

River Plan / North Reach: Industrial Development and Natural Resources Integration Task Group
Meeting #11
Friday, March 21, 2008

Meeting Summary

Facilitator: Don Hanson

Integration Task Group Members: Ann Gardner, Susie Lahsene, Nancy Munn, Bob Sallinger

Bureau of Planning Staff: Rick Bastach, Mindy Brooks, Shannon Buono, Brian Campbell, Brent Dorig, Sallie Edmunds, Eric Engstrom, Diane Hale, Roberta Jortner, Steve Kountz, Matt Lustig, Arianne Sperry

Other City Staff: Kim Freeman, Paul Ketchum, Kim Parsons, Chris Prescott

Audience Members: Bob Short, Dan Dishongh, David Gorman, Phil Grillo, Wayne Kingsley, Greg Theisen, Barbara Quinn, Curt Schneider, Jan Secunda, John Shaw, Ruth Shriber

Handouts: Restoration Site Prioritization Criteria, River Plan/ North Reach summary, Introduction to the Integration Alternatives

Introduction

Don Hanson convened the meeting at 8:07 am

Hanson noted this is the last scheduled meeting of the Integration Task Group and reviewed the agenda:

Approve February 25, 2008 meeting notes

Review site acquisition prioritization criteria

Continue discussion of program options (River Environmental Overlay Zone, Purple/Green and Port/Working Waterfront Coalition)

Don Hanson asked for comments about the meeting notes from February 25, 2008. The notes were approved following no comments.

Sallie Edmunds distributed two handouts: a one-page summary of the River Plan/ North Reach project description and a summary of assumptions and desired program components created July 30, 2007 for the initial group discussions and revised following yesterday's meeting. Sallinger indicated he was still upset with the changes to the NRI rankings and the loss of ranked habitat on the river presented the previous meeting. Hanson suggested they use the new material as a framework to move forward. Edmunds indicated staff reviewed the feedback and suggested the task group discuss all three program options, identifying pros and cons with each proposal, and what would it take to make each proposal work. Lahsene indicated she may have inadvertently separated the NRI from the program option in the Port/WWC proposal, not realizing the NRI is an integral part of a potential program. Hanson indicated that if the group needs more time, it would be a worthwhile process to add meetings. Munn indicated that she is not able to continue working with the task group after this meeting because of her other work responsibilities.

Pearl Restoration Site Prioritization Criteria Discussion

Edmunds distributed the *Restoration Site Prioritization Criteria* (draft) handout, provided an overview and read through each of the draft criteria. Hanson asked for clarification of “lift/ habitat unit”. Chris Prescott explained that the metric measures the improvement in ecological function on a per unit basis as a way of ranking proposed restoration projects. Lahsene suggested the language in the first bullet for the *willing property owner* criteria be changed to state “... sell a conservation easement or fee simple title to the program” and Edmunds agreed. Gardner asked for clarification about the urgency reference. Edmunds indicated that it was referring to the speed at which the acquisition happens. Lahsene asked if a private owner would be given credit for improving their land, even if they didn’t sell to the program- such as the Port owned South Rivergate Corridor site. Edmunds suggested that the property owner could sell a conservation easement to the program. Campbell suggested that the public needs to have certainty of the long-term status of the site. Lahsene expressed concerns about NRDA and the identification of properties as potential acquisition sites diminishing the land values for NRDA purposes. Lahsene suggested that property owners may want to know if they will receive NRDA credit before entering into permanent agreements, and wondered how this program will relate to other requirements in the North Reach. Munn indicated that the trustee council is willing to enter into preliminary agreements that will give partial credit but won’t dissolve all liability, but that any credit must be separate from mitigation credits granted by another jurisdiction. Lahsene responded that this may create a timing issue for the success of the City program as some property owners will be faced with the decision of whether to use their property for the City program or to hold onto it for NRDA purposes.

Edmunds continued reviewing criteria, noting that if a site is more contaminated the program administrator may want to wait to acquire it. Lahsene asked if sites exist that do not fall into a contaminated category. Staff responded that the restoration sites have varying degrees of contamination, which would possibly affect the timing of acquisition. Hanson indicated that contamination also becomes a cost factor.

Edmunds continued reviewing criteria, indicating another challenge is permitting. Providing an example, she said if they decided that flooding the Sauvie Island site was a good idea, there would be permitting issues related to the levee. Lahsene suggested permitting issues related to Superfund requirements were another example, and asked if someone is working on that analysis. Munn indicated that the work is ongoing and Edmunds indicated that staff would have to do further analysis. Edmunds reviewed the last category, institutional, explaining that compatibility with other public policy goals and existing infrastructure compile this category. Grillo suggested staff need to go further with the last category and look at the context of the actual site, pointing out that the Salzmann site is surrounded by industrial uses. Campbell replied that staff had added that consideration to the *project location* category. Grillo suggested grouping the sites by feasibility and timing: those that might be possible in the near term, those that are long-term projects, etc. Hanson asked if the criteria look good to the group. Lahsene presumes that city staff is going to provide detailed information and that this is the framework. Edmunds indicated that they would, with the assistance of other City bureaus.

Grillo suggested that sites that have been ranked as critical habitat or identified as restoration sites may lose their value having a harmful effect on the property owner. He does not like the idea of

using an environmental overlay (e overlay). He suggested the program try to use creative ways to secure the site before acquisition rather than zoning. Gardner suggested the *willing property owner* category should be the first filter for site prioritization. Edmunds indicated that the first filter is if the property has ecological benefits, relating to the *ecological lift* and *property location* categories. *Willing property owner* is right below the ecological categories. Gardner asked if the program would refuse some property owners if they wanted to participate. Edmunds stated that this list prioritizes City action specifically for this program. Any property owner who wants to restore their site could do so and perhaps receive credit, but not necessarily with this program. Sallinger indicated that the City is very careful not to acquire contaminated sites due to liability

Hanson asked about the next steps. Edmunds indicated that staff will continue to revise the list based on feedback. Theisen asked if the top three sites have been identified yet. Prescott said they had identified some high priorities, but have not developed a complete ranking. Munn stated that a complicating factor is that high scores vary depending on the target category or species; the trustees have grouped properties into high, medium, and low priorities, but haven't ranked them one by one. This is a long term commitment and there are sites that may not be ready for decades. Lahsene asked how they will know the results of the rankings. Campbell suggested that because private negotiations will occur with the acquisition, the City may not want to publish very detailed information. Sallinger said it is difficult to come to decisions and really invest in the process without the detailed information. Lahsene pointed out that Metro published detailed information in the Greenspace process, but was countered by Sallinger who said Metro's criteria were much less specific, only identifying target areas. Theisen suggested that there is a lot of existing public information about the sites that could be helpful, especially regarding contamination, and suggested staff compile it.

Regarding the Plan as a living document, Sallinger asked how staff will craft a document that will guide future City Councils to the identified goals and objectives. How will it be kept alive at the political level? Edmunds indicated that there is the North Reach Plan, the program and staff to provide guidance to the City.

Discussion of Program Options

Review assumptions and desired program components

Edmunds reviewed the second handout, *Introduction to the Integration Alternatives*, outlining assumptions and desired program components developed by staff, reviewed by the group in July, 2007 and subsequently updated. Hanson asked if the group agreed with the assumptions. Lahsene indicated that there are other watershed programs that contribute to watershed health. Prescott suggested that CERCLA and the Clean Water Act also play a role. Sallinger agreed that there are other mechanisms but emphasized this is a critical piece that is under performing.

Edmunds reviewed the desired program components, which are specific to the restoration program. The group suggested we eliminate the word "potential" in relation to acquisition since we know that acquisition is part of program. Munn wanted to add the term "easement" somewhere in this section. Theisen expressed concerns about consistency between City, state and federal agencies and regulations and suggested resolving conflicting regulations associated with inter-jurisdictional permitting as a desired objective. Hanson suggested adding it under the *clear and concise* bullet. Sallinger suggested compatibility is a better word. Hanson asked if they were going

to use the desired program components to critique the three program options. After discussion, the group agreed to outline what is good and bad about each program option and what it would take to make the program work.

Program Option: River Environmental Overlay Zone

Munn indicated she thinks the exemptions are too broad and would result in habitat loss over time; the fees are too low to generate sufficient revenue for restoration; and the fee should be linked to impacts. For the proposal to work for her, Munn indicated increased fees; additional required mitigation; applying the program to areas that are low ranked; eliminating exemptions, particularly #8 and #10 in the *River Environmental Regulations: Draft Concepts* document; and the temporary emergency procedures (#1) should not be a clear exemption but rather should have to go through a review process even if it occurs after the fact. Munn also indicated that mitigation needs to be applied to typical impacts and permits, such as groundwater cutoff, deepening, extension of seawall and shallow water habitat loss from sloughing. Different standards could be applied to industrial and recreational docks. However, she indicated that NMFS recently eliminated ESA SLOPES (Standard Local Operating Procedures) for industrial dock designs because the designs such as grating (to allow light to penetrate), cannot be applied due to safety concerns (hazardous materials could be spilled into the river) Sallinger indicated the incremental loss of habitat due to the 10% encroachment in the zone is a concern.

Sallinger noted that BDS comments frequently behind the scenes and asked if they had any comments to share with the group. Freeman indicated that BDS did not have anything official at this point for this option because they have not reviewed it. However, she suggested that staff should not cut and paste the environmental zone (e-zone) regulations into the North Reach, staff should include the standard e-zone exemptions, and exemption #13 listed in the *River Environmental Regulations: Draft Concepts* document is not normally included in the e-zones. Sallinger indicated that BDS and other City Bureaus should not criticize the program behind the scenes, but rather should participate in the public discussion. Freeman indicated that BDS has not critiqued the draft environmental approach. Lahsene indicated that other bureaus have not commented either.

Gardner has concerns that the environmental community's concerns would require a higher threshold and greater mitigation; the environmental program needs to be balanced with industrial concerns. Campbell indicated that staff did not like this approach to begin with, which is why they suggested the purple/green approach. Gardner indicated that the e overlay approach is not balanced and is missing consideration of what is affordable to the industrial community. She indicated that it was time to move beyond talking about this as a conceptual program and to start looking at actual numbers. Lahsene expressed that she wanted private parties to be able to use their own inventories, as in the existing environmental zones and the existing proposal does not address concerns about City review below the OHWM.. Theison asked if we are losing habitat in the City because of the 10% encroachment factor, and suggested that the environmental zones may not be working for the City of Portland. Buono indicated that she thinks it is working generally, but there are issues in translating the environmental zones approach into the industrial part of the City. She asked how staff can suggest environmental protection zones where river dependent use is required. Gardner asked if off-site mitigation is allowed. Buono replied yes. Engstrom indicated the River Environmental Overlay Zone option specifically used the environmental conservation zone, which is intended to allow development. Sallinger thinks the program option could work if the

City of Portland acquired the Pearls and if review could limit impacts. He reiterated that having dedicated higher level staff would help the process.

Chart Pack Notes from River Environmental Overlay Zone program discussion:

Key issues

Exemptions don't work

Net loss of habitat over time

- *Exceptions too broad*
- *No mitigation for low [ranked areas]*
- *Scale of impacts*
- *Not enough fees to restore pearls*

Change of NRI value for low

What would it take to make this option work?

Higher fees and/or mitigation required

More City resources (staff)

Fewer exemptions

- *Require mitigation at least, maybe review*
- *Dolphins, piles, paved area*
- *Temporary emergency procedures need review after*

Standard (10% encroachment)

- *Make it not incremental*

Hardened banks need consideration

- *because deepening, ground water blocking, erosion/sloughing*
- *Mitigation at least, apply program*

Low impact criteria could be used but issues with safety may not work for industrial docks

- *Different standards for recreational docks v. industrial docks*

Include all Greenway exemptions in proposal

- *Land divisions are rarely exempt (see River Environmental Regulations: Draft Concepts, D.13)*

Concern that higher mitigation would not be affordable and could go beyond the desired components

Include using your own ground-truthed information or resources

Doesn't address the below ordinary high water issue

- *Inconsistency between agencies not addressed*

Make sure we encourage the "right" investments in infrastructure

Need a fee-in-lieu component

Notification with standard operating procedures for non high/medium [NRI rank] areas

- *Concern regarding notification requirements*
- *Clear exemptions?*

Summary: Ezone component could work if we could ensure the pearls and find a process (city review) that would alleviate the inconsistencies or conflicts between agency decisions.

Program Option: Purple/Green

Lahsene indicated that a reasonable fee structure that is not substantially greater than what applicants currently spend throughout the current greenway review might make this option work. She continued that industry will be making investments in the Pearls in a number of ways in addition to this program, the regulations alone will add to the cost of business and it must remain feasible for businesses to continue operating. Gardner added that the cost of doing business is already going up, with additional fees currently under discussion, such as new building codes and transportation fees. Edmunds said she'd heard it was important for business to have certainty and predictability by knowing earlier in the process the approximate amount of the fees. Gardner indicated that the fee should be linked to project costs so it can be amortized as a capital cost. Munn disagreed, stating that the fee should be related to function or impacts so it acts as an incentive to minimize impacts. Proposing a t-dock instead of a seawall for example would reduce an applicant's mitigation requirement. Lahsene suggested that at some point the fees get too high and business won't do the project. Campbell suggested according to this discussion, the fee should be calculated upfront, based on impact and proportional to what is paid now. Lahsene suggested there should be a very low or no fee for maintenance or existing disturbed surfaces. Industry should not be punished for doing maintenance. Gardner indicated that if everyone took the minimal disturbance approach then there would be insufficient revenue to invest in the restoration sites. Munn said that would be ok.

Lahsene asked how you deal with areas that already have high impact use, such as an existing hardened bank. Munn indicated that there are sites with existing bulk heads that are proposed to increase the impact. Lahsene stated that there are projects that are not that expensive that end up having a high impact, and the businesses would have to completely rethink undertaking the projects. Munn indicated that the fee calculator presented was too complicated and advocated for a simpler version. Lahsene stated the fee calculator needs a new approach rather than the old one, which sort of backed into the issues. Gardner stated the fee should not be based on construction costs which can fluctuate wildly and could be easily challenged. Gardner stated that the calculator could combine impact with the cost of development.

Grillo stated another issue with purple green is the parking lot landscaping requirement, asking if there is a fee-in-lieu option for that. Staff replied that parking lot landscaping is a requirement of the base zone, and is unrelated to the Greenway overlay zones. Sallinger indicated he was uncomfortable without any review in the purple area. Perhaps there should not be review on some portion of the purple (e.g. hardened surfaces), but review in some places is valuable. Munn indicated she viewed an impact based fee as helping with that issue through mitigation. Edmunds indicated that more review would have to be exchanged for a lower fee. Munn indicated that conflicts between trail/recreation uses and the restoration also need to be addressed, citing examples of applications for recreation uses at Willamette Cove and Kelley Point Park that variously include docks, paving and parking.

Gardner what is BDS's position on this option and why their memo was not shared with the task group. Staff indicated that BDS's memo to Planning indicated that the Purple/Green option would contribute to a net loss of habitat and that it would limit the City's compliance with Goal 15. BDS

instead recommended adoption of an e-zone on the river. Edmunds indicated that BDS and Planning try to work together internally. Gardner asked if BDS is a policy making agency. Staff replied that BDS does have influence in the policy making process as they are the code implementation bureau and have valuable experience.

Campbell indicated that refining the type and extent of a review was necessary. Sallinger indicated that if the proposed e overlay and purple/green were combined into a hybrid program option, he would be willing to give up some fees to have more review. He said review is not necessary on hardened banks but there should definitely be review on the high and medium NRI ranked areas. For the low ranked areas and hardened banks, the City needs to look for opportunities to work with property owners through voluntary actions or through incentives. Jortner asked Sallinger to clarify his position on the banks. Sallinger indicated that they are already lost to a certain degree, and maybe a more voluntary approach would be best. Jortner asked if Sallinger had more specific questions about the NRI. He stated that he would like to better understand how staff made the changes. Lahsene indicated she feels that more and more is being placed back on industry.

Chart Pack Notes from the Purple/Green program discussion:

What would it take to make this option work?

Fee structure that is reasonable – what's being paid now

- *Other processes will contribute*
- *Multiple burdens on businesses (stormwater regulations, building code changes, transportation fees, NRDA)*
- *Able to know with certainty up front [this point also connects to fee details below]*

Fee related to function

- *Simpler fee calculator based on what we're trying to accomplish*
- *Not based on fluctuating factors*
- *Combination of impacts and costs*

What would be allowed in purple?

- *Review has value*
- *Review where high and medium NRI [ranks apply]*
- *Voluntary approach in other areas*
 - *Look at low functioning areas*

Make sure we encourage the "right" investments in infrastructure

Need a fee-in-lieu component

Notification with standard operating procedures for non high/medium [NRI rank] areas

- *Concern regarding notification requirements*
- *Clear exemptions?*

Break 10:02 – 10:20am

Program Option: Port/ Working Waterfront Coalition

Lahsene stated that in some ways this reflects the fee and review component. Sallinger likes the 75' from top of bank (TOB), thinks the fee is too low, would like to see the high and medium ranked

area (including in-water) with some sort of review and wants review coupled with the fee, not either/or. Munn would like to see evaluation if development affects land within 75' from TOB, not just if it is constructed within 75', and pointed out that recreation issues still need to be addressed. Munn is concerned about the overall impacts to natural resources of piecemeal projects, not just the parts of the project within 75 feet that would be regulated. She suggested that applicants in the past have constructed their projects in piecemeal fashion in order to avoid federal reviews and mitigation requirements. She warned that under this proposal, applicants might do the same. Theison asked how we want to capture the piecemeal approach to development in the North Reach. Munn does not support the fee based on project costs because it does not take into consideration the impact on resources. Sallinger agreed. Hansen suggested that the 25' setback is very minimal, compared to requirements in other parts of the region and thinks 75' is a good distance as a "consideration area".

Lahsene clarified that if Munn wants the fee related to impact and Sallinger believes the fee is too low, then that there should be a trade-off for a high fee: less regulation and review. She sees value in an incentive component and wants to ensure maintenance will continue. Munn indicated that work is constantly going on in the North Reach without permits. Gardner stated that there should be a way to opt out of review by paying a fee. She indicated some areas have no value and would be obvious choices. Sallinger stated that removing review from the low ranking NRI areas would be a good idea, but a review should be required for medium and high resources. He emphasized that he wanted to see an updated map before agreeing to this, however. Munn indicated that NOAA created standard local operating procedures, and if an applicant follows best management practices you only have to file electronically. NOAA can still monitor the activity because they received notice, but the process is fairly simple.

Grillo stated that the City of Portland operates under different rules than the federal government and would need to develop clear and objective standards for any exemptions. Thus, a discretionary system like Munn described probably wouldn't work.

Sallinger asked how Gardner and Lahsene feel about placing an e overlay on high and medium ranked NRI areas. Lahsene stated that it depends on the map and they would want exemptions for routine activities such as maintenance. Munn agreed if the exempt activities were clearly defined and agreed upon. Sallinger asked about regulating upland habitat. Gardner indicated she did not participate in this conversation to create additional regulations, is not interested in having a conversation about upland regulations and is not sure they are going to come up with improvements that are workable. Grillo inquired about partnership areas in upland areas, and opportunity areas based on landscape features. Campbell indicated that upland areas need to be addressed.

Lahsene inquired who has jurisdiction below the ordinary high water mark (OHW), and suggested the City of Portland should not regulate that area. Munn said NMFS can only comment on endangered species and that the City reviews for broader impacts to the aquatic ecosystem as a whole. She explained the under ESA, NMFS attempts to balance the positive aspects with the negative aspects of the proposal and cannot technically require mitigation. Gardner asked what the basis is for the City's authority to regulate in water areas, and which jurisdiction has supremacy below OHW. Buono asked why the City's authority below OHW would be any different than its authority above OHW. Lahsene stated that it is not transparent and that there are inconsistencies

in the process that need to be resolved before they are comfortable. Gardner indicated that there is no fee below OHW currently, and they would rather pay a fee than have the City review activities below the OHW. Sallinger indicated he is not comfortable having no City review below OHW. Campbell asked if the City can focus only on those aspects not covered by NMFS. Munn suggested the City could perhaps comment under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act; however the Corps is not required to address comments from other jurisdictions. Lahsene pointed out the sheetpile wall issue at T-4 (BDS initially asked for holes to allow fish egress but NMFS said it wasn't necessary). Businesses want to be able to report to one entity and the permitting process is the biggest problem. Hanson indicated that consistency is on the outstanding issues list. Campbell asked if the City of Portland can include the requirements of other agencies in this process. Lahsene said they don't want to add another review body with a different set of issues, but Sallinger stated that it is a different constituency with different issues. Munn stated that 95% of the conflict arises from landscaping issues, which the applicants often don't want and don't provide value in her opinion. Sallinger indicated along with Gardner and Lahsene that there are problems, but suggested institutional solutions were required, such as better communication, more resources and dedicated staff. Hanson indicated the issue is to improve coordination between the agencies.

Chart Pack Notes from Port/Working Waterfront Coalition program discussion:

Key Issues

Likes 75' from top of bank

Concerns about high and medium [NRI rank] getting review, in-water and above 75'

Fee is too low – not just linked to project costs, link to impacts as well

What would it take to make this option work?

Needs a combination of review and fee

Link project to impacts [on] natural resources

- Evaluate above 75' to impacts within 75' or in-water*
- Disincent piecemeal [projects]*

In water and ordinary high water issues need resolution

- Existing regulations address?*
- The authorities are very specific for other agencies (NOAA only address listed)*
- Who has in-water authority?*
- Resolve incompatibility between local, regional, state and federal permit requirements for in-water.*

Make sure we encourage the “right” investments in infrastructure

Need a fee-in-lieu component

Notification with standard operating procedures for non high/medium [NRI rank] areas

- Concern regarding notification requirements*
- Clear exemptions?*

Discussion with Gil Kelley

Following the program option discussion, staff brought Director Gil Kelley into the room to discuss the outstanding issues and other topics with the Task Group. The group agreed on the outstanding issues as listed below.

Outstanding Issues

Below ordinary high water
 Fees/mitigation requirements (not the Dennis Canty fee calculator)
 Trails and other recreations facilities in restoration areas
 Routine exemptions for maintenance activities
 Regulation of upland habitat
 Regulation of NRI high/medium
 Restoration sites in relation to Superfund/NRDA
 Details of River Environmental Zones

The group members went around the table outlining issues with the current proposals. Lahsene indicated that with simpler/ less regulation, they are willing to look at a fee structure, but the fee structure suggested in the purple/green option was too high. Adding more regulation with higher fees is not a recipe for success. Gardner added that the fee structure was complicated, and they were philosophically opposed to it because it was based on removing investment and therefore counter to the idea of promoting development in the North Reach. Furthermore, it was based too much on construction costs which are easy to challenge. She said Munn and Sallinger want a fee based on impact, which is different than removing investment.

Kelley asked if a direct link to the use of mitigation funds is necessary, and Gardner replied no. Kelley asked if an impact based fee is ok with Gardner/Lahsene if there is a good way to measure it and it is predictable so that it can be projected into project costs. They affirmed this concept. Campbell indicated that a hybrid fee based on both impact and project costs was discussed. Kelley inquired to confirm that the group does not object to obtaining the sites early, but not through zoning. Gardner indicated her understanding was that there would not be any zoning changes and that the program is really a willing seller program. Edmunds indicated that we are talking about applying something like an environmental conservation zone to the high and medium ranked areas, which would act as the trigger for review. Lahsene would like to have more discussion about this. Campbell indicated that in order to have an environmental review we would have to change the zoning in some way, but indicated that we would not change the base zone.

Munn indicated that the fee needs to be tied to the impacts and needs to be easily calculated. Kelley asked if it is known what level of restoration is needed, and Munn replied that the state-led process to determine that isn't finished. Munn indicated that NOAA also has problems with recreational uses, including development such as parking lots and restrooms, as they limit restoration potential. Kelley inquired about Munn's concerns over the lack of green areas. Munn reiterated that what is proposed is not sufficient. Munn stated that there are areas that could get more ecological lift. Kelley asked about the importance of the strings. Munn indicated that strings are more beneficial to wildlife than to fish. Kelley asked if Munn was opposed to off-site mitigation. Munn replied she supports off-site mitigation where it makes more sense; it can be extremely beneficial. Kelley stated that the object is to help with the acquisition of the Pearls and asked if there are other ways in the future. She suggested NRD assessments and ESA mitigation, but the City of Portland should refer to this as restoration not mitigation in order to qualify for funding from

various state and federal funding sources. Munn has written a letter in support of the appropriation and the program. Kelley stated that it is possible to achieve competing objectives in the North Reach, but that we may not achieve it all in this process. He also stated that this might serve as a platform for future collaboration. Munn suggested that one challenge relates to multiple reviews with multiple authorities. Kelley said they could have a checklist perhaps, not necessarily a delegation of authority.

Sallinger spoke in support of the “strings”. He is worried about uncertainty with the pearls and suggests that the string and the pearls need to operate together. He also indicated he was concerned about the changes in the NRI and the resulting low rank for much of the riverbank. Kelley indicated that the City can carve out a district plan to comply with Metro. Sallinger indicated that there is still much uncertainty. Kelley stated that maybe an early agreement could be used to meet some of the requirements of the Portland Harbor Natural Resource Trustees. Sallinger indicated that having dedicated staff is critical to the success of this program. Lahsene indicated that someone familiar with the development process and natural resource processes. Theisen indicated that it should be someone who has considerable power to deliver. Additional qualities mentioned include familiarity with contamination, security, creative problem solving abilities, knowledge of the programmatic details and the application process, and someone who can work with the multiple bureaus that are involved.

Kelley asked if there are any other points that need to be made and stated that we need commitment that the group is committed to moving this forward. Sallinger indicated that the framework is viable but isn't sure that the group can find common ground on all the issues. It may need to be a political decision. Kelley suggested the need to take a whole proposal forward without big holes in the next few months, but all of the details don't need to be worked out. It may also be possible to take a couple of different scenarios to City Council. Campbell suggested that staff get a revised program option to the group by April 2, 2008, which was agreed as the tentative date for the next meeting. Munn will not be in our next meeting but will review any proposal that staff comes up with. Edmunds indicated that we may need to cancel the April River Plan Committee meeting. Hanson adjourned the meeting at 11:55 am.