

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, November 27, 2012

6-9pm

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray (arrived 6:04pm), Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Lai-Lani Ovalles (arrived 6:04pm), Gary Oxman (arrived 6:04pm), Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

Commissioners Absent: Michelle Rudd (recused from WHI project)

BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson; Joe Zehnder; Eric Engstrom; Julie Ocken

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 6pm and provided an overview of the agenda. Testimony will be limited to 2 minutes for those who signed up at 11/15 and 1 minute for others who signed up tonight.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from [11/13/12](#) and [11/15/12](#) PSC meetings

Chair Baugh asked for any comments to the consent agenda. *Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the minutes. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.
(Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

West Hayden Island - Draft Plan

Continued Hearing - Eric Engstrom

Documents

- [Chair Baugh's e-mail to PSC members 11/20/12](#)
- [Chair Baugh's e-mail to PSC members 11/21/12](#)
- [Mayor's updated proposal, zoning updates and proposed IGA](#)
- [WHI Advisory Committee Facilitator's Report](#)
- [Addendum to Facilitator's Final Report: AC Straw Poll Recommendations](#)

Eric gave an update of the Advisory Committee (AC) meetings. There has been one additional meeting since the 11/15 PSC hearing. The Report from the AC facilitator was created and presented to PSC members earlier this week, and today there the [addendum](#) was published.

Mayor Adams noted this is a Council-initiated process. The WHI issue and questions have been on the City's to-do list since 1983 when the land was brought into the UGB for a deep-water port opportunity. In 2004, Metro asked that Portland come up with a mitigation plan for the earlier decision about making WHI a deep-water port.

As Mayor-elect, Mayor Adams initiated the first of the 4-year process via Council resolution. Decisions about mixed-use development needed to be created as expected by State law (SB100 in the 1970s) and regional policy. There was a cost to the 30-year delay as well.

The WHI AC's work over the years included working at 125 different aspects/questions/points of view. The Mayor shared a potential financial plan at a recent AC meeting, and the AC asked the Mayor to return with what was assumed in the financial plan. The original plan was based on the August 2012 Draft WHI Plan. The revisions followed the AC's voting (e.g. some mitigation should happen on WHI). This is a draft, not final thoughts or best thinking - which

will only happen after the PSC's recommendation and thoughts are included. The financials include mitigation at 110%, human health mitigation as per the Portland Plan, it addresses regional plans, provides opportunity for private investors to create terminals to increase import/export capacity.

The Mayor acknowledged PSC commissioners and City staff for this work.

Commissioner Smith noted he met with the Mayor last night. He is concerned that the community has not been fully a part of this last phase of discussion.

- Mayor: We will not have a consensus among the stakeholders. Waiting has some value, but this City Council is prepared to move this project forward. It is one of the most informed and researched projects we've seen.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted the improvements in the current iteration of the IGA. However, he noted there are significant concerns that will need to be addressed before the PSC can reach a truly informed decision, one way or the other. He expressed his concern that we not find out years from now that lack of attention to detail will result in a major problem, similar to what we are experiencing with Ross Island restoration.

Members of the AC shared their comments.

- Victor Viets: The AC was not able to complete their assignment, and a number of things were left unresolved as shared in the AC letters in the addendum. A number of issues were studied, but some of the crucial questions (financial and technical feasibility among them) were not answered. The AC was not able to get through the health report and mitigation aspects in that report.
- Chris Hathaway: 12 days ago the last PSC hearing focused on the AC process and list of unresolved issues. These concerns remain, and the process is being unnecessarily rushed. At the last AC meeting, there was the new proposal from the Mayor with the new IGA and zoning code. It was disappointing end to 24 months of work. The final AC report lacks substantive recommendations, mostly straw poll votes, contradictory NPVs, and a number of mitigation proposals that are not complete. He urged to delay making any recommendations or decisions about WHI. The Mayor's latest proposal comes close, but the majority of the AC voted against this because it lacks specifics and details to evaluate it, specifically in terms of timing and mitigation issues.
- Sam Ruda: The AC process has served its purpose; the ending wasn't pretty, but going back to the Council resolution, we can be satisfied that many of the areas and scope of work were completed. The work of the AC has put us in a better position, including those who don't endorse the project. The Port likes much of what the Mayor has put forth regarding mitigation efforts. Money is important, but there is a fundamental process issue. He advocates allowing the City of Portland and Port staff to work together on the details, make the final product available at public venues, and an efficient end to the process.

Commissioner Smith: what was the vote to address human health impacts?

- Sam: There wasn't a full vetting at the AC. There is lots of disparate information, and many of the issues didn't get fully completed and reviewed. At this point, I would like to see the Port and City start working on the details.
- Victor: Don't read too much into the AC voting on community and health issues. There were limited discussions of individual items on those lists (effectiveness, costs of solutions were not discussed). The plan is too difficult to compensate for with no clear mitigation strategies. We should just put this piece of property aside until Portland industry is calling for the development.
- Chris: The voting method was triage. As Sam stated, it's all in the details, and everyone needs time to figure the details out.

Commissioner Shapiro: It sounds like there are some good things in the Mayor's proposal. Perhaps this is a good starting place.

- Victor: There still is no way to mitigate for the health impacts.
- Chris: Yes, there are some solid things in the proposal. If we had that proposal months ago, we could have had time to discuss details that are not yet worked out.

Commissioner Oxman: What has been keeping Port and City staff from working together?

- Sam: That is how we started, but half way through the process, people called out process sham, so the coordination stopped, which is a shame. It took away lots of efficiency, but it was viewed that deals were being brokered behind doors.

Commissioner Houck: As soon as I looked at the Mayor's document, I thought there was no way the PSC would get through and have an opportunity to make informed decisions before the end of this calendar year. Other stakeholders - technical experts - should be included in the work with Port and City staff to give the PSC context and share they work with the PSC before any vote.

Commissioner Schultz: About process, is it staff working through the details and then coming back to the PSC?

- Sam: We agree that the PSC doesn't have a completed document to make a recommendation from. My proposal of staff working together is one way to get there. If technical experts need to be a part of that work, that is good.
- Victor: Hiring more consultants won't improve the process or results. It's a question of natural and human health.

Commissioner Houck: : I want to be clear that I am not questioning the expertise of city staff. Over the past 5-10 years, the City has added staff at BPS and BES that have technical expertise. But there should be outside expertise as well to ensure opinions outside the city are included in the analysis and that the process is transparent.

Chair Baugh: Does the Port, working with City staff, have an agreement to come up with a plan for the PSC to evaluate?

- Sam: Yes. The Port's Commission also has to approve the final plans. We should continue moving forward, but the Port is not putting any restrictions on the PSC about a timeframe. We think it's bad policy to move quickly just for the sake to move quickly, but we would like to see a finish line at some reasonable point.

Testimony

- Jay Withgott: Portland is a demonstration of environment and economic success together. WHI is a vital part of the natural areas link. Environmental justice issues and human health are also compromised if the port is built. The proposed development cuts out the heart of the natural areas of WHI.
- Hans Bernard, ED BEST Freight Coalition: Please work to craft a path forward to create an export facility on WHI. The CAP and the Export Initiative call for the port facility. Process should not be used as a delay tactic.
- Jim Francesconi: Representing carpenters today, who haven't gotten involved in big issues very often. WHI is an irreplaceable resource for the community. They want to partner more with the environmental community. Don't lose sight of \$200-300M personal income and the hiring agreement the Port has confirmed they will do. Look at economics and environment at an equal footing.

- Jane Christensen: opposes annexation and development. The proposals have been developed at the end of process and without adequate time for public review. The project still has issues and impacts that need to be addressed. It is the role of officials to represent Portland's residents to be responsive to all impacts of any project under their purview.
- Mary Ann Schwab: The public doesn't realize the number of hours the PSC has put into this project, but outcomes are in the details. The health analysis is a big concern. Clean air, water quality are key objectives that aren't fully addressed. The Audubon Society's comments are right on and should be listened to.
- Leslie Cody, HILP: A family nurse practitioner and health representative with patients on WHI. Opposed to the current plan. There are too many negative health impacts, particularly those to manufactured home residents on lower- and/or fixed-income. Chronic conditions will be worsened by the Port's construction and impact of noise, vibration and decreased air quality, and there is no remedy for these impacts.
- Krista Koehl, Port of Portland: The 500 acres of open space are beneficial because the area will be down-zoned to limited open space. There is a restrictive covenant to remain in perpetuity to maintain this land. The Port has a financial incentive to do mitigation, and WHI is a great location for it. There is liability for the superfund site too, and WHI is an opportunity to do mitigation. 700 acres in habitat mitigation are already owned by the Port. (written testimony provided)
- Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland: A number of issues raised, and the Port's response are included in her written testimony. Some comments are a misunderstanding e.g. the conditions of annexation. Some of the misunderstanding is based on the concept plan by Worley Parsons. Another process will discuss planning for the actual Port facility, but that can only happen after the City annexes the land. (written testimony provided)
- Ian Whitlock, Port of Portland: The Port doesn't own the full 500 acre parcel outside the 300 acre parcel. That piece includes easements, wastewater discharge and State lands. This mixture of ownership is well-known, and the IGA acknowledged the Port's intent to purchase the land or work cooperatively - the land will be preserved as open space. Tribes expressed concern about not being asked to participate, but the process has offered opportunities for the tribal voices to be heard from City.
- Carly Ritter, Portland Business Alliance: supports annexation into the City with a plan for economic and feasible port. (written testimony provided)
 - *Commissioner Smith*: This Port will not export anything made here, so why are we talking about things we make here?
 - Carly: It keeps the Port viable - we need to build capacity in our port to stay cost-competitive for local businesses to ship their goods.
 - Susie: Indirect and induced jobs like a barge business. An economic system, economies of scale do create a better foundation for investments.
 - *Commissioner Houck*: Goal 9 land use planning goal requires analysis, but the City doesn't have to do whatever it takes to meet the objective of this goal. We can decide one way or another and should look at this on a regional scale.
 - *Commissioner Shapiro*: Does the mayor's new proposal look like something the Port can work with? Yes.
- Joseph Chapman: Jobs and the port can be built elsewhere - not where there are at-risk species and land. (provided written testimony)

- Ann Takamoto: opposes annexation. Please keep the paradise of Portland. The 11/15 testimony was primarily against moving ahead. I'm concerned that we still have to stand up to the process which has been going on since 1983. There are still too many unanswered questions, especially from the tribal and Hayden Island communities.
- Barbara Quinn: Reiterated what other N Portland neighborhoods are saying - the PSC should reject this flawed and rushed process. The process needs to be readdressed. The City and Port are public agencies, so they should have a relationship with the community to be involved in decision-making.
- Scott Drumm, Port of Portland: WHI Port can attract rail, puts Portland on the national stage to get further funding. Investment in rail allows local shippers to take advantage of service and facility. By attracting freight from a larger region, we also have cargo coming from other areas. (written testimony provided)
- Linda Caso: WHI resident. This is a historic decision. The Port facility project is not justified, and it seems like we could work with the Port of Vancouver for space/facilities. This is a business deal for the Port of Portland. The land is here for a reason other than to be trampled by industry.
- Cheryl Lund: Has been fighting the annexation process for 7 years. She supports saving the entire WHI for future generations instead of wiping out one-third of the habitat. Job creation is complete speculation and is unsubstantiated. Loss of critical fish and habitat should be a primary consideration. Portlanders don't know about the key aspects of WHI.
- Dan Rohlf: Lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers have over 12 salmon species that use these waters as critical habitat. Portland needs to prevent further deterioration and needs to take measures to improve conditions for these fish. EAS forbids actions that constitute a "take". Eliminating 300 acres of critical habitat without at least full mitigation is unlikely to be consistent with maintaining habitat.
- Debra Porta: manufactured home community resident. The public process has become rushed and bullied to get through Council. Every meeting results in more doubts and questions. These need to be addressed and resolved before moving forward. We should respect the history of engagement in Portland.
- Skip Nitchie: 12 year resident of floating home on WHI. Opposes annexation. Hayden Island Dr is already too crowded. Police, fire and health all at risk because of the over-crowded road. (provided written testimony)
- Irene Schwoeffermann, CLF: It is important to honor residents and habitat like WHI. The City says it supports the triple-bottom line, but actions must reflect. A true commitment demands that the project leave WHI better off than it is currently. CLF urges PSC to reject current proposal.
- Mike Williams, Business Oregon: There is intense interest in use of industrial lands across the state since they provide large returns for jobs and funds via tax revenue. Oregon has high standards for development, but creation of a larger tax base is also important. WHI has counted toward industrial land for region, but without the Port option to build this is lost. Chances for investment come and go quickly, so we have to be ready with the sites when the time comes.
 - *Commissioner Houck*: One of the conundrums is to overcome hurdles on making brownfields useable for industrial lands. PBA and others are interested in working with the State - will you work on brownfield issues with us?

- Mike: Yes, though they offer limited opportunities for us in this region. We would work state-wide with Port authorities and would be involved.
- Meryl Redisch, ED Audubon: Lots of data suggests the facility doesn't make sense from community, economic or environmental perspective. The process and lateness of the Mayor's proposal is an issue. (Audubon provided written testimony)
 - *Chair Baugh*: Is the Mayor's proposal a starting point?
 - Meryl: I'm not prepared to respond, but we need to consider all outstanding details before we move forward.
- Jimme' Peters: WHI floating home resident. Lack of respect for the public process is a key concern. The last-minute proposal by the Mayor is disrespectful of the public. The Portland Plan's pillars should be leading all projects, and WHI project fails 75% of these objectives. We can't put a price on human health. Vehemently opposes project.
- Deanna Sawtelle: former union member - understands importance of jobs, but not sure if this project will ever see the economic benefits projected in the proposal. The 300/500 split is not true because the majority of the confluence area is already filled and developed. We can't chip away at what little remains. 300 acres is in dense habitat area, and 500 acres is fragmented. Jobs shouldn't be used to justify unsustainable development. Please vote no on annexation.
- Sebastian Degens, Port of Portland: favors annexation. Ports offer contributions that are important to a vital community. This is a historic time and an important policy decision. The future doesn't come with a clamor for a new development, and opportunities have passed us by in the past.
- Lawretta Ray: former chair of Planning Commission, lived on Hayden Island. We will change the whole environment of the island if a port is developed. Traffic will be a major destroyer of livability of the island.
- Joe Esmonde, IBEW #48: in favor of annexation. The process has been long and sufficient. Workforce development training is abundant, but there are no jobs for people to go to after training. The port will help provide jobs.
- Jana Jarvis, Oregon Wheat Growers League: Wheat is a traded sector industry and fifth in Oregon agriculture. It's a \$.5B industry. The majority of wheat is exported to Pacific rim countries, 90% is exported through Portland. The ability to effectively process wheat is a vital concern. Expansion for cargo-handling capability is important for wheat growers throughout Oregon and the mid-west.
- Andrew Polta: oppose annexation and rezoning. We can't mitigate for habitat loss. Concerns about environmental mitigation have been voiced throughout the process. The AC did not make a final recommendation, and the public has not had time to review and comment on the current proposed plan.
- Greg Theisen, Port of Portland: spoke about Vancouver's Columbia Gateway property. The Vancouver area is completely in the floodplain and there are a number of other concerns with the Vancouver site. (written testimony provided)
 - *Commissioner Smith*: What is the entitlement status of Columbia Gateway?
 - Greg: It's in city of Vancouver, zoned industrial. There may be market, jurisdictional and other factors that would play into its viability.
- John Peterson: opposes annexation and development. Health, safety and livability issues are largest concerns as is economic rationale. Critical wildlife habitat will be

destroyed and can't be mitigated. The process has been manipulated; it needs to slow down and start over.

- Jeanne Galick: opposes plan based on environmental issues and rushed process. In the 1980s, she was part of a loose land-use development (Sellwood River Park) where sufficient mitigation didn't happen. A transparent process is vitally important and details need to be worked out to guide the future.
- Rick Brown: places like WHI make Portland a desirable place to live. We need to step back, take a broader perspective. The land should not be annexed and developed.
- Mike Ryan: let it be. We need to look out for interests of people and other life-forms. Development would preclude options for future generations.
- Eileen Wynkoop: Mitigation should not be used as a reliable method to fix any problems that may arise. It must be followed for many years to know if it's successful. Mitigation for WHI would be insurmountable. Once a project is approved, it is too late to address issues from the public.
- Corky Collier, Columbia Corridor Association: The Columbia is the largest economic corridor in Oregon and an important natural resource. The Mayor's proposal builds upon our infrastructure and mitigates for adverse affects. The Port needs a profitable site. Residents need health, community fund. Nature needs for us to get out of the way, but mitigation of 110% is a fantastic option. Look at a balance and don't take sides. We respect nature and the economy.
- Lacy Campbell: It's unfortunate that this is taking place in Portland. Ecosystem fragmentation decreases biodiversity. With development, ecosystems will be forever changed. Invasive species thrive in edge ecosystems. There has been negligence of a fair and open process. Please don't develop.
- Esther Wright: WHI resident. There has been intelligent testimony and input about the crucial issues. This is my home, not just a house I live in. It is where I feel safe, and there are 2500 other people on the island who have the same sense as I do. Not one of the people who have spoken in favor of annexation live on the island - they won't feel the daily impacts of development.
- Deb Whitcomb: would be happy if WHI remains as it is. Surprised that the AC members had agreed to the 300/500 acre split initially, but we can't fragment the area and not lose the vital habitat. The Mayor's push to wrap up the project is the biggest issue. Many partners have put work into the project and can carry it forward if the process continues to a rightful end.
- Tom Liptan: We have reached the finish line. People in the city are saying we need to protect the land, even with a job crises. If we develop WHI, there is no turning back. We can still protect this land.
- Jeri Williams: Klamath tribe member and DCL program manger with ONI. Government is rarely trusted by Native Americans and under-represented communities. Promises have not been kept. Not all tribal people have been considered in this process. Portland is the ninth largest population of Native people in the U.S. and all views should be included in a final recommendation.
- Tonia Burns: objects to annexation and future development. The Intertwine, which focuses on natural connections for benefit of citizens, is a commitment by the City of

Portland. It needs to take on actions to preserve natural areas including all of WHI. We can't be short-sighted to move forward with development. Please provide a process where the City does not push the annexation.

- Jennifer Famulare: opposes annexation. Public process issues. The AC failed to finish its final recommendations due to the influx of information at the end of the process and not seeing a full, cohesive package. Please slow down and look more critically.
- Barbara Woodside: WHI is a crown jewel for wildlife and wetlands. The Port needs to keep its hands off. We need to figure out how to build Portland's economy without sacrificing this land. Look elsewhere to stimulate the economy.
- Linda Robinson: A citizen activist with a focus on meaningful public engagement, and this process is not in that category. We've seen how the Port has done things in the past, and she is disappointed with the Mayor's rush to get the project through.
- Dana Krawczuk: Goal 9 is the economic goal to provide for at least adequate supply of sites consistent with plan policies. Via Portland's adopted EOA, rules require the City to designate sites, sizes and locations to meet needs identified in the EOA. When decided the need for 352 acres for harbor access land, and WHI is a potential opportunity. Brownfield remediation is not enough.
 - *Commissioner Houck*: other land use attorneys have disputed this. We should confirm.

Chair Baugh closed testimony.

Written Testimony Received

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| • Tony DeFalco | • Suzinn Weiss | • Greg Snider |
| • Peter Teneau and Nancy Cushwa | • Sarah Durham | • Phyllis Oster |
| • Shannon Diez | • Rick Till | • Cindy King-van Witzenburg |
| • Tim Donner | • Michelle Arensberg | • Valarie Smith |
| • Ann Given | • Trevor Koch | • Barbara Basom |
| • Nina Landey | • Deborah Sheaffer | • Melissa Huff |
| • Timme A. Helzer | • Jillian Vento | • Amy Schutzer |
| • Alicia Cohen | • Kasey Church | • Janette Vlahos |
| • Linda Caso | • Lani Bennett | • Patricia Crane |
| • Terrance L. Maloney | • Shirley Kishiyama | • Deanna Mueller-Crispin |
| • Joseph Martinez | • Tricia Knoll | • Jimme' Peters |
| • Herman Kachold | • Virginia Ross | • Nancy Hatch |
| • Robert B. Bernstein | • Kenneth Klos | • Kathleen Elston |
| • Julia Harris | • Jim Labbe | • Dawn Lawrence |
| • Tony Fuentes | • Patricia A. Campbell | • Eileen Schill |
| • Karen Drain | • Bill and Terri Gallagher | • Andrea LePain |
| • Robin Smith | • Peter Hurlin and Kristin Ellingsen | • Roberta Schwarz |
| • Richard Marantz | • Andrea Hamberg | • Jan J Lucas |
| • Katy Ehrlich | • Gary Marschke | • Jacqui Parker |
| • Patsy Lindsay | • Questions from <i>Commissioner Smith</i> | • Questions from <i>Commissioner Gray</i> |
| • Mariha Kuechmann | • Seth Tane | • Barbara K. Baker |
| • Tricia R. Sears | • Vincent Alvarez | • Mara Cohn |
| • Eileen Wynkoop | • Timme A. Helzer | • Angela Moos |
| • Ann Littlewood | • Sherian Groce | • Chris Glad |
| • Diana Kekule Bastron | | |
| • Diversified Marine, Inc | | |

- Comments from *Commissioner Houck* re: updated IGA
- HILP
- Terry L. McCoy
- Leslie Cody
- Nina Landey
- Joseph Chapman
- Pat and Linda Wheeler
- Scott Drumm, Port of Portland
- Robert Bernstein
- Carly Ritter
- Krista Koehl
- Greg Theisen
- Kent Ellsworth
- Therese Sullivan
- North Portland Neighborhood Services
- Skip Nitchie
- Susie Lahsene
- Jana Jarvis

Discussion and Considerations

Commissioners shared their thoughts on the issues that are important and need to be addressed.

- *Commissioner Gray*: With respect to all the testifiers, we still need time to discuss actions. Mitigation, health, regional/local economic benefits, and a balance of health aspects if key. Big projects cannot have all answers or details answered when we make a decision. But big questions for WHI still need more detail. Suggest to set a 3-6 month workplan before making a recommendation to Council with a clear explanation of our intent and actions. We need a solid hand-off to the new Mayor to move the process towards a decision.
- *Commissioner Smith*: The process does need to come to a decision. The final decision will make some people upset. The pacing of the project in the last months has been disruptive, and the value of getting this project to Council before the end of the year is damaging to the process - the community has to understand why we get to the decision we finally get to. Perhaps at the next meeting staff can respond to the PSC's questions. We should then get consensus on high-level direction and give that to staff to create a work plan (with other experts and partners).
- *Commissioner Oxman*: We acknowledge the community for testimony and information presented by staff. I'm feeling overwhelmed and unable to make a decision at this point. We do need to have a deadline to complete and make a cogent recommendation. The Mayor has made some good suggestions, but we need more time to process all the information.
- *Commissioner Schultz*: As the newest commissioner, more than overwhelmed with this project. I echo the need for more time.
- *Commissioner Shapiro*: While the Mayor would like to see this through, the integrity of having time and voices heard is necessary. We need a timeline to complete our recommendation with respect for all voices.
- *Commissioner Valdez*: I appreciate the Mayor's perspective and could be ready to make a vote. Change is difficult; but it's going to happen. We need to honor a realistic timeline, perhaps 2-3 months. It's critical to have Port and City staff continue conversations; they bring information to the commission that we need. PSC members should send questions to staff to be answered before the next meeting to be answered and move forward. Thanks to the Port. Everyone brings something of value to the table.
- *Commissioner Hanson*: There have been no backroom deals as some people have alluded to. This has been an overt public process. Our schedule got jammed up at the end, which is a fair criticism. The AC could not agree on a path forward, but the Mayor's proposal gave us and the Port something to react to. Questions remain. The dialogue between PSC members and staff needs to continue to have an informed PSC

decision. A timeline to move forward is important - don't send this back to the AC. A cooperative evaluation between City and Port staff is a next step. We should try to close on this in Q1 of 2013.

- *Commissioner Houck*: The Mayor indicated that as much as he wants to wrap this up in his term that he could hand this off with his prints on it. There is no way I'd vote on this today - as good as the IGA has become, there are still many outstanding issues to address, especially regarding mitigation issues. I would like to see a conclusion in a reasonable timeline. The new Mayor and commissioner are no strangers to the City and this process, so we will have good input from them.
- *Commissioner Ovalles*: We need more time to digest information to make a thoughtful decision. Some glaring questions are about Goal 9 criteria and what we're held to. My decision will be based on weighing economic development, environment and health and looking at future generations. Regarding tribal sovereignty and treaty violations, we need an expert opinion on this. We should be able to complete this by the end of March 2013.
- *Chair Baugh*: Thanks to all testifiers for taking time to attend. We want to make an informed decision with integrity. It's important to feel good about the decision we move forward to Council with a fair but moving process. This needs to be the PSC's process, not the Mayor's... our proposal, our IGA. Staff and Port staff need to engage together. The Mayor has created a solid base to discuss and build on. Thanks to staff for your diligence and hard work. Thanks to the Mayor for pushing to get something done in a timely manner.

Chair Baugh provided 3 options for next steps:

- Vote up or down today - off the table.
- Come back on 12/04 or 12/11 for a work session to direct staff and develop a workplan to give the PSC information they need to make an informed decision; PSC would provide direction about how we proceed, with a timeline.
- Press ahead and work with City and Port staff to push forward in the next two meetings.

Commissioner Oxman noted the commission needs to come to consensus about what the key issues are. Part of the process needs to hone in on the top issues that need to be addressed.

Commissioner Gray suggested a smaller sub-committee to do a draft outline - commissioners could work with staff in the next two weeks before the 12/11 meeting. *Chair Baugh* suggested that a few commissioners could help staff get a strategy together and narrow down the big ideas.

Commissioner Hanson: The 12/11 meeting should be an open work session to get responses to questions already posed by PSC members (in addition to process / next steps). This is not a restart... it is a way to finish a process.

Susan: Staff could come up with a draft of key issues before a sub-committee. Staff would then send this to the commissioners who could decide if a sub-committee is necessary. This would include a draft workplan with timeline, list of questions and potentially digging in to one of the topic areas on 12/11. Part of the workplan includes how the City, Port and stakeholders (who need to be defined) work together. All commissioners can send questions or list of important items to staff by the end of this week (11/30). Sub-committee members, if needed, will be *Commissioner Hanson*, *Commissioner Gray*, and *Chair Baugh*.

Commissioner Houck: Staff knows the key issues and who can assist with these. We trust staff to identify these technical stakeholders to come back with responses.

Commissioner Oxman: What comes to the commission on 12/11 should be a straw man for the PSC to discuss and break down if necessary.

Susan: One or multiple meetings with a group of technical experts all together may slow down the process. We will likely have a few people meeting individually before 12/11. The process to meet with experts/stakeholders as a group will be longer-term in the 2-3 month process.

Motion

Commissioner Shapiro moved to direct staff to create a draft schedule/workplan and identify key issues and other technical experts for the PSC to evaluate on 12/11.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Ovalles, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 9:25pm.