### **Public Involvement Process**

WHI Open Houses for the Preliminary Draft Plan: June 20<sup>th</sup> and July 17<sup>th</sup> 2012 Community Comments/Questions and City Staff Responses

## Overview

On June 20<sup>th</sup> and July 17<sup>th</sup> the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability held open houses to discuss the West Hayden Island Preliminary draft plan. On June 20<sup>th</sup> City staff provided an overview of the planning process, described background technical studies (Concept Plan, Cost/Benefit, Harbor Lands, ESEE, etc) and discussed key elements of draft zoning code language and an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City and the Port. On July 17<sup>th</sup> City staff provided a brief overview of the draft plan but also discussed potential changes to the plan based on community and Advisory Committee feedback. The Mayor presided over the Q & A portion of the July open house.

Below is a summary of all comments and questions received from both open houses. City staff has divided the comments up into major themes including livability, health issues and health impact assessment, transportation, terminal development, dredging issues, environment, and wildlife. City staff has written a response section for each major theme in an effort to respond to community questions and concerns.

## Livability, Health issues and Health Impact Assessment

## Comments:

## Health Impact Assessment

- Community mitigation is impossible to determine without an HIA.
- Community needs to know next steps for HIA and when it will be completed related to the rest of this process.
- The color diagram indicates 25 factors (resident referencing a diagram in the City's PowerPoint). Only a fraction of these can be measured at the stage 1 level, and will be at the "50,000-foot" level.
- It seems that any study needs to have a knowledge of the types of materials being transported to/from the Port. This would have a greater impact than light and noise issues.
- The HIA seems to be done at the last minute, and in different stages. If there is a possibility that this or future HIAs could result in a no-build recommendation, the longer we wait to do the detailed analysis, the larger the expenditures of public funds. We should get all information now. Do not move forward without a HIA.
- Efforts by project to improve health impacts have been ignored.

### Baseline Data needed

- Need to get baseline information to know affect on community prior to going to Council
- Need more than just baseline noise readings. What about air quality, existing hazardous particulates.
- Actual measurement of air quality on the island (dust, benzene, exhaust) need to be done before this goes to City Council. This will show a baseline of what current health impact is.

It is difficult to establish a guideline for noise and air quality based on a one-shot assessment of the impacts. A staged approach would factor in changes in the seasons that affect leaf cover, wind speed and direction, etc. This isn't possible by the PSC hearing.

### Health Issues

- Diesel emissions are a major concern but there are a number of other toxins that need to be looked at on and around the island (see DEQ Air Toxin Study).
- The World Health Organization states that Diesel is the #1 pollution concerns, and Asthma is the #1 health issue in Portland.
- How can this be a positive contribution to the community if there is more noise and air quality problems.
- Health impacts around the Port of Oakland should be looked at more closelyrecommendation there is to not build facilities (rail?) within 1 mile of residents- study indicates life span of those living within 1 mile of Oakland facility is shortened by 10 years.

### Livability

- Community mitigation provided in the IGA is not enough. Doesn't benefit residents of Manufactured Home Park. More beneficial to the proposed traffic than to the residents.
- Success of terminal comes at expense of mfg home community. Residents will lose all value in homes.
- The Best Management Practices (BMPs) listed in the IGA document are vague and insufficient, and in many cases only state what is legally required, not anything additional to benefit the community.
- State of California would never allow this facility in close proximity to neighborhoods.
- A reference was made to the Basel Convention as an example of issues related to movement of hazardous wastes from more developed to lesser developed nations similar to what is happening on Hayden Island.
- Hayden Island is under siege. The CRC, Mall rebuilding, Salpare Bay apartment construction, lottery row and now the WHI project all are affecting the island. The island can't handle this density of development.
- The is no regard for community in this document, no equity, no bridge to marine drive
- Take livability more into consideration -don't turn west side of island into a terminal and rail yard.
- City should be considering maximum impacts and costs this development could have as opposed to minimums.
- Community and Environmental impacts have been studied as an after thought
- There is already a lack of affordable housing. This development would be the demise of the manufactured home community.
- Hayden Island development (east and west) is already full- sufficient business and residential---need green space.
- We don't want this facility here—another location that is already developed would be better.
- Area better served for nature based recreation.

- When coming down I-5 this should be a beautiful entry to Portland, not a marine terminal. Keep the island green - no development.
- Class Harbor (floating homes) is only .5 miles away from a potential development.

## **City Responses to Comments:**

Several of the issues raised above may also be answered in other sections, but the items below provide an overview of the studies that were, or are currently being undertaken to address many of these issues.

- The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability completed a <u>Local Impacts</u> report in 2010, which explores issues such as noise, traffic, air quality, etc. It includes case studies of how other communities have addressed port-related impacts.
- The <u>Cost/Benefit study</u> outlines potential community impacts and the economic implications, and suggests that additional work may be appropriate via a Health Impact Assessment (HIA).
- The likely <u>impacts on the local transportation system</u> have been quantified in a report prepared by PBOT.
- The City and Port are collecting additional baseline noise and air quality information and expect to make that information available during the fall of 2012.
- The City is conducting additional health research with Multnomah County Health Department and compiling a health impact report for Planning and Sustainability Commission review later this fall. A draft scope of this report has been circulated with the Advisory Committee.

- Why doesn't the city advocate on behalf of the community? Would the City be able to go to City Council and say "no development"?
  Answer: In July 2010 City Council passed a resolution (Resolution 36805) which directed the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to continue planning efforts for West Hayden Island. BPS was given parameters for developing a concept plan with no more than a 300 acre footprint for industrial development and at least 500 acres for open space. Later this year we will bring back to City Council a legislative package which contains the concept plan, a number of additional studies, potential changes to the zoning code, and an ordinance for potential annexation. City Council will make the decision on if they want to annex and zone the property or not.
- Jantzen beach investment is \$50M -what will the Port development investment be for the community?
   <u>Answer:</u> The <u>Cost/Benefit study</u> summarizes potential economic benefits. Experts estimate 2,300 to 3,600 jobs could result from development of a marine terminal on WHI. This includes direct jobs, induced jobs and indirect jobs. Together, these jobs could generate \$200 to \$300 million in personal annual income within the region, and \$18 to \$30 million in annual state/local tax revenue (in Oregon and Washington).
- As a north Portland resident I am very concerned about air quality and this project and all the industrial development that already exists. The

neighborhood literally stinks and how will another industrial facility just 0.4 miles from my home affect the air that I breathe?

<u>Answer</u>: The City is conducting additional health research with Multnomah County Health Department and compiling a health impact report for Planning and Sustainability Commission review later this fall.

- How do we make sure we get the jobs that are being promised?
- How can jobs and/or local hiring preferences get guaranteed if most jobs are through a union?
  - <u>Answer:</u> The City is including a local hiring preference clause within the proposed intergovernmental agreement.
- Why don't recent DEQ reports address the air quality impacts of ships on the river? Of if they do what are the impacts?
   <u>Answer</u>: DEQ's Portland Air Toxins (PATs) report does discuss air quality impacts from ships on the river. They have produced a series of white papers as Appendices to the main report. Page 39 of the PATS report appendix has links to all of the white papers: <a href="http://www.deg.state.or.us/aq/planning/report/10Appendix.pdf">http://www.deg.state.or.us/aq/planning/report/10Appendix.pdf</a>
- Concern expressed of loss of value to homes what programs are available to community members for this loss? Is relocation an option? Are there any programs planned to buy out citizens who cannot sell their residences?
- How will this study analyze the stress from access problems due to traffic, and effect of impacts on property values?
- Over the long-term, demographics for the area could change which change the affect on impacts. How will that be considered?
- The center of health impact chart includes factors about effects on individuals in the area. How is the city going to determine these factors without health history?
- How do you measure the anxiety/stress of people not able to get on and off the island?

<u>Answer:</u> The five questions noted above will be addressed in part by additional research being conducted for the health impact report that will be available this fall 2012.

- How do we get approval of a stage 2 HIA—how can Port be held accountable? <u>Answer</u>: A Health Impact Assessment is proposed prior to marine terminal development. The City has proposed that this study be completed before federal environmental impact assessments are underway, so that health information could be considered in the federal permit process. The City has proposed a clause describing this in the draft intergovernmental agreement between the Port and the City.
- Demographics of island will change with new residential development—how w<u>ill th</u>is be analyzed?
   <u>Answer</u>: BPS and the Multnomah County Health Department will be projecting
  - and considering demographics at the time of a future Port development as part of the health impact report that will be ready later this fall 2012.

# **Terminal Development**

Comments:

## Types of Terminals/Design

- Automobile imports are best achieved at current sites on the Willamette River.
- Build any new facility in Vancouver, Fort Vancouver or along the Willamette.
   Trade the facility (jobs) to Vancouver for approval of Max Light Rail.
- Concern expressed that the island could end up with a coal banking yard.
- The usage of this piece of property has not been thought through: 1) does not seem to be enough room to store autos in transit, 2)train loop and rail yard will take up quite a bit of space, 3)trains entrance and egress hinders access to recreational areas including boat ramp.
- The port would require major dredging and navigational maintenance due to the presence of shallow water on north side.
- The suggestion of a bridge from WHI to Marine Drive is fraught with problems: 1) sail boats with 30' to 80' masts could not longer navigate slough, 2) businesses such as Diversified marine would have to close without access through the slough, 3) if a bridge is built it would bisect the proposed wildlife area.
- The Port working area would be built on dredging spoils- does not seem like a good idea for trucks/trains—look at North Hayden Island Drive and its waves.

### Location

- There is adequate space in Vancouver, Kalama, etc.
- Columbia River shipping channel is not deep enough for deep water ships.
- There are many developable sites up/down the Columbia river -why WHI?

#### Need

- The market for a new terminal has not been identified—the projection of need is critical and this has not been shown.
- The established need for this development has not been shown. The attitude of "if we build it they will come" is stupid.
- City will be responsible for funding some infrastructure and this is the people's
   \$.
- Build the terminal and use the proceeds to protect residents and improve habitat.
- A Port is a good idea- it brings jobs. A bridge on WHI is absolutely necessary,
   The I-5 interchange on Hayden Island with, or without a new bridge can't handle WHI traffic. The Bridge must come first.

### City Responses to Comments:

### Types of Terminals

The city is proposing restrictions in the zoning code that prohibit coal or LNG terminals on WHI. Regulations are also being proposed to limit the disturbance of the shoreline, which would not allow the building of a seawall. See below for links to references documents that provide other relevant information.

### Concept Plan

The city has worked with a consultant to determine a <u>base concept plan</u> for West Hayden Island which includes the potential for up to three terminals on the 300 acres. As part of this concept plan, the following features were considered:

- A WHI marine terminal would serve as a place to load and unload freight on and off of ocean-going ships, taking advantage of the deeper Columbia River channel.
- A major element of the development would be new rail facilities designed to handle modern trains, which are often up to two miles in length. Most of the cargo would be arriving or departing on ships, barges or via the railroad.
- Consultant research suggests a demand for terminals that handle autos; agricultural bulk products and break bulk (for example, steel beams or other large structural objects).
- A manufacturing business that depends on water and rail for their operation may also be located within the terminal.

#### Demand Forecasts

The types of terminals were based on forecasts that are part of the <u>harbor lands</u> <u>analysis</u> done by ECONW. This analysis also considered the potential for other sites on the Willamette to accommodate new marine terminals and reviewed the capacity of the Port of Vancouver to accommodate regional port growth.

The report also concluded the following, regarding the role of the Port of Vancouver:

- The Port of Vancouver has about 350 acres of vacant land in reserve for future growth.
- The regional need for new marine terminals (in both Portland and Vancouver) could be 570 acres through 2040 (assuming mid-range in the cargo growth forecasts).
- Unless cargo volume growth is on the low end of the expected range, there is not enough land in Vancouver to meet the regional need by itself.

## Development on Fill

Much of the North Portland industrial area, including Rivergate has been built on fill. Engineering and building standards exist to limit the potential for shifting soils. Worley Parsons prepared a memo on potential fill requirements, (Appendix 10, Project Memorandums, Cut/Fill Calculations, dated November 16, 2011) during the concept planning process.

## Shipping Channel Depth

The Columbia has recently been dredged to a depth of 43-feet and will be maintained at this depth. Ocean-going ships have a range of depths, but the 43-feet would meet the needs of all but the largest of the post-Panamax container ships. Much of the recent development and interest in new grain and dry bulk terminals is due to the deepening of the Columbia.

- Need a more extensive alternatives analysis- why can't this go in Vancouver?
  - <u>Answer:</u> These types of terminals can also go in Vancouver. However, forecasts indicate a long-term regional demand for additional marine terminals that exceeds the supply of land available in Vancouver.
- Where will the bridge be located?

- <u>Answer:</u> If a bridge were to be built, its expected location off Marine Drive would be just east of the crossing over the railroad tracks. This is an area where the roadway is already above grade and would aid in bridge clearance. The bridge would touch down across the slough on to West Hayden Island.
- Why not explore other options for a mix of uses on Hayden Island? Why not look at better coordination between Ports in the area- consider a joint Port authority?
  - <u>Answer:</u> The mix of uses currently being considered is based on Metro's designation of the land as regionally significant industrial land and an environmental habitat of concern. Staff completed a <u>white paper</u> describing the different ways the two ports could coordinate their work and exploring a range of options for greater coordination in the future. A merger of the ports would require an act of Congress, and approval from both states. Although the bureau has explored this issue in response to public questions, there are no current plans for a merger.
- Would like to see some input from the railroads could a facility work at this location?
  - <u>Answer:</u> There have been several studies done on <u>rail congestion</u> in the area. BNSF has stated that they feel the area has the ability to handle increased freight trains. The studies have also suggested rail improvements in Vancouver and Portland, many of which are currently under construction.
- How will a new facility be financed? What if there is a bond measure and it fails?
  - <u>Answer:</u> The majority of the facility would be financed by the Port and privately by the developer/operator of the terminal(s). Of the \$300+ million estimated development cost, more than \$150 million would be private investment. The draft Intergovernmental Agreement includes some public cost sharing on infrastructure extensions into the site. Specifically, staff is proposing that the City help fund road improvements to North Hayden Island Drive (\$5.25 million of the \$21.5 million estimated cost) and some of the recreational improvements (\$.75 million of the \$1.75 million estimated cost).
- 15-30 feet of fill to build the rail loop—how is this possible? <u>Answer:</u> It is expected that some of the developed areas of the island may need up to 10 to 15 feet of fill to bring the area above the flood elevation. As part of the <u>concept plan</u> the consultant analyzed the amount of fill and the potential cost needed. This is located in <u>Appendix 10 of the Concept Plan</u>. Essentially the fill would bring the developed part of the island up to a similar elevation as East Hayden Island. Dredge materials would be one source of fill.
- Why is WHI such a priority for industrial development? Who is pushing it? What are the other options than what is being presented? <a href="Answer:">Answer:</a> WHI was brought into the Metro Urban Growth Boundary in 1983 to "satisfy a long term regional need for water-dependent, deep water marine terminal and industrial facilities." In 2004, WHI was designated by Metro as a Regionally Significant Industrial Area. It is the largest piece of property in the UGB that has both deep-water and rail access making it suitable for a marine terminal. Forecasts within the <a href="Harbor Lands Study">Harbor Lands Study</a> indicate the potential need for lands both in Portland and Vancouver. State law requires the City and Metro to periodically study the expected land need for a variety of industries, and make changes to the UGB and/or adjust zoning or make investments within the UGB to ensure enough employment land is available to meet the

- region's projected 20-year need. Other options include choosing lower job growth targets, or expanding the UGB elsewhere - in other words, meeting the region's employment land need in other ways.
- Has Council taken a look at potential profit and loss of this endeavor and the high potential cost to the citizens of Portland?
   <u>Answer:</u> The City Council will have access to all the produced technical documents including the <u>Concept Plan, Cost-Benefit Analysis, Harbor Lands Study</u>, and the completed health information.

## Transportation: Traffic & Bridge

### Comments:

- The WHI bridge would help resolve many of the community issues related to traffic.
- The CRC's current phasing is incompatible with WHI increased traffic. Truck traffic will go right through the transit center.
- Resident states that Mall has indicated that CRC has not provided them with enough access.
- Bridge should not be removed from city or regional project list even if existing proposal doesn't include it.
- The bridge was planned 10 years ago, and dirt for a ramp is already placed on Marine Drive. The project should be finished.
- "No bridge, no proposal" was the opinion of past studies. This shouldn't change with the proposal.
- The "optional" bridge from Marine Drive is not optional, as traffic through Hayden Island impact is too high.
- AORTA's comments and concerns related to bridge alternatives have been ignored during the process.
- Without a bridge this will ruin this island. The Hayden Island plan increases living density and cuts down on big box stores. This slows the island down and a port on WHI will turn it into a manufacturing area.
- Concerns raised about ability of emergency vehicles to get on and off the island with an increase in traffic.
- Commitment for a truck bridge on WHI is necessary.
- Need to properly analyze future traffic—need to wait until CRC is built, mall completed and further ingress/egress analysis done.
- We should also consider a separate bridge to Vancouver.
- Traffic west of the mall is already bad especially around the holidays and Tuesdays when Manheim is delivering. The back up is at the light because there is just a single lane. This will get grossly worse if there is traffic from a Port project. Short term solution- make 2 lanes - one to go to N I-5 and one to turn right for S I-5. Long term solution- do not annex the property.
- Hayden Island is unsuitable from mid November thru mid January due to seasonal shopping. (thanks to no sales tax in Oregon).
- Parked trains will back up trucks a very long way and be unproductive. Trains would also back up due to off loading of materials.
- Consider designing the rail bridge to accommodate trucks.

### City Responses to Comments:

The city staff is basing their direction on several studies and white papers. In addition, studies for the Columbia River Crossing project considered future development on WHI as part of their analysis. Staff studies on WHI include the city's North Portland Rail Study and PBOT's Traffic Analysis to provide information on rail and traffic impacts. The following are some of the assumptions used for the traffic analysis:

- WHI would be developed as a rail-oriented port. Cargo would be loaded on and off ships, onto river barges or trains. Very little cargo would leave the site on trucks.
- The "worst case" scenario assumes two auto terminals and a bulk terminal, and projects up to 2,050 daily vehicle trips, including 516 medium and heavy trucks. Further limits are being considered for development.
- For comparison, Terminal Five, which includes a bulk and grain terminal, generates 626 daily trips (125 of which are trucks). This is a more likely scenario for the first stage of development.

Based on these assumptions, the <u>Traffic Analysis</u> finds that the Hayden Island Street network can accommodate the trips generated by the Port as well as the additional trips anticipated over the next 20 years by other development on the island.

- There are already traffic issues with the mall rebuilding and the new Target Store. How can the street absorb additional traffic?
  <u>Answer:</u> The <u>PBOT Traffic Analysis</u> included evaluation of the cumulative impacts of development on WHI and additional commercial and residential development on East Hayden Island.
- Concern that WHI bridge is not part of staff proposal. Why can't staff advocate for the bridge?
   <u>Answer:</u> The Traffic Analysis for the development indicates that with the CRC development and improvements, traffic can be absorbed by the street network on the island.
- Would a smaller bridge that only served the terminal be cheaper?—request for City to look into a smaller design.
   <u>Answer:</u> The city contracted out with David Evans and Associates (DEA) to complete an Alternative Bridge White Paper that considered potential cost savings for a smaller bridge. The paper indicated a potential savings of approximately 25% (\$66M to \$50M) for a smaller bridge.
- What has the city done for mitigation in other neighborhoods surrounded by industry, including rail and road congestion?
  Answer: The city has existing regulations that consider certain noise, vibration, odor, and light impacts when industrial land is immediately adjacent to residential areas. Other agencies also regulate air quality and other impacts. As part of this process, an Advisory Committee will be set up to review issues related to community impacts. The intergovernmental agreement with the Port will also detail mitigation measures. Some of these may include: A community enhancement grant program, increased island security, recreational trail development, stringent best management practices

- for a new development and the reconstruction of Hayden Island Drive with sidewalks, bike lanes and additional pedestrian crossings.
- How will increased trains be handled? How will trucks make it through Hayden Island?
  - <u>Answer:</u> BNSF owns the rail line through WHI and has stated in previous <u>rail</u> <u>analysis</u> that its facilities can handle greater freight rail. <u>PBOT's traffic</u> <u>analysis</u> has indicated that auto and truck traffic can be absorbed by the planned street network on the island.
- If the CRC project does not get built is it a deal breaker for WHI development?
  - <u>Answer:</u> If CRC is not built, it will have a significant impact for all development in the Portland region. Additional transportation analysis would be needed to look at development without a CRC bridge. Language will be placed in the intergovernmental agreement between the City and the Port to address WHI development if a CRC bridge is not built.
- This is the high speed rail corridor how will this project affect the rail capacity?
  - <u>Answer:</u> The city completed a <u>rail white paper</u> that reviewed past studies related to rail capacity in North Portland. True high speed rail would likely need a separately dedicated passenger rail track.

### **Environment**

## Comments:

- WHI should remain a critical environmental area. We are developing too many natural areas
- We are being sold a bill of goods keep the island as habitat and improve it.
- Need to have net environmental improvement mitigation above the norm and has to be in an accountable way.
- Port needs to be accountable to all habitats—forest, meadow, rare/regional habitat.
- Yakama Nation has treaty rights and takes actions when necessary related to natural resources. Currently we are not seeing benefits of this project, only impacts.
- Look at some of the mistakes we've made on the Willamette—WHI should be left undeveloped.
- 500 acres of green is great. Where is the public access, bike paths and beach access? Make use of what we have.
- Net environmental improvement standard is a critical quid pro quo for any development on WHI. Mitigation for all habitat types is necessary and additional measures to ensure a net improvement of ecological functions.
- Mitigation must compensate for ecological functions at multiple scales not just square foot by square foot—this is insufficient.
- WHI is a large connected habitat patch, unparalleled in the City and Metro region.

## City Responses to Comments:

The city completed the Hayden Island Natural Resource Inventory to document existing natural resource features, functions and wildlife use, and an Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) analysis to evaluate the pros and cons of different levels of environmental protection. The city also developed a forest mitigation framework to evaluate development impacts and actions to mitigate for those impacts. Staff is proposing regulatory limitations on development though the zoning code and environmental elements of the IGA.

In response to community and Advisory Committee feedback, staff have included in the IGA additional mitigation for impacts to forests and habitat that supports grassland-associated species. Staff have also strengthened the city's role in future permitting of impacts to wetlands and shallow water habitat.

## **Community Questions and City Responses:**

- The WHI project has a guiding principle of net increase in ecosystem function does the Port or the City's proposal meet this standard? <u>Answer:</u> Mitigation actions are still being negotiated. The staff proposal is intended to replace impacts and get back to baseline ecosystem functions (nonet-loss). However, because it is difficult to find large mitigation receiving sites in the metro area the staff current staff proposal would only achieve full replacement of wetland, shallow water and grassland habitat while only 88% of forest habitat would be replaced. Additional actions can be added to the IGA to get back to baseline and reach a net increase in ecosystem functions. This is one of a number of guiding principles, all of which will be considered.
- An alternative to development needs to be considered: why not a wetlands mitigation site (selling credits)—Has the City looked at the island for environmental mitigation?
   <u>Answer:</u> The staff proposal is intended to provide City Council with a mix of uses as per the <u>Council Resolution</u>. The proposed mix of uses could still allow for potential mitigation banking in a portion of the 500 acres, particularly within wetlands and shallow water habitat.

### Wildlife

#### Comments:

- Should still be very concerned about the eagles even though they are not listed
- WHI is a transportation corridor for fish and wildlife species (13 listed species)—consider the impacts to these species.
- Critical habitat has already been halved once—don't do it again.

## **City Response to Comments:**

In response to community and Advisory Committee feedback, staff have included in the IGA additional mitigation for impacts to forests and habitat that supports grassland-associated species. Staff have also strengthened the city's role in future permitting of impacts to wetlands and shallow water habitat.

Why is the City moving ahead without considering the endangered species on the island?

<u>Answer:</u> The City has documented and considered endangered species use and use by other wildlife species as part of the Hayden Island <u>Natural Resources Inventory</u>. The <u>Economic, Social and Environmental and Energy</u> (ESEE) analysis considers the pros and cons of different levels of natural resource protection, including the impacts to federally-listed ESA species and other wildlife species. The IGA also addresses habitat that supports ESA species including wetlands and shallow water habitat.

## Dredge Material Placement on WHI

### Community Questions and City Responses:

- What chemicals are in the dredge spoils?
   <u>Answer:</u> This can depend on the source of the materials. DEQ issues permits for dredge material placement and evaluates the chemical analysis of the materials placed on the island. The City does not have oversight of this.
- How will dredging be incorporated into the future project? Will it remain as part of a future project?
   <u>Answer:</u> Until development occurs, the federally-designated Dredge Deposit Management Area can continue to receive dredged materials. Dredge materials would likely be used as fill to establish the elevation of the development site. Depending on the future layout of the development, part of the 300 acres may continue to receive dredged materials.
- Where are dredging materials going to go from this project (if dredging is needed in Columbia channel)?
   Answer: There are several areas along the Columbia that are authorized to receive dredge materials, if WHI does not have room to place materials during or after development. These details would be negotiated between the Port of Portland and other interests along the river.

# **Project Process**

### Comments:

- Document reads as if written by attorneys seems to advantage the Port.
- The consultant's recommendations are not followed as the draft reports indicated that port benefits are not accrued locally and there may be enough capacity in Vancouver.
- There isn't a need for this to be resolved with the current council. The project should be rushed through on their behalf.
- Need more clarity on the steps toward recommendation and approval as it moves from staff to advisory committee to PSC and to Council.
- More baseline data needs to be collected before taking the project to City Council.
- Slow down and analyze this more.
- Seems as if Port and the City are "in bed together"—working behind closed doors. This project needs to be further analyzed—it is a bad idea.

Technical reports have had many loopholes- ways out for the Port.

## City Response to Comments:

The City's current recommendations are based on many of the recommendations found within our consultant reports. The draft intergovernmental agreement, which is part of the draft plan, is an agreement that will be signed by both the City and Port of Portland, so it will need to be acceptable to both parties for the proposal to move forward.

City staff will provide greater clarity when releasing documents to indicate what the next process steps will be. In August, the city will release a "Proposed Draft" which will be the staff proposal for the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC). Based upon the discussion and feedback heard during the PSC hearings in October, a "Recommended Draft" will be prepared for City Council consideration. Once the Council decision is reached, an "Adopted Report" will be produced.

- How many draft plans will there be before the project goes before City Council?
  - Answer: See response above.
- Port's proposal seems to be the main proposal put forth throughout the agreement, especially in natural resources mitigation section—why is this?
   Why isn't the City proposal noted?
   Answer: Both city and port proposals are being considered as part of the IGA
  - <u>Answer:</u> Both city and port proposals are being considered as part of the IGA and this will be more clearly indicated where applicable on future drafts.
- What is the timing of the project as it relates to the Columbia River Crossing? How is this potential project being advertised to the rest of the City?
  - Answer: If funding is approved by the Oregon State Legislature in 2013, the City anticipates CRC construction from 2014 through 2020. If WHI is annexed, the planning and permitting of a marine terminal would likely take at least 10 years. Construction would not occur before 2022. The WHI legislative project is not tied to the CRC timeline, but conditions are being placed in the IGA to ensure that development on WHI consider the final CRC construction. The project is advertised to the city through ongoing email and web updates that include interested parties citywide.
- The Oregonian mentioned need for transparency and time for decision makers. Is the project still expected to go in front of current council?
   <u>Answer:</u> The current timeline anticipates a hearing before the Planning and Sustainability Commission in October. The PSC will need to make a recommendation before this goes to the City Council.
- How is the information that the Port provides being verified, both for HIA and for all other information?
   <u>Answer:</u> The information supplied by the Port has been verified by other consultants who may use the information in their reports. The information has also been discussed during technical work sessions on the subjects, which were attended by a variety of subject experts.
- Does the PSC or the Council have the ability to require changes in the proposal prior to their approval?
   <u>Answer:</u> Yes, both the PSC and Council will have the opportunity to require changes or conditions of approval as part of the hearing and work session.

- How about having the City Council hearing on the island?
   <u>Answer:</u> This request has been forwarded to City Council offices for their consideration.
- What is the rush on this project if the development is not seen for another 10-15 years? Is this a credible process?
   <u>Answer</u>: If annexation is approved, marine terminal design and permitting could take up to ten years. It may take a decade or more to secure the needed private investment. Private investment is unlikely without city services and compatible zoning. The City is considering annexation now because there is a foreseeable need for additional marine terminal expansion within the next 25 years. The Harbor Lands Analysis describes this potential needs, and the supporting analysis.
- The City adopted Hayden Island plan which conflicts with this proposed development-how will the City deal with impacts of increased traffic/traffic patterns and impact on community plan? Answer: Possible development of WHI was understood when the Hayden Island Neighborhood Plan was adopted. The Hayden Island Plan included planning for the future of WHI as a goal, but made no judgment on the outcome. That said, two things have changed since that time: First, the marine terminal proposal has shifted from a 400+ acre footprint, to a footprint less than 300 acres. This has changed the potential traffic impacts, and made it more difficult to justify a separate bridge dedicated to WHI (from a traffic perspective). Second, there has been a proposal to modify the design of the CRC bridge interchange, which changes how traffic may impact the intended light rail station area. Both of these issues are being actively examined and discussed by Cty staff and the project Advisory Committee. BPS anticipates that there will be changes to the Hayden Island Neighborhood Plan once the final design and timeline for the CRC becomes clear.
- Has this process already been decided?
   <u>Answer:</u> No. The Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) will hold
   hearings and make a recommendation later this year. The City Council will
   hold hearings and vote after they receive a PSC recommendation.
- Why have the EcoNorthwest reports been ignored especially in the ESEE analysis? Reports state benefits accrue elsewhere and impacts happen here.
  - Answer: EcoNorthwest took a fairly skeptical view of Port benefits, pointing out that many port benefits flow to the larger region, and many impacts are local. Despite that general statement, they did conclude that the local benefits would still exceed the costs. Depending on your view of Port benefits, the project could be expected to generate between \$3.75 and \$90 million annually, in local benefits. As noted in their conclusion, the break even point is about \$5.5 million annually. The findings of this report were included in the ESEE and subsequent analyses.
- How many people need to oppose the project before it is considered a bad idea?
  - <u>Answer:</u> The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability will make its recommendations based on consideration of technical analysis and public feedback. There are a variety of stakeholders involved in this project, with different perspectives. The decision to annex WHI (or not) will be made by City Council.

- Why isn't the timeline done in a more linear process? The ESEE and legislative package are already out even though the HIA hasn't been completed yet. Why are the research and the release of a proposal out of sequence?

Answer: A health analysis was not part of the City's initial scope of work for this project. We are taking on that additional research based on public comments, and based on the Cost/Benefit report recommendations we received from EcoNorthwest earlier this year. The ESEE, IGA, and zoning proposals are drafts, and they will change as we continue to evaluate public comments and consider additional technical information.