He does not think that is a rushed process.

(Bob Sallinger left the meeting during the next comment.)

Sam Ruda: likes Eric's calendar proposals, but we have all been faced with large documents throughout this process. We spent lots of time on engineering and physics, and we may be exaggerating. There will be things this body does not agree with. People are talking about the concern for health impacts, and there is agreement on that. He wants to have the areas of agreement and disagreement clarified, and relay all of that accurately to the PSC, City Council and Port Commission. Adding time will not add huge epiphanies. More time would be better for some things, but he also thinks there is already meeting fatigue. He is not sure if it is rushed, it is a long process, and this group should spend more time digesting and getting their arms around it.

Sam Imperati: The elephant in the room is that everyone is counting noses, thinking about this elected Council vs. the new elected Council. He suggests we have taken this topic as far as possible and suggests staff give the AC the current state of affairs. He saw the documents for the first time yesterday evening. The packet included the current state of the negotiations between the City and Port. It is the packet that will be presented to the PSC on June 26. Independent of this, they could say we, the PSC, want to move this forward, or they could ask for other actions. His take is that if the Open House on the 20th is the only public event, that is insufficient. If it is the first of a series, then that is workable. Folks still have time to plan with their constituencies and boards to make the Open Houses useful. He is personally unsure if an AC meeting on 6/27 is good or not. We need to reserve that issue until the end of the day today. There are areas of agreement and areas of significant difference, and we need to see where we end up today.

Emily Roth: it would help her to understand the framework of the ordinance. Can it contain conditions that an HIA be required? We can sit here for the next 5 years and still have some uncertainty. But knowing how the Ordinance can be framed could take away some of the uncertainty.

Sam Imperati: the short answer is yes.

Eric Engstrom: conditioning an HIA would part of the IGA. We will walk through those later today.

Emily Roth: if we do not come to an agreement on mitigation, would the IGA set out conditions? To give certainly to the project, does mitigation have to be decided upon?

Sam Imperati: if you cannot reach a concrete deal, then the next step is to agree upon a process that gets to a deal. It is a “conditional deal.” If we know those things we cannot predict (e.g., the results of an HIA), we know there will be some recommendations. There could be an agreement that says the Port, City, any other parties agree to implement the recommendations from an HIA. Bob would say there are advantages to deferring, and there are disadvantages. There are competing forces that make these questions challenging.

Sam Ruda: he read through the draft IGA, and as someone who does not spend his life in the planning arena, it does appear to reflect most of the things we have been talking about. He does not think the document will radically change people’s positions. Again, he thinks we are exaggerating the gaps.

Sam Imperati: we have not yet had time to see if we can bridge the gaps. Something he knows from years of experience is that 90% of the work happens in the last 10% of the time. It is time to play cards up and deal with the issues. The AC needs to get to the substance today.

Bob Tackett: one comment about Open Houses in July and August, there are many retired folks on the island, they might be available for the Open Houses.

Andy Cotugno: diving in is really what we have to do, so we can narrow down the remaining issues. We are not there yet, but we can get there. All the parties need to say what they can and cannot agree to. It is not going to happen until September.

BACKGROUND REPORTS – UPDATE ON CHANGES AND AVAILABILITY OF FINAL VERSIONS

Eric Engstrom, PBS, provided updates on the background reports conducted as part of this process. ECONorthwest took comments about role of the City of Vancouver and other topics and revised the draft Harbor Lands report. It should be up on the website by Monday.

The Cost-Benefit analysis was updated as of yesterday and can also be found on the project website.

Victor Viets: question about the quantification of impacts to the island.

Eric Engstrom: they reach the same conclusion, to recommend an HIA. There was some discussion about how to characterize issues around mitigation and environmental impact costs. The consultant worked backwards, starting with cost and then translating that into the amount of revenue you need to make to make it worth it. This will also be posted on Monday.

Sam Ruda: did they highlight the changes?

Eric Engstrom: no, but we could.

Chris Hathaway: follow up question; at the beginning the process, staff did a great job of providing summaries and briefings. Now at the end, we just get a report that has been changed, and the onus is on us to figure out what is new and what it says, so we have to go back to the original and see what has changed.

Sam Imperati: agrees; we need to get at least a track-change version, or a compare documents version. He agrees that people need to be able to see the changes.

Eric Engstrom: ok.

Sam Imperati: to Phil, you have been the point person on these reports, can we get a comparison?

Phil Nameny: we could get the comparison, but staff could also do a summary. The conclusions of the reports are very similar. The main points of the reports are similar but will look into doing the document comparison so it is clear what has changed.

Eric Engstrom and Phil Nameny, PBS, reviewed several memos included in the meeting packet.

Port Coordination Memo – it has been finalized and is on the website. It is a summary of the opportunities, history, and mechanics of how additional coordination might occur in future. The major change was adding a discussion about the types of coordination that could occur, and additional comments about Oregon land use and how our state goals interact.

Land Management Options Memo – more specifics have been added. The recommendation forthcoming is that the Port would maintain ownership through construction and mitigation. Portland Parks has expressed interest in being involved in day-to-day management for recreation. Also, looking at the long term, they have added a statement indicating that there may be opportunity for non-Port ownership after the construction and mitigation phases.

North Portland Rail Analysis – this is the final version, which includes an exploration of additional congestion and an outline of the completed studies.

Recreational Analysis Memo – this memo discusses the current recreation needs. Once the City agrees upon a completed concept plan, we will need to revise the recreation memo to be sure there is alignment with new concept plan.

Final Concept Plan Report – this is the final report from Worley Parsons summarizing the background information used for the development of the Concept Plan, the consideration of layout options and the public and technical involvement process in creating the final base concept plan.

WHI Health Impacts Update – health topics are explored in several places: the ESEE, the Cost-Benefit Report and the Community Impacts Report from 2009-10. There is a cover memo from Eric to the Planning Commissioners. Eric reviewed the attachments:

- A) Hayden Island Community Profile and associated census data
- B) Consolidated health information from 3 technical studies produced for this project
- C) Scope of work for baseline noise monitoring
- D) Transportation Modeling Analysis, PBOT (2011)

This was all compiled based upon the Planning Commission request for additional information about health impacts. The package of information will be sent to the Multnomah County Health Department and they will provide feedback on what is missing, what can be done now, and what can be done in the future. There are thus two timelines and two sets of recommendations we hope to get out of this. The City is working closely with Multnomah County to address the repeated concerns and calls for better, more complete information.

Victor Viets: when you are posting this, he would like a summary of how to find the reports on line.

Eric said staff talked about doing a blog entry on the website to highlight and help the public wade through the large volume of information on-line (blog posting submitted 6/18). Eric wondered if there were any questions about status of background documents. There were none.

Mindy Brooks, PBS, provided an overview of the ESEE and distributed the recommendation chapter. To set the context, she reminded folks that the ESEE is the Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy analysis and that reviewing the recommendations first is like turning to the last page of a novel. There is a large volume of information that went into the analysis. They focused solely on the 500/300 acre split. We also stepped back and asked what if you allowed more land and what if you allowed less land for industrial development. For this exercise, they used 420 acres and 100 acres and did a sensitivity analysis. At 420 acres of industrial development, you get more rail efficiency and more operational efficiency, and you have more impact on ecosystem services. If you go smaller, to 100 acres, you cannot fit a rail loop, which means you would serve cargo ship to truck, and would have a lot more truck traffic, but could avoid all forest and wetlands.

Mindy continued to review the report and the analytical process, describing how they looked at each factor in silos, that is to say, they framed the question as what if only economic mattered or what if only social issues mattered. Once process all the information in silos, they pulled it together and crafted a recommendation. Their general recommendation is to go with the 500/300 split, and fully allow industrial development within the 300 acres, while recommending limits on the remainder. On balance, it appears to be the best use of the land. Mindy reviewed several aspects of the recommendation from a code perspective.

Victor Viets: question about access and the existing dirt roads in the resource area of the island.

Mindy Brooks: a trail will be put in only as necessary to access. There is an existing road and it is allowed to stay under the code.

Sam asked the AC if there were any big picture questions or questions for clarification?

Eric Engstrom: big picture purpose for an ESEE is to ensure we are making good decisions; it is a subset of planning and state goal 5.

Victor Viets: question for clarification of the map.

Andy Cotugno: question for clarification of the map.

Mindy Brooks: noted there are couple things to fix before it is posted.

Emily Roth: how can the City put a zoning code over the river without jurisdiction?

Eric Engstrom: we do have jurisdiction related to land uses and development. We cannot use zoning code to direct ships or people, but can do so to regulate river uses and docks.

Mindy Brooks: for example, if the State wanted to put in a large dock, they would have to go through our zoning code.

Emily Roth: that does not make any sense to her. The City has such a minor role.

Mindy Brooks: correct; there are so many regulations pertaining to the river, and also to rail. We do not have much say over it. She gave examples of situations in which they do and do not have authority.

Eric Engstrom: the core of our authority is the use.

Chris Hathaway: why the green on Kelly Point Park?

Mindy Brooks: that is the existing zoning.

Victor Viets: question for clarification of map.

BREAK

Sam Imperati framed up the next conversation. We will be going over the Preliminary Draft Recommendation Package, looking for what are the remaining issues, not the resolution of the issues.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT PACKAGE AND ISSUES

The Preliminary Draft Package contains the following:

- A. Boundaries of annexation (legal description of site and ownership)
- B. WHI Project Summary/Introduction to documents
- C. Comprehensive Plan Map Designations and Policy Amendments
- D. TSP Map and Policy Amendments
- E. Plan District – Zone Maps and Regulations
- F. Intergovernmental Agreement
- G. WHI Advisory Committee Report
- H. Natural Resources Inventory
- I. Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy Analysis (ESEE)
- J. Transportation Impact Analysis
- K. Technical Studies requested per Council Resolution 36805

Eric provided an overview of the package, focusing on A-G. He briefly described each, the proposed changes, and the options the Planning Commission will be considering before the whole package is presented to the City Council. He called attention to two special geographies noted in the zoning code proposal: a 100 foot setback from the ordinary high water mark on the north shore of the industrial line and a 200 foot wide swath on the western side of the IH zone.

Victor Viets: is the state boundary correct?

Eric Engstrom: they are being synched up with the new technology. Different levels of government (state, county) have different boundaries.

There were some AC questions for clarification about the map.

Mindy Brooks: there are 542 total acres of IH zone. The total acres on-land is 315. With the ordinary high water set back and the western setback from the OS zone, the developable area of IA is 291 acres.

Brian Owendoff: with the setbacks, is the concept plan still workable?

Eric Engstrom: yes. We have had discussions about where that edge would be, and this is what we have ended up with, which allows us to preserve industrial land and provide for environmental buffers.

Eric went on to describe beach access and the distance between the forest area zoned OS and the residential area to provide buffers. The OS zone does not go all the way to the south in order to provide for rail access from the BNSF railroad to the site.

Sam Ruda: if we were to superimpose what you have on WorleyParsons concept map, would we see alignment?

Eric Engstrom: yes.

There was continued discussion on how the rail would work, the geometry of the curves, and the WorleyParsons concept map, and whether there may be situations where the rail can't fit within the geometry.

Phil Nameny: to Victor, you will see when we get into the code, there are allowances for rail between the site and the mainline.

Emily Roth: 498 acres of open space is a misnomer. There are lands owned by DSL, and there are at least 60 acres of ROW corridor that BPA can mow down. So when we say 498 of open space is being preserved, it is not correct. By her estimation, it is really 380 to 420 acres left. We have to be careful with the numbers.

Sam Ruda: we should not circumvent those issues; they should be stated clearly in the recommendation package.

Emily Roth: thank you; also, you have to note the vegetation management needed for the proposed open spaces.

Eric continued, noting the island is in an aircraft landing zone and thus there are special height and noise contours that apply.

WHI Plan District Review and Discussion

Eric said the Plan District included the basic land use regulations as to what is allowed on the site. There is some overlap in topics with the IGA. The City has the authority to adopt and implement zoning code. An IGA is an agreement and therefore inherently bi-lateral (i.e., it requires signature between the two parties).

Susan Barnes: wouldn't the Council be interested in what is in the agreement?

Eric Engstrom: yes, of course. It is a package. We hope they adopt the code, comp plan and IGA through ordinance all in the same day.

Susan Barnes: how can they do that, if there are still numerous unknowns, unresolved issues, and uncertainty surrounding the project?

Eric Engstrom: that is their prerogative.

Sam Imperati: it goes without saying but bears repeating that folks will be lobbying members of City Council. By a series of amendments and discussions, they will be negotiating and doing this in real time.

Victor Viets: you are only showing them the “no bridge” language. He does not understand how you can do that. You are silent on the bridge, but also have language in there saying it is still under discussion. He thinks it should have option A and option B. Original Council resolution discusses the consideration of a bridge option.

Eric Engstrom: right now, the staff recommendation is no bridge, and that is what is on the table. We are starting with the staff recommendation, and he understands the community does not fully agree with it.

Sam Imperati: right, wrong or indifferent, as a result of our discussion, the City staff will make a recommendation, which may include all, some, or none of this Committee’s recommendations. What he is telling you is that there will be no bridge in the recommendation and it is up to those who want one to tell the Council why it is important.

Victor Viets: is there going to be a cost estimate in the design?

Eric Engstrom: we are comfortable with the cost estimate we have, from WorleyParsons.

Victor Viets: who came up with the \$37M figure?

Eric Engstrom: that figure came from ECONorthwest, but it was only the public portion of the full cost.

Eric continued describing the documents, explaining the zoning for the Special Deep-water Marine Terminal Use Category. The Council wanted the site to take advantage of this capability, in particular.

Andy Cotugno: under prohibited uses, why is “container terminal” not listed?

Mindy Brooks: it is precluded via the requirements we have around the dock standards, which do not allow developers to put in a sheet pile wall.

Eric Engstrom: it is functionally precluded.

Phil Nameny: if there is one, it has to be environmentally sensitive, plus a container terminal’s traffic could trigger the PBOT review.

Andy Cotugno: for all the various things being allowed and prohibited, it seems like you should just call it out.

Eric Engstrom: LNG and coal are prohibited. We could consider a container terminal prohibition

Andy Cotugno: also by omission, one of the plans we reviewed before called for some industrial lands east of the line.

Eric Engstrom: it is in there, in the Deep Water Marine Terminal Uses Category on page 2 of the Plan District document under the Characteristics clause. We have defined it within the definition of Deep-water Marine Terminal.

Sam Ruda: just wants to acknowledge all the things we are saying no to.

Chris Hathaway: can you talk about process for how it is going to work?

Eric Engstrom: over the next few meetings there will be in-depth conversations about the details we are surfacing today.

Eric continued the review, moving from use to development. Use is the broad category, development standards, which begin on page 4, pertain to the actual structures that will be on the ground. He reiterated the setbacks described previously and how they have built in some wiggle room for the rail, recognizing that the WorleyParsons drawings will need some flexibility for actual engineering and construction.

Susan Barnes: question related to setbacks - why is it not in the code?

Mindy Brooks: it is because we relied on the map, and the map is part of the code.

Eric Engstrom: we can include it in the code, something to the effect of, "the purpose of the 200 foot wide set back is...."

Chris Hathaway: what is the current forest canopy?

Eric Engstrom: 65%.

Mindy Brooks: and, also noted that 60% canopy is the minimum used in the NRI for closed canopy, connected forest.

Eric continued the review of development standards.

Andy Cotugno: question for clarification of traffic counts.

Eric Engstrom: it is an engineering standard.

Andy Cotugno: you could read this as the traffic applying to all development in the plan district, rather than just the IH zone.

There was further discussion and comments about the zoning code and Plan District.

Andy Cotugno: could add "proposed uses."

Chris Hathaway: that could include any trips.

Eric Engstrom: The traffic standard should refer to uses in the IH zone. The language might not be quite consistent; we have said it two different ways. The intent was for Port trips, not non-Port trips. We will work on clarifying that.

Eric commented about parking spaces, and the staff is proposing to not include a parking standard in this because there is not enough known about what will be needed in the future. They have to discuss this topic further with Metro.

Emily Roth: would it go through a review?

Eric Engstrom: no, the number would not be included in the code.

Transportation Elements of IGA

Sam Imperati asked Eric to describe how this IGA was created.

Eric reviewed the basic structure and purpose of the Intergovernmental Agreement. The first step was all the technical work. Staff has been building the outline of the document over the last several months, the basis of which has been AC discussions and input, feedback from the public, Mitigation Subcommittee discussion on natural resources, and on-going negotiations between the City and Port. All of this has lead to a set of agreement points. The document itself was created by BPS, and Port has reviewed it. There is no point in the City proposing something the Port cannot agree to, so we are working together on it. It is our best effort thus far, but there are clearly still some points of significant disagreement, e.g., forest mitigation.

Sam Imperati added that lawyers from both sides have done an analysis. The document includes sections that are 100% Port, 100% City, and some compromise. Eric agreed that it is just an initial level legal review. Staff provided enough specifics to move the conversation forward, but additional review will occur as the package progresses.

Susan Barnes: what is goal to get the IGA finalized and signed?

Eric Engstrom: the same time as the zoning and everything else.

Sam Ruda: to Susie Lahsene, what happened in PDX Futures?

Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland, from the audience: this mirrors the PDX Futures process, in that an IGA, Plan District and Comp Plan went to City Council as a package for consideration at the same time. It also included a follow-up process to monitor commitments and agreements. The package went to the Port Commission after City Council.

Sam Imperati: was the facilitator for PDX Futures, as well. He said to think of all the conditions and terms important to this process. If there are 100, some will be in IGA, some will be memorialized in the zoning code, and some will be memorialized in the comprehensive plan. It is all or nothing. They will say yea or nay to all of it. Usually such deals are contingent on both sides saying yes.

Susan Barnes: so, October?

Sam Imperati: yes.

Eric Engstrom: we cannot go to City Council saying we have not agreed. We have to resolve the issues or come up with process for how we will resolve them.

Chris Hathaway: that is what he is concerned about. There is still so much disagreement. If the package will not go to Council with the City proposing this and Port proposing that, you will have to get both sides closer to agreement.

Eric Engstrom: correct. It may go to PSC with some differences, but the political reality is they will not approve the zoning without the rest of it.

Victor Viets: knows there have been discussions with parties other than the City. The community only meets once a month, and they passed a mitigation resolution yesterday. He just wants to know how open to change it still is.

Eric Engstrom: it is still open and will be for a while. Once the PSC proposes something, it is still open until the council signs.

Victor Viets: will ask for Sam Imperati's assistance in setting up a community meeting with the City.

Transportation Section, Draft IGA, Item 3.1

Eric said that there is a series of steps that will be taken over time concerning transportation improvements, with development triggers and traffic thresholds. There is a section discussing what if the CRC is not built, then they will re-open traffic analysis as needed.

Chris Hathaway: Section 3.1.6, is that in current dollars or future dollars?

Eric Engstrom: that is an open question, but we could add an element to address inflation.

Victor Viets: would like a more complete explanation or comparison of costs between the bridge and North Hayden Island Drive construction. He discussed financing the bridge. This Advisory Committee should have gone through this earlier in the process. He looked back at previous designs, and looked to him like the criteria was a four lane bridge with two bicycle lanes. For a Port-only bridge, we do not need one that big and expensive, so he wonders what an accurate cost estimate is on a modified, smaller bridge.

Eric Engstrom: we can look into that. (Staff is working with DEA for cost estimates.)

Recreation Section, Draft IGA, Item 3.2

Eric Engstrom: The IGA has a commitment of \$1.75M between the City and the Port.

Chris Hathaway: timelines?

Eric Engstrom: it is currently set up as a twenty five year agreement. There is some Master Planning work which will have different, shorter term benchmarks.

Sewer and Water Systems Section, Draft IGA, Item 3.3

No comments.

LUNCH

Eric continued the overview of the zoning code and the Preliminary Draft Intergovernmental Agreement, Section 4, "Program to Provide Ecosystem Values and Functions in Excess of What is Required by the City's ESEE and Goal 5 Findings and Conclusions." He said there were three tiers to the macro-structure: 1) determine if you're subject to the regulations; exemptions are administratively handled; 2) if you are not exempt, figure out the pertinent standards; or 3) a public land use review process of the proposed project.

In general, City zoning code cannot trump federal regulations. As we become aware of federal and state laws conflict, we initiate efforts to address them.

Emily Roth: question about the Exemptions section of the Draft Plan District (page 8, section 5, The following development and improvements, number 4):

Natural resource mitigation that is permitted through a local, state or federal process including but not limited to a US Army Corps of Engineer 404 permit, Oregon Department of State Lands removal-fill permit, Endangered Species Act Section 7 permit, or Natural Resources Damages Assessment;

Mindy Brooks: there currently isn't a local permitting process. There is not a local permitting process that would allow you to do a mitigation project. We are looking into creating a mitigation bank.

Kaitlin Lovell, for Mike Rosen: noted there are some mitigation projects that are completely exempt from city code. So what you are saying is that the city won't have a chance to review proposals that have Federal or State approval. BES has come across situations where these types of projects have been in conflict with city environmental goals.

Mindy Brooks: if you are doing development that isn't exempt, you have to meet City environmental codes. If you are developing under Army Corps or DSL, and the City has no jurisdiction, then you do not have to.

Kaitlin Lovell: described example scenario of a mitigation required for Bonneville Dam that LCREP gets funding for, asks if the intention is to exempt them from a review process?

Mindy Brooks: no; and we could still be involved in other processes.

Sam Imperati: what her point is, the ultimate ability to say no does not rest with the City.

Eric Engstrom: we are very aware of it and that is the intent.

Chris Hathaway: explain why you went that way.

Eric Engstrom: one of the potential uses of WHI is as a mitigation site and receiving enhancements; the Port's vision for portions of WHI is to serve as a receiving site for mitigation.

Sam Ruda: mitigation for natural resource damages, probably more focused in shallow water habitat. It is one aspect, a subset.

Eric Engstrom: this is all debatable, and that is how it is written right now. There is potential with the NRD mitigation from the Willamette.

Environmental Development Standards, Draft Plan District

Eric continued describing the Environmental Development Standards in the Draft Plan District. The development standards would be implemented by the BPS or BES. Most of what you will find in this section are things that will not surprise you, as they have been talked about in the concept plan development. You will see standards for trails, driveways, resource enhancement standards, low-level enhancement work, rights-of-way, pipes and associated structures, and overall requirements regarding trees and tree removal that apply to all the standards. We have it here, all captured in one place.

Emily Roth: how does this relate to trees and other plantings? We have run into difficulties with standards at Parks. It does not make sense in the world of natural resource restoration. She would suggest it is looked at again and build in more flexibility.

Sam referred the group to the table, on page 14 of plan district draft, below:

Size of tree to be removed (inches in diameter)	Option A (No. of trees to be planted)	Option B (combination of trees & shrubs)
6 to 12	2	Not applicable
12 to 18	3	1 tree and 3 shrubs
19 to 24	5	3 tree and 6 shrubs
25 to 30	7	5 tree and 9 shrubs
Over 30	10	7 tree and 12 shrubs

There was discussion about standards for trees and shrubs.

Eric Engstrom: they are open to change if there are better performance standards.

Kaitlin Lovell: natural restoration activities have to go through review, but appear to be exempted through E.4 (noted above on page 14).

Mindy Brooks: It should be noted that these are standards and not part of a discretionary review.

Eric Engstrom: if the Port or any other entity is managing the site, and it is not tied to federal action, then these standards would apply, and a review required if the standards weren't met.

Kaitlin Lovell: she does not see any project that would go through City review, and not be exempt.

Mindy Brooks: we have set it up so a lot is exempt. We can continue to talk about it.

There was further discussion on the concept undergirding this exemption. Sam said this topic clearly needs more thought, consideration and discussion and requested that it be tabled for now.

Resource Review Section

Eric continued with the Resource Review Section, which addresses what happens if you cannot meet the standards, or if something occurs that staff and this committee have not thought of. It provides a review process and opportunity for appeal.

Emily Roth: question for clarification regarding Type 1 and Type 2 procedures.

Eric briefly described the difference in the procedures:

- Type 1 – City staff review and decision, appealable to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC)
- Type 2 – City staff review and decision, appealable to a City hearings officer
- Type 3 – automatically goes to hearing for decision, appealable to City Council

They are recommending that most things be Type 2, except for natural resource enhancements. General standard is to “Avoid/Minimize/Mitigate.”

Approval Criteria, Corrections to Violations Section

Eric reviewed the Corrections to Violations Section, noting it is linked with the IGA, page 7, section 4.1.1. In the IGA, the Port agrees to not propose zoning changes in the future, giving more weight to agreements and addressing the concern of what a change in leadership will mean to the preservation of Open Space. He explained some areas where the Port and City differ, and the current language in the drafts calls out the issues.

Sam Imperati: why did you put in the Port’s version instead of the City’s version?

Eric Engstrom: because of the nature of the document, it will not result in an agreement if the Port cannot agree. They felt the cleanest way to frame the discussion was to put it all out there. It is intended to provide a better platform for discussion.

Sam Ruda: this is evolving, but so there is clarity, there are federal and state mitigation requirements. The real issue up for discussion is what is the City’s role for review.

Sam Imperati: he was bringing this up not for substance, but for process. The AC might feel that if “we had a chance to weigh in, we could have swayed them” in one direction or another.

Kaitlin Lovell: she reads this as completely abdicating the City’s jurisdiction over environmental enhancements. BES cannot agree. We have to say the City has jurisdiction in addition to the state and feds. We have always maintained a jurisdiction to protect broader city interest, e.g., flood plain, FEMA compliance, etc. This creates a loophole. She suggested that a way to do it is to agree on what the mitigation looks like and lay out where the AC can weigh in. You have already gotten the City’s view, and that should go to the state and feds. ODFW has a lot of jurisdiction that is not captured here.

Susan Barnes: also question about DSL, where is that boundary being delineated?

Sam Ruda: nothing has being proposed yet. What he is hearing is that the feds and state are incapable of executing their permitting process without the City being involved. How is the city currently involved?

Kaitlin Lovell: we are out of the process completely, no way to track our jurisdictional influence. She described the current city land use process, of how the city overlays conditions on the approval, which get transmitted to the state and feds. So they cannot approve without City approvals. A lot of people think it is redundant and overlapping, but it is not. The city has a much bigger interest on issues than is covered just through State and Federal regulatory authority.

Sam Imperati: policy interest and legally recognized?

Kaitlin Lovell: yes, both.

Sam Imperati: we need to hear more from Susan on ODFW's position on 4.2.

Susan Barnes: have our mitigation policy, which applies to state lands. DSL lands boundary is being resolved with Port.

Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland, from the audience: mitigation we have been talking about will be within DSL lands.

Marla Hansen, Port of Portland, from the audience: aquatic resources will get permitted though DSL and the Feds.

Susan Barnes: described ODFW process and the fish passage statue.

Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland, from the audience: we will also be required to get a land use compatibility statement, and upon making the request, we will notify BES to review before submission. We will want them to provide feedback and input to the mitigation proposal.

Brian Owendoff: what is the City's legal interest in the property?

Kaitlin Lovell: listed numerous requirements. If we cannot implement them, we put a lot of other things at risk. Question to Susan, some of this land is DSL land; in such cases, how does ODFW get involved on the proprietary side of things? Does your role or policy change when it is a regulatory review or proprietary review?

Susan Barnes: it is a recommendation on non-state-owned lands. On state-owned lands it is a requirement.

Dave Helzer, from the audience: DSL administers wetland permitting and ODFW provides review and comment. ODFW also has policies for all state owned lands. If mitigation takes place on state owned lands then the ODFW policies will have to be met. So, there are two state angles on this project: 1) permitting for impacts to wetlands; and 2) mitigation and enhancement actions on state owned lands. ,

Susan Barnes: where is the line being drawn, there are many different kinds of wetlands.

Sam Imperati: so the to do issue is we have to surface is the DSL role and lines on the map. It seems to him there about five levels of issues, and he wants to take it off-line to figure out what is going on.

Emily Roth: she wants to gain a better understanding of what that one section of local-state-federal permitting is about, including what it exempts and what it allows and how it is to be implemented. It might be helpful to bring some examples. The AC needs a greater understanding of the code exemption.

Sam Ruda: start one or two levels above. There will also have to be a NEPA process - an EA or EIA. There are touch points for this, too.

Chris Hathaway: this is just another example of all of the discussions that are still plaguing us. It comes up again and again. It is always to be discussed later, off-line. It is awkward how this is coming together.

Sam Imperati acknowledged and summed up the frustration he has heard.

Chris Hathaway: are we having these conversations or not? This is coming down to Sam Adams and Bill Wyatt in a room figuring this out. Why are we even having these discussions?

Susan Barnes: what is the stronger language that the City wants?

Eric Engstrom: he is happy to provide it. In summary we ask for a stronger, enforceable review, earlier involvement, and joint preparation of the mitigation for shallow water and wetlands. The Port's version is more of a consultation and discussion process.

Susan Barnes: this seems kind of similar to the Governor's "Shovel Ready" concept. She described her understanding of it, that a lot of work gets done conceptually, up-front, with a mitigation plan, and that package is all presented to a developer, up-front.

Marla Hansen: the issue we are dealing with is E zones and potential conflicts between city requirements and what NOAA may have wanted. The Port spent a lot of time figuring out how to serve two masters. It is fairly clear what DSL and NOAA regulate, it is less clear with the City. That is the reason for our more collaborative approach, to bring them in at the beginning to work something out.

Sam Ruda had to leave the meeting at approximately 12:15. He said he is happy to be having these discussions today. He wants this AC to talk about these things. We need a reasonable amount of time to digest all of this information and talk about it. He liked Eric's proposal, but is open suggestion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Rose Longoria, Yakima Nation, had a meeting with some City representatives. She appreciated them coming, along with Bob Sallinger, herself, the Willamette Riverkeeper, Columbia Riverkeeper. The Yakima Nation decided a couple years ago that they would not heavily engage in this process, due to lack of significant federal nexus, but she was directed by Tribal Council to pay attention. Initially the process seemed to be going very well. Unfortunately, she was not available for several months, then she came back in February and heard the discussion on mitigation concerns. Since then it does not seem like the process is leading to a cohesive recommendation from this Advisory Committee. She called the meeting to get more information. Bob left this morning, and he might be withdrawing from the process. She sees great concerns with the timeline, big issues with the environmental side. She will be relaying all these issues to Tribal Council.

Eric referred the group to the bottom of page 8, section 4.3. It lays out where the City and Port differ.

Areas of disagreement in the Natural Resources Mitigation section:

City interested in pursuing the following additional natural resources mitigation (acreage #s come from BES mitigation modeling work):

- 1) Natural resources enhancement of Forest/Woodland area on West Hayden Island: approximately 103 Acres
- 2) Additional floodplain forest reestablishment within 10 miles of Willamette/Columbia River confluence – up to 253 acres of reestablishment, or 736 acres enhancement of forest, with some of this on Government Island.
- 3) Grassland enhancement project – either enhance 150 acres of grassland habitat or provide 1.5M to a third party.

Victor Viets: his understanding is that the project would trigger full enhancement on-island, and additional off-island. If so, then he is confused about Section 4.2. He does not understand how the two can be the same project.

Eric Engstrom: the Port has proposed 150 acres of off-site mitigation. Only the City has made the proposal for on-site. There is a conflict between what the Port and City propose.

Chris Hathaway: what do you envision for the process of continued discussion?

Eric Engstrom: we have not identified the next step.

Emily Roth: what about the Mitigation Subcommittee? Did it fall apart?

Sam Imperati: in summary, the Mitigation Subcommittee has been on “hiatus.” There have been issues with a meeting happening with Commissioner Saltzman. We will have to have reality therapy going forward.

Emily Roth: it is unclear to her how we are moving forward.

Eric Engstrom: the products from Mitigation Subcommittee thus far are the two proposals: the BES framework and the Port proposal. The Audubon Society does not believe either are adequate.

Sam Imperati: now that things are framed up, it is time to have those final sets of conversations.

Eric Engstrom: we felt it was important for the City to have this meeting first.

Susan Barnes: ODFW has not been involved in the Mitigation Subcommittee, but BES did ask for review. We are in the process of doing that. They were asked to chime in on habitat categorizations.

Eric Engstrom: City would like to have it by the Open House.

Susan Barnes: cannot commit but will try. Please provide the 2011 letter.

Greg Theisen: question for clarification; is 736 acres the right number in Section 4.3.c.2?

Dave Helzer, from the audience: yes; this was based on their analysis in the gaps between the analyses. The proposal doesn't address feasibility of attaining the acreage.

Sam Imperati: if the Port did 1, 2, and 3 on the list of Areas of Disagreement, is it the City's position that you would have a deal?

City: yes.

Kaitlin Lovell: There could still be federal wetlands issues.

Chris Hathaway: when this goes to PSC, how are you going to present this section?

Eric Engstrom: they will not see this on June 26th, that meeting will be about human health. We are open to input on how we present this in the future.

Andy Cotugno: the City put in a lot of effort around the methodology; understanding that is fundamental to this whole process. Susan, if you have not seen it, it would be worth knowing about. Communicating the whole methodology to the public is important, something needs to be done.

Eric Engstrom: true. There are two pieces, and there is some technical and policy work involved.

Andy Cotugno: the policy call is fair game, that is the Commission's and Council's charge; a technical disagreement is not as fair.

Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland, from the audience: good point, Andy. She had an ah-ha moment recently. Much of the City's very good work is based on the concept of no-net-loss, and the community works on a net-increase to ecosystem function basis. That is a fundamental difference or fly-by, and the foundation of why these differences exist. The Port is working toward addressing a net increase in ecosystem function which may not achieve a no-net loss

Sam: a) true and b) we will frame that up at the right time. We will discuss the community piece first.

Community Improvement Measures

Eric summarized the community pieces at the top of page 9. He described numerous meetings, which could not have been done without help from Pam and Victor. The City has been sharing information with the WHI community, listening to feedback, and had discussions with the Port. All of this work and effort resulted in the agreements in Section 5, including Best Management Practices for Marine Terminals, which the City would like to see more detail on, and commitments to community impact mitigation. Last paragraph, 5.5.2, about health impacts, is in flux.

Victor distributed a document from the HINoon Board. The community sat down, thought about it, and prepared this document. It was challenging, given their basic opposition to the project. The document says that if the project goes ahead, they need a bridge for mitigation purposes

for the community, which is a completely different standard for thinking about it. The information upon which this is based comes from the City consultant, ECONorthwest. To them, the bridge is essential and a \$100M bridge needs to be rethought. A smaller bridge that still meets Port's requirements would be a wiser choice. Basically, there is still an on-going controversy between what would the CRC do and pay for, and what the Port will do and pay for. The current CRC plan is on your documents. He described how the street network functions with the mall if the CRC intersections are not completed. There are many remaining problems with the project that has been proposed.

Eric referred folks to the map showing streets on.

Victor noted his mitigations do not include dollar figures, as they do not know what things cost. Their number one concern is health. The HIA will help to quantify and then monetize the impacts. We cannot do it until that time, and neither can ECONorthwest, that is why they left it blank.

He described some local street fixes, other features of mitigations requested. Some are re-hashed and some are new. It is a significantly different place than what they have been talking about and where they are today. He thinks they need to sit down and talk some more.

Sam Imperati: questions for clarification only, please.

Greg Theisen: thank you, Victor, for all this work. Much of it is addressed in the IGA. He noted Item 1, the "positive contribution to the community," and disagreed with facts and dollar amounts cited by Victor; about \$26M that has been proposed for the community, if you consider transportation and recreation. Also, under #2, the last bullet point, there is much of what the community requests in the transportation section. He completely agrees we need to align and assess what we have and what the committee has proposed.

Chris Hathaway: \$25M – is \$24M for the North Hayden Island Drive improvement project and \$1M for recreation?

Greg Theisen: yes.

Victor Viets: the road is already there, it is not a community benefit because you have to upgrade it to handle the truck traffic.

Chris Hathaway: question for Victor; on the last bullet of the Community Mitigation proposal, there is a reference to natural resources vs. local community interests. He suggests maybe think about it a little bit, right now it is framed as an either/or, when you probably want both. Just something to think about.

Victor Viets: we want to balance it. The Port's not proposing any enhancements to the island at all, so there isn't a community benefit to the natural resource enhancement.

Eric noted one final comment relating to next steps in this process. There is a proposal for an on-going committee to monitor agreement located under Section 7.22.

CALENDAR REVIEW, WRAP UP, AND MEETING EVALUATIONS

There was discussion about scheduling. Eric agreed that moving the release of the Proposed Draft from 7/13 to 7/27 would allow for continued discussion at the 7/20 Advisory Committee before the release. However, the Open Houses on 6/20 and 7/17 are already announced and will happen.

It was also confirmed that there will be an Advisory Committee meeting on 6/27 from 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. The agenda topics will be:

1. Environmental mitigation
2. Community benefit + health
3. Possible info from PSC the day before

Sam said that the off-line discussions surfaced the issue that Susie brought up earlier, regarding the difference between no-net-loss and net-increase in ecosystem functions. There are also numerous other issues. How you frame up this discussion is where the fly-by has been. Sam will be working with everyone, framing out the issues in as neutral a tone as possible and relating to our 11 guiding principles, to tee up the conversation.

Staff will provide meeting materials with as much time as possible for review.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Notes respectfully submitted by the Institute for Conflict Management, Inc. facilitation team.

**WHI AC MEETING # 19
JUNE 15, 2012**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

4 Evaluation Forms

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

6. MOST USEFUL?

- Presentation and discussion of Plan District

7. LEAST USEFUL?

- Getting documents sooner. I know City staff have been busting their butts to see a lot of work done in a short timeframe. Keep process going.
- Lack of availability of HLI, C-B Analysis, and other material in advance or at least at the meeting.

8. COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, OR QUESTIONS?

- Pacing: too busy



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

**West Hayden Island
Preliminary Draft Package
Advisory Committee Meeting 6/15/12**

The proposed draft for the West Hayden Island Project, which is in process, will ultimately consist of the sections listed below. The sections listed in **bold** are included in today's package for Advisory Committee Discussion, although currently in a preliminary draft form. Some of these sections are still under discussion with final decisions to be determined by the time of the release of the Proposed Draft for the Planning and Sustainability Commission.

- A. Boundaries of the annexation (legal description of site and ownership) **Note: Aerial map of annexation area included in package**
- B. WHI Project Summary/Introduction to documents
- C. **Comprehensive Plan Map Designations and Policy Amendments**
- D. **TSP Map and Policy Amendments**
- E. **Plan District – Zone Maps and Regulations**
- F. **Intergovernmental Agreement**
- G. WHI Advisory Committee Report (contains the recommendation of the 14 member committee)

While the following are not included in today's package, the documents will be made available on the project Website within the next couple days.

- H. **Natural Resources Inventory**
- I. **Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy Analysis (ESEE)**
- J. **Transportation Impact Analysis**
- K. **Technical Studies requested per Council Resolution 36805**

(Note: the above information summarizes what was provided to the AC. The actual copy is not included in the AC summary notes.)



**West Hayden Island Concept Plan
Open House Design
June 20, 2012**

- I. Program
 - Three-hour program (6:00-9:00 pm), with single presentation advertised for a specific time at 7:00 pm
 - For the first hour attendees circulate among staffed discussion tables where they can comment on specific topics noted above
 - A PowerPoint presentation at 7:00 pm provides a project overview and discussion of key plan elements (20 minutes)
 - The presentation is followed by a facilitated Q/A session (20-30 minutes)
 - The open house portion is reconvened with attendees directed back to discussion tables of their choice.

- II. Assumptions
 - BPS staff and available AC members at each discussion table to present information, respond to questions, and assist, as needed, in recording comments

- III. Stations/ Discussion Tables:
 - Registration/Informational Materials
 - Project Overview
 - Transportation
 - Natural Resources
 - Community Benefits
 - Technical Studies

 - Discussion Table Logistics:
 - Staff will be available to respond to questions and hear feedback
 - Easel at each station for individuals to provide additional input
 - Comment cards at each table - to be returned at Open House

- IV. Staffing
 - BPS – Eric Engstrom, Mindy Brooks, Phil Nameny and Rachael Hoy
 - PBOT – Paul Smith
 - BES - TBD
 - Mayor's Office – Jonna Papaefthimiou
 - Facilitation – Sam Imperati

- V. Advertisement
 - Broadly-disseminated media release
 - Project Web site
 - E-mail blasts to mail list

Updated (5/18/12) WHI Calendar of Upcoming Meetings/Activities

June	July	August *	September	October
<p>Advisory Committee Meeting 15th: 9am- 2pm: BPS, 7A Agenda: 1) Discussion: release preview draft to AC</p>	<p>13th: Public release of Proposed Draft Plan</p>	<p>14th: Planning and Sustainability hearing (1900 SW 4th Ave. 2500 A) time: 5-9pm (3.5 hour session)</p>	<p>11th : Planning and Sustainability Commission (1900 SW 4th Ave. 2500A) - work session and recommendations</p>	<p>17th or 24th: Target dates for 1st Council Hearing</p>
<p>Public Open House 20th: Public event to share AC preview draft plan at Oxford Suites on Hayden Island. Time: 6-9 pm, presentation at 7pm</p>	<p>Public Open House 17th: Public event to share proposed draft plan at Oxford Suites on Hayden Island. Time 5-9 pm., presentation at 6:30pm</p>		<p>14th : Advisory Committee meeting (BPS, 7A)- discuss PSC recommendations and staff legislative package submittal to City Council</p>	
<p>Advisory Committee Meeting (special meeting) 22nd: 9am- 12noon: BPS, 7A Agenda: 1) Discussion:public comments on draft and additional AC comments</p>	<p>Advisory Committee Meeting 20th: 9am- 2pm: BPS, 7A Agenda: 1) Letter of recommendation on Plan</p>			
<p>Planning and Sustainability briefing: 1900 SW 4th Ave., 2500A, 7:30pm 26th: Topic - Health</p>				

* No Advisory Committee meeting in August