



WHI Mitigation and Enhancement Subcommittee  
Meeting #4 - Meeting Minutes  
2-14-12

**Subcommittee Attendees:**

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

Eric: Presented an overview of the memo

Sam R: Question regarding Advisory Committee –Are we going to present anything?

All: Generally agreed yes, an overview of where we are should be shared.

Chris H: [To Eric] Are we going to continue to vet the costs?

Eric: Yes, we will vet costs through the subcommittee and WorleyParsons will be reviewing and updating the information. ECONorthwest also be looking at mitigation costs.

Sam R: On the Port's action items: 1) Summarizing state and federal jurisdiction regarding ratios and costs; and 2) Looking at what other ports are doing.

Sam I: First, let's start with grounding in the diagram.

There was an issue raised about the definition of shallow water habitat and ordinary high water. It was explained that while different definitions have been used by the parties involved, the City's definition has not changed; so the habitat impacts are comparable over time. It was also acknowledge the ordinary high water will have to be determined at the time of development.

Sam R: Impacts based on either definition can be mitigated for on-island. Our mitigation experience has been 1:1. Our cost is about mid-range of the City's proposed costs.

Marla: Our proposal is to make Benson Pond into Benson *Slough*, through channel connection to river.

Kaitlin: We also need to consider changes in hydrology. There should be a functional assessment and a regulatory assessment of mitigation.

Sam R: We will depend on state and federal process for shallow water habitat.

Bob: What about floodplain?

Kaitlin: This is an unresolved issue, but it will be an issue down the road. The ordinary high water elevation may change as a result of climate change or dam management.

Bob: We should wrap in the volume of fill in the floodplain and how to mitigate for that. On wetlands, how much functional improvement can we get with on-site wetlands?



Sam R: The ratios the Port is use to seeing are between 1:1 and 6:1. The higher is mitigating for a mitigation wetland. The costs we have experienced are about \$250K/acre, \$1.15-6.00 per sq. ft., so \$2 - \$11M for wetland mitigation.

Dave H: There is a lot of difference between the impacted wetlands and the enhancement sites. The wetlands along the banks have surface water connection to the Columbia River, while interior wetlands are inundated through ground water. Red-legged frog use the interior wetlands, not the wetlands on the banks and the current red-legged frog habitat is within the development footprint.

Eric: We would like permission to use the annexation process to set up an early agreement with the state/feds on shallow water habitat and wetlands and then the City can stay out of it.

Sam I: For the Advisory Committee, we'll need to explain this.

Marla: The shallow water habitat issue is constantly changing – functions, values, hydrology, measurements, etc. It will be a negotiation to determine impacts and mitigation. Wetlands assessment is much more sophisticated but a new methodology is being used. Also, litigation could change what is required. But based on past experience, \$7M for permitting, construction, etc. for shallow water and wetlands, plus \$110K per year for O&M would be what we are looking at.

Eric: The agreement we come up with will be a process that involves the state/feds/port/city.

Bob: Would rather this be nailed down. Also have concern with the piece meal process versus a holistic approach.

Sam I: Expects that the recommendations to AC will need to be boiled down to a few action items or bullet points.

Sam R: We'll need a committee to follow the process during and post development.

Eric: Gave an overview of the forest/woodland mitigation. Enhancement is more about what is done under the canopy (invasive removal and understory improvements)

Bob: Invasive removal doesn't equal mitigation. There will be less island habitat as a whole unit and increases in edge habitat. We need to buy a big site off the island and improve it.

Eric: On-site vs. off-site is part of the conversation. So is the credit for permanent protection (i.e. down-zoning and restricting development on the remaining 500 acres). This is still under discussion.

Sam R: The Open Space dedication value compensates for impacts to the forest. Under today's zoning we could log, mine, do residential development and in the future it will be just natural resources and recreation.

Bob: The public would not be OK with logging or mining. It's in the UGB for marine development and natural resources.

Sam R: There should be a lower ratio for tree to tree replacement, 1:1. Our costs estimate is \$0.32-1.60 per sq. ft. which corresponds (on the low end) to \$14K/acre.

Bob: Our ratios would be higher to look at the island affect of the forest now vs after development.

Eric: If off-site is needed, then one consolidated site is preferred.



Sam R: our cost estimate for grassy and shrubby is \$0.23/sq ft.

Bob: Grasslands should go to one place as well. Sauvie Island (Grandma's Kitchen) needs money. Airport Futures mitigation was \$4m for 300 acres.

Eric: The City's proposal is that grassland mitigation go off-site and be located at one place.

Andy: And there is enough shallow water habitat left over for NRDA.

Bob: We need to figure that out now.

Eric: The Port will focus on Benson Pond for mitigation. That leaves a lot of shallow water habitat remaining.

Sam R: On our Port of Vancouver homework – They are in the process of 500 acres of development including water front and upland resources; 450-500 acres of impact. Their mitigation is 600 acres including wetland restoration and bird enhancement, related to Columbia Gateway.

Bob: What are they spending on that? I heard it's \$20M plus the set-aside. We were looking at that as an example set-aside of 50% of the total land, plus \$20M for enhancement.

Sam R: We think they are spending about \$3M.

Sam I: So it's a 1.2:1 ratio.

Sam R: The Vancouver mitigation was also the subject of a lawsuit. We can summarize the Vancouver experience in a memo (TO DO).

**BREAK**

Sam I: Let's talk about the Open Space valuation.

Eric: The gap is about \$20M. We agree that some credit is appropriate but the value of the zoning is under discussion. The existing site has environmental overlays and is in the floodplain and it has no city services. It's not developable. The Open Space zoning does create a delta of value, but not that much. Also, we want actual on the ground functional improvements too.

Bob: I agree to give credit for the value of the Open Space, but the bottom line is net eco-system improvement. We need the set-aside, mitigation and enhancement as part of package.

Eric: We'll go to lower ratios to account for the Open Space set-aside.

Bob: What about the enhancement package?

Eric: Not sure if it's dollars or a functional assessment.

Sam I: Wrapped up. No report out to Advisory Committee. Homework to Sam R – What is the end-game for NRDA? Please put the Port of Vancouver stuff in a memo.

Bob: I think all cards are on the table and it's up to the City to split the difference.