



Hathaway Koback
Connors LLP

E. Michael Connors
520 SW Yamhill St.
Suite 235
Portland, OR 97204
503-205-8401 (Dir)
503-205-8406 (Fax)
mikeconnors@hkcllp.com

November 15, 2012

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Planning and Sustainability Commission
City of Portland
1900 SW 4th Avenue
7th Floor, Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201-5380

Re: Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community – Owners
Comments on West Hayden Island Proposed Draft Plan

Dear Commissioners:

This firm represents Hayden Island Enterprises, the owners and operators of Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community (“HIMHC”). HIMHC consists of 440 manufactured home sites, 169 RV sites and approximately 1,500 residents located on Hayden Island. Many of HIMHC’s residents are concerned about this process and the proposed development of West Hayden Island (“WHI”) and have communicated their concerns to Hayden Island Enterprises. Hayden Island Enterprises previously submitted comments on an earlier draft concept plan, dated November 7, 2011, and has remained actively involved in the process. Hayden Island Enterprises is submitting the following comments on the West Hayden Island Proposed Draft Plan (the “Draft Plan”).

Although Hayden Island Enterprises has been open to the Draft Plan process and a marine terminal on West Hayden Island (“WHI”), it has become increasingly concerned that the process is being unnecessarily rushed at the most critical juncture. Several critical issues have not been fully vetted and there is insufficient time to adequately address them before this Commission. Some key technical reports are incomplete or have only recently been finalized. Mayor Adams announced a draft mitigation proposal less than one week ago, which could potentially be a major benefit to the Hayden Island community and address many of the concerns, but there are few details about the plan and insufficient time to flush them out. The Advisory Committee, which was created to “produce a long-term vision and long-range plan for West Hayden Island that may serve as a foundation for an annexation decision” has not had time to complete its final report and recommendations and will not do so until after the only scheduled public hearing before the Commission. Final WHI Advisory Committee Charter, Project Objectives, November 10, 2010. Given the lack of information and time for this Commission to consider all of the issues, elicit public input and determine the specific measures necessary to address the concerns and impacts, the Commission will not be able to provide a complete and meaningful recommendation under the current schedule.

We understand that this process has gone on for an extended period of time, but the current decision-making phase is the most important one and should not be rushed. The Draft Plan and the Port's proposal to develop a 300-acre deep water marine terminal development on WHI (the "Project") will have substantial long-term implications for the City and the surrounding community. It will particularly impact HIMHC and its residents given its close proximity to the park. It is absolutely imperative that the City carefully and thoroughly address all of the potential impacts and incorporate the necessary mitigation. Hayden Island Enterprises is asking the Commission to slow the process down and ensure that all of these critical issues are carefully and adequately addressed. Given how much time and energy has been expended on the Draft Plan to date, it does not make sense for the City to rush through this critical phase simply to ensure the decision is made by year end.

In the event the Commission feels compelled to address the substantive issues under the current schedule, we have outlined our concerns and questions in this letter. At a minimum, the outstanding issues set forth in this letter need to be resolved before the Commission should recommend approval of the Draft Plan.

1. Traffic impacts.

Hayden Island Enterprises is very concerned about the traffic impacts associated with the Project and does not believe that the Port and the City have adequately assessed or mitigated these impacts. We have several concerns explained below. These concerns are supported and supplemented by the attached memorandum from our traffic engineer, Chris Stanley at Green Light Transportation, dated November 14, 2012.

a. The local WHI bridge should be maintained.

We are strongly opposed to the proposal to remove the local bridge connecting WHI directly to Marine Drive and send all of the Project traffic through North Hayden Island Drive ("NHID"). The City's Transportation System Plan (the "TSP") currently provides for a local bridge to accommodate the traffic associated with the industrial development of WHI. There is no reason to amend this plan given that the Project will result in a significant amount of additional traffic, including 2,050 total daily trips and 516 daily truck trips.

NHID was not planned and is not designed to accommodate such a large number of heavy trucks. NHID is currently designated as a Community Corridor and Local Service Street for large segments and is not designated as a truck route along any portion. Even with the proposed improvements, which have not been fully designed, there is no assurance it will be sufficient and it will create significant impacts for HIMHC. Heavy trucks will conflict with HIMHC, Jantzen Beach Mall and surrounding traffic. Many of the ancillary impacts, such as noise, vibration and air quality, will be exacerbated as a result of the trucks using NHID all hours of the day and night. At a minimum, additional mitigation measures should be considered, such as restricting the trucks from using NHID at night or constructing some type of sound barrier between the park and NHID.

The cost based justification for removing the local bridge costs is questionable in several respects. The most recent investigation into the costs for the local bridge, performed by David

Evans and Associates, dated August 29, 2012, concluded that the WHI bridge cost would be approximately one-half of the original \$100 million figure cited by the Port and the City. While the Port and the City cite the lower costs for the NHID improvements, the City has not completed its analysis of the design and improvements necessary to accommodate the Project traffic on NHID. The estimated costs associated with the no local bridge alternative are premature and appear to be designed to minimize the cost of the project as opposed to ensuring that all of the impacts are adequately mitigated. Given the significant impacts on the residents and businesses along NHID and the substantial benefits that will be derived by the Port, the additional costs associated with the local bridge are justified and at a minimum warrant further consideration.

b. The City's traffic analysis is incomplete and based on flawed assumptions.

There are numerous concerns and questions concerning the City's traffic analysis. First and foremost, the City's traffic analysis is incomplete. The attached November 14th letter from our traffic engineer lists a number of missing items that should be provided for a project of this type and scale. ECONorthwest's Public Cost Benefit Analysis described the City's traffic study as preliminary:

“We understand that the City's traffic analysis of the WHI port is preliminary and meant to generally describe the amount and type of traffic the facility could generate. City traffic engineers have not yet conducted a detailed analysis of how port traffic could interact with other traffic on EHI at specific intersections.”
ECONorthwest's Public Cost Benefit Analysis, p.5-11.

The City's design for the improvements to NHID is still conceptual and it is unclear if NHID can accommodate heavy trucks given that it is built over a landfill and therefore the soil stability is highly questionable. The City has not provided a specific safety analysis to demonstrate that the significant increase in heavy trucks in this area will not create safety issues. It is unacceptable to assess the traffic impacts from such a large and traffic intensive use based on a preliminary and incomplete traffic analysis.

The City's traffic analysis assumes certain transportation improvements that may not, and will likely not, be made before the Project is constructed. The most problematic one is the City's traffic analysis heavy reliance on the assumption that the original Columbia River Crossing (“CRC”) project will be built as planned and before the Project. As explained in Section 1.c below, the City's reliance on the CRC project is flawed from both an engineering and legal perspective.

The City relies on an arbitrary trip cap of 175 truck trips and the exact amount is still up in the air. The Port already indicated that it expects significantly more than 175 truck trips per day. The Draft IGA does not provide for sufficient monitoring or an enforceable mechanism to ensure that the Port does not exceed the trip cap.

The City failed to provide a Transportation Planning Rule (the “TPR”) analysis. The City is required to demonstrate compliance with the TPR because the Draft Plan proposes an

amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan, TSP and land use regulations. OAR 660-012-0060(1); PCC 33.855.050.B.2.c. To comply with the TPR, the City and/or the Port must demonstrate that the proposed amendments will not significantly affect existing or planned transportation facilities over the applicable planning period. While the City provided a preliminary traffic analysis for the Project, a TPR requires an analysis of the most intense traffic use allowed under the proposed amendments over the entire planning period. The City's failure to specifically address the TPR as part of this legislative process is legally flawed. *Willamette Oaks v. City of Eugene*, 232 Or App 29, 220 P3d 445 (2009).

The funding mechanism for the transportation improvements is insufficient and premature. The City cannot determine the overall costs for the transportation improvements until it has a final design for the improvements. The Draft IGA does not adequately ensure that the Port is responsible for the primary funding of the NHID improvements. In fact, the Draft IGA specifically references the need to consider local improvement districts, which means that the local community will be forced to contribute undefined amounts toward improvements that are solely designed to accommodate the Project. Draft IGA, Section 3.1.1.4.

For all these reasons, the City's traffic analysis is incomplete and unreliable. The Commission should require the City to address these issues and provide a more complete analysis before making a final recommendation regarding the transportation issues.

c. The traffic analysis improperly relies on the CRC project.

Perhaps one of the most glaring flaws with the City's traffic analysis is its assumption that the CRC project will be constructed before the Project. There are several problems with this approach.

State law and the City code prohibit the City from relying on the CRC project because it is not an approved or funded transportation facility. The CRC project has not obtained the required permits and currently has *no* funding secured. Therefore, the CRC project does not qualify as a "planned facilities, improvements and services" that can be assumed as part of the traffic analysis. OAR 660-012-0060(4). Moreover, the City code requires a determination that the "public services for transportation system facilities are capable of supporting the uses allowed by the zone or *will be capable by the time development is complete*. PCC 33.855.050.B.2.c. (Emphasis added). The City cannot assume that a \$3.5 billion project that has not been approved nor secured any of the funding will be complete by the time the Project is constructed.

Not only has the CRC project not received approval or funding, but both appear to be in serious jeopardy. The U.S. Coast Guard advised the CRC project last year that the proposed 95 ft. bridge is too low. In September of 2012, the Coast Guard sent the CRC a letter highlighting significant flaws in its recent work plan submittal to address this problem and rejected the proposal to submit a permit before the bridge height issue had been fully resolved. The Coast Guard's approval is a mandatory requirement. In order to be eligible for federal funds, Oregon and Washington must commit their state funding by early 2013. Neither state has committed funding yet. If either state does not commit funds by this deadline, the CRC project is dead.

Even if the City could rely on the CRC project, the CRC has recently proposed significant changes that reduce the scope and timing of the improvements affecting Hayden Island. In response to the Oregon Governor and Legislature requests, the CRC project proposed reducing or deferring a significant portion of the improvements that directly affect Hayden Island. One of the changes is to remove the proposed improvements to the portion of NHID east of the terminus where the improvements are proposed as part of the Draft Plan. So NHID may well only be partially improved. The City failed to account for these changes in the CRC project and at a minimum should reassess the Project in light of the reduced CRC improvements.

Moreover, it is highly unlikely that the CRC project improvements will be in place before the Project is constructed. Even under the current schedule, which has been significantly delayed due to the complications noted above, the new bridge will not be complete until 2020 at the earliest and portions of the Hayden Island work will not be complete until 2022 at the earliest. Therefore, these improvements may not be in place until after the Project is completed.

The Draft Plan's proposal to address this major discrepancy is insufficient and legally flawed. Section 3.1.4 of the Draft IGA provides that the CRC project will be deemed "completed" for purposes of the Project if all of the funding necessary to complete certain portions of the project have been authorized despite the fact that the CRC improvements benefitting Hayden Island will take 6 to 8 years to complete. Moreover, if the CRC project is not "completed," Section 3.1.4 merely requires the Port and the City to re-evaluate and work collaboratively to identify additional traffic mitigation requirements. No public process or public input is allowed. Not only is this approach inadequate from a fairness or policy perspective, but it is legally prohibited. *See Moreland v. City of Depoe Bay*, 48 Or LUBA 136, 153 (2004); *Sisters Forest Planning Committee v. Deschutes County*, 45 Or LUBA 145, 154-55 (2003); *Rhyne v. Multnomah County*, 23 Or LUBA 442, 447 (1992) (the local government may not defer compliance with a discretionary requirement until a subsequent stage unless it provides the same type of public process as the underlying decision).

There is substantial evidence that if the CRC project is not constructed prior to the Project it will significantly impact the Hayden Island transportation system. ECONorthwest's Public Cost Benefit Analysis concluded that if the CRC project is not built as assumed it will result in increased congestion, delays, travel times and traffic accidents. Our traffic engineer concluded that the transportation system will not operate acceptably and meet the requirements of the TPR without the CRC project. At a minimum, the City must evaluate the traffic impacts without the CRC project to determine if the Project will comply with the transportation standards and/or what additional improvements are necessary.

d. The NHID and Main Street intersection improvements.

The City's traffic analysis addresses three potential mitigation options for the NHID and Main Street intersection. City's Memorandum regarding West Hayden Island Traffic Analysis: Phase 2 – Intersection Operational Analysis, dated May 23, 2012, p. 3 & Figure 3. Hayden Island Enterprises strongly urges the Commission to recommend the option that signalizes the existing off-set intersection. This is the only option that improves the intersection operations and maintains the Community's eastern access. The other options would require the removal of manufactured homes and/or relocation of the access to an area that is not acceptable to Hayden

Island Enterprises. ODOT considered these same issues as part of ODOT's 2009 draft I-5: Hayden Island Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) and the CRC project, and agreed to signalizing the off-set intersection. This is an extremely important issue for Hayden Island Enterprises and we strongly encourage the specific adoption of this proposed improvement as a necessary mitigation for the Draft Plan.

2. Health impacts.

There has been insufficient time and resources dedicated to assessing the health impacts of the Project. Both the community and the Port agree that the draft Health Analysis raised significant questions and had substantial flaws, albeit for different reasons. This is not a result of a poor job done by those who prepared the analysis, but rather a lack of sufficient resources and time to do an adequate assessment. The Health Analysis was not even commissioned until the end of this process.

Although the final Health Analysis attempts to address these deficiencies, there are still outstanding issues and insufficient time to analyze and implement the report. Many of the immediate and practical implications of these health issues raised in the report are unclear. The Health Analysis includes an extensive menu of mitigation measures to consider, but there are no recommendations regarding which options should be selected, how much they cost, who will fund them or how they will be implemented into the Draft Plan or IGA. Nor has sufficient time been provided in the public process to enable the public and the Commission to adequately assess these options. While the City cites the fact that there will be an Environmental Impact Study ("EIS") required at some later undefined stage of the Port's development, the City will not decide the EIS. This current process is the last time the City will have full discretion and decision-making authority over these issues. If the City concluded that the Health Analysis was important enough to commission as part of this process, it should make sure that it uses it properly by taking the necessary time to carefully assess these critical health issues and ensure that the health impacts have been adequately mitigated.

To the extent the Commission considers the health issue evaluated to date, both the Health Analysis and ECONorthwest's Public Cost Benefit Analysis identified numerous significant negative health impacts on Hayden Island as a result of the Project, with a disproportionate impact on the residents in HIMHC. The Health Analysis concludes that there will be substantial negative air quality, noise, vibration and community design and housing impacts from the Project. The air toxins will increase by three times and will result in air quality that is 55 times the state benchmark. Noise, vibration and lights from the Project and associated trucks will have significant impacts on HIMHC residents. The Health Analysis states that people who live closer to the Project, older adults and low income people will be particularly affected and vulnerable to the impacts. HIMHC is very close to the Project and has numerous residents that are older and/or lower income. The Health Analysis specifically notes that residents of HIMHC are especially vulnerable to noise/vibration impacts and economic challenges caused by the decrease in property values and personal wealth. ECONorthwest's comments on the Health Analysis, dated October 21, 2012, reiterated these disproportionate impacts on HIMHC.

Although the Health Analysis identifies some positive health impacts, these positive impacts are either overstated or will not benefit Hayden Island or HIMHC. Neither the residents of Hayden

Island nor HIMHC will benefit from Project related jobs, the primary positive impact noted in the Health Analysis. Increased opportunities for recreational and physical activities are significantly overstated because the recreational and transportation improvements have not been fully developed, older and/or physically disabled residents will not benefit and it does not account for the fact that the negative impacts will dissuade residents from these recreational and physical activities. The Health Analysis concludes that there will be positive traffic safety impacts even though the traffic safety analysis has not been completed. ECONorthwest's October 21st comments reiterated these overstated positive impacts.

Notwithstanding the fact that Hayden Island and HIMHC in particular will bear the brunt of the substantial negative impacts and benefit very little from the positive impacts, neither the City nor the Port have proposed adequate mitigation to address this discrepancy. The Health Analysis identifies numerous strategies and mitigation measures that should be considered. If the City is unwilling to take the necessary time to evaluate these strategies in order to meet its deadline, at a minimum the Commission should recommend that all of these strategies be adopted as part of the Draft Plan.

3. Community impact mitigation.

The Draft IGA does not provide sufficient or adequately defined community impact mitigation to mitigate the impacts of the Project on the local community. The Draft IGA provides for a \$25,000 to \$40,000 annual contribution to a Community Benefit Grant Program. The annual figures are arbitrary and do not adequately account for the significant adverse impacts on the local community. Additionally, the purpose and use for the Community Benefit Grant Program is undefined and deferred until some later date. The amount and use of the community impact mitigation needs to be better defined in the Draft IGA.

We understand and appreciate that the Mayor's draft mitigation proposal includes a significant amount of housing funds to address community impacts to HIMHC in particular, but it is still unclear how those funds will be used and/or if it is the best use of the funds. The draft mitigation proposal proposes funds to the City's housing bureau so it is unclear to what extent those funds will be used exclusively or primarily for HIMHC. There are no details about the "weatherization/replacement program for manufactured homes" so we don't know how it will be implemented. Nor do we know if it is the best use of these funds. We want more time to flush out these details and ensure that the program will be used in the most effective manner to address the impacts.

4. Recreational opportunities.

As Hayden Island Enterprises explained in its previous comment letter, providing recreational opportunities is an important component of the Draft Plan for HIMHC. Hayden Island Enterprises specifically requested that the City and/or the Port provide the funding, planning and maintenance for the recreational areas as part of the Draft Plan. While the Draft Plan attempts to address these issues, there are some deficiencies that still need to be resolved.

The proposed funding is inadequate and does not require sufficient contributions from the Port. The Draft IGA's funding provided for constructing the recreational improvements (\$1.75

million) is on the very low end of the \$1.5 million to \$4.6 million range estimated in ECONorthwest's Public Cost Benefit Analysis. Additionally, the City's obligation to fund almost half of the construction costs (\$750,000) is too high given that the Port will be the primary benefactor of the Project. The Draft IGA's annual funding for operating and maintaining the recreational facilities (\$33,500) is well below the \$52,000 estimate in ECONorthwest's Public Cost Benefit Analysis. These discrepancies need to be resolved.

The Draft Plan does not resolve important issues such as public access and maintenance obligations. The Port's obligation to provide public access to the recreational areas as part of the Draft IGA is too ambiguous and undefined. There is no designated party responsible for maintaining these recreational areas to ensure that they are preserved. These important issues need to be defined now as opposed to some undefined process in the future.

We recognize that the Mayor's draft mitigation proposal includes additional money to acquire six acres for a recreational park, but there is no information about key questions such as whether the property owner is willing to sell the property for this amount, how much will it cost to develop the park, who will maintain the park, etc.? Again, we want more time to flush out these details and ensure that the park will truly be built and will be a community asset.

5. Natural resource impacts and mitigation.

We support the proposal to require the Port to mitigate 100% of the natural resource impacts from the Project. The Port's proposal to mitigate less than half of the impacts is clearly insufficient. The Port will obtain significant economic benefits from the Project and therefore should be required to fully mitigate the natural resource impacts.

The problem is that there are still many questions and unresolved issues about how the Port should mitigate the natural resource impacts. While the Mayor's draft mitigation proposal includes significant funds for environmental mitigation, it is unclear how that money will be used or if it is the best use of the funds. Again, these issues need to be carefully considered and evaluated.

6. Senate Bill 766 (2011).

Given that the specific design for the Project is unknown at this time, the Draft Plan relies heavily upon subsequent City processes to review and evaluate the Project when it is ready to be constructed. The Draft Plan relies on the Resource Review process, which it describes as a "public discretionary process," to ensure that there is a public process for reviewing and ensuring that the proposed development complies with the applicable standards.

The Draft Plan fails to recognize that the Port could bypass these future City review processes under Senate Bill 766. ORS 197.722 through ORS 197.728. The Port can bypass these future processes by obtaining designation of the Project as an industrial development project of state significance under Senate Bill 766. If the Project was designated as a state significant industrial development project under Senate Bill 766, the Port can bypass the City's process and obtain approval under a much narrower and less discretionary process through the Oregon Economic Recovery Review Council. Currently, the Project could not qualify because it requires an amendment to the City's acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations.

November 15, 2012

Page 9

Therefore, it cannot qualify unless the City approves the Draft Plan. Once the Draft Plan is approved, however, the Port could apply for designation. The Draft IGA should include a provision that prohibits the Port from applying for approval of the Project as an industrial development project of state significance under Senate Bill 766.

Conclusion

We appreciate your consideration of our comments and hope that you will take them to heart. The Draft Plan and the Project will have significant long-term impacts for HIMHC, the local community and the City as a whole. While we believe that the issues can be adequately addressed if sufficient time is provided, it is simply too important of a decision to rush with so many outstanding questions and issue remaining. The City needs to make sure that it makes the right decision as opposed to meeting some arbitrary deadline. Therefore, the Commission should request that the public hearing be continued, the outstanding issues and questions be more thoroughly addressed, and not make its recommendation until sufficient time has been provided to ensure that the right decision is made.

Very truly yours,

HATHAWAY KOBACK CONNORS LLP



E. Michael Connors

EMC/df

Attachment

cc: Hayden Island Enterprises

November 14, 2012

Frank Michel
Hayden Island Enterprises Ltd.
31550 Northwestern Highway, Suite 200
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF THE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY FOR THE WEST HAYDEN ISLAND PROJECT

Dear Mr. Michel:

As requested, we have reviewed the City of Portland's traffic study for the West Hayden Island (WHI) Project. Based on our review of this material, additional information and analysis is needed to determine the WHI Project's traffic impacts and the mitigations required to meet performance standards. In particular, the study assumes several significant infrastructure improvements that have not been approved or funded as required by the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule. Without these improvements the future transportation system will not operate as concluded in the traffic study.

This letter specifically addresses the additional information and analysis needed in the areas listed below.

- Analysis and Methodology
- Heavy Vehicle Impacts
- Columbia River Crossing (CRC)
- Local Road Network
- Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community's (HIMHC) Access Streets on Hayden Island Drive

ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

The City of Portland summarized the traffic impacts in their May 23, 2012 *West Hayden Island Transportation Modeling Analysis: Phase 1 - Planning Level Network Analysis* and *West Hayden Island Traffic Analysis: Phase 2 - Intersection Operational Analysis* memorandums. The City's Phase 3 memorandum outlining the mitigation measures and Transportation Planning Rule findings has not been completed. Listed below is the standard analysis information in a comprehensive plan amendment traffic study that is not included in the City's memorandums.

- Turn Movement Volumes showing the traffic at the study intersections.
- Traffic Count Data to determine existing conditions and calibrate the traffic model.
- Level of Service Worksheets showing the assumptions and traffic analysis.

- Trip Generation data used to determine the site-generated trips. In particular, additional information on truck volumes.
- Approved and funded transportation improvements.
- Transportation Planning Rule findings.

In the absence of this additional information and a more complete traffic study, it is difficult to determine if the WHI Project satisfies the applicable transportation standards and if the proposed improvements and mitigation are sufficient.

HEAVY VEHICLE IMPACTS

The proposed elimination of the WHI Bridge will create additional impacts on HIMHC that have not been fully analyzed. The August 14, 2012 *West Hayden Island Project Proposed Draft* recommends the WHI Bridge be removed from the City's project list for North Portland. The plan also recommends the City's Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan be modified to classify West Hayden Island as a Freight Facility and upgrade North Hayden Island Drive (NHID) from a Truck Access Street to a Major Truck Street. North Hayden Island Drive is the primary roadway fronting and providing access to HIMHC. There are several potential impacts this will create for HIMHC and its residents.

The truck traffic recorded at the Port of Portland's existing facilities indicated that "trucks arrive and depart at all hours of the day and night" (*West Hayden Island Marine Terminal Development Highway Transportation Analysis*, Appendix E, Parametrix, Inc., October 1999). Since many of the residential homes closely abut North Hayden Island Drive, additional information on future heavy vehicle volumes at various times of the day is needed to understand their impacts and identify potential mitigation measures.

If the WHI Bridge is eliminated, all of the trucks serving the new port will utilize North Hayden Island Drive. The *West Hayden Island Intergovernmental Agreement* indicates trucks will be limited to 175 one-way trips per day. This is significantly less than the 516 daily truck trips generated by the project in the City's traffic study. It is unclear how the new port will operate under a threshold that is so much lower than their demand, or how this threshold will be enforced or mitigated if exceeded. In addition, clarification on the type of vehicles this applies to is needed since a heavy vehicle is defined as "any vehicle with more than four tires touching the pavement" (*Highway Capacity Manual 2010*, Transportation Research Board).

The City's traffic study doesn't identify the future truck volumes resulting from upgrading North Hayden Island Drive to a Major Truck Street and other future development that is assumed to occur in the area. This information is important to determine the cumulative truck impacts.

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING

The City's traffic study assumes and relies on the construction of the proposed Columbia River Crossing (CRC) and the Concept D interchange recommended for Hayden Island. The actual design of these CRC improvements are still under development and the project schedule may continue to change. If the Hayden Island interchange and associated arterial bridge are not

constructed as currently proposed, then the traffic impacts of the WHI Project will be different than those included in the City's traffic study.

Division 12 of the State's Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012-0060) requires that comprehensive plan amendments ensure the future transportation system meet performance standards. Planned improvements assumed to be part of the future infrastructure must be approved and funded. The CRC project is not approved and fully funded. If the project does not continue or the schedule shifts so that it is not complete before the WHI Project, then the future transportation system will not operate acceptably and meet the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule.

In order for the WHI Project to be approved without the approval and funding of the CRC, an analysis of future traffic conditions without the CRC improvements would need to be conducted to determine the mitigations necessary to accommodate traffic from the WHI Project. This has not been included in the City's traffic study and existing development and geographic constraints make improvements on Hayden Island difficult and expensive.

Several of the future improvements for the area are currently being reduced or eliminated. Alternatives to reduce the CRC project costs and associated improvements are presently being studied. The City of Portland's November 2, 2012 *Alternative Design Concept for North Hayden Island Drive Reconstruction In Support of Port's Proposed Development of West Hayden Island* memorandum presents an initial concept to narrow the future NHID cross section. The WHI Bridge would also be removed from the City's project list as part of the WHI Project.

The funding and assumed transportation system improvements need to be fully determined and finalized for the traffic study to accurately determine the WHI Project impacts and support the comprehensive plan amendments.

LOCAL ROAD NETWORK

The future transportation system for Hayden Island and the CRC assume a local street network west of Interstate 5. Many of these public roadways don't currently exist and their locations bisect private property. In addition, the location, traffic control, and cross sections for these roadways have not been determined. Without these roadways the future transportation system and the Hayden Island interchange will not operate acceptably. Additional analysis needs to be conducted to determine the design, location, timing, and funding of these roadways to ensure acceptable traffic operations with development of the WHI Project.

HIMHC ACCESS STREETS ON NORTH HAYDEN ISLAND DRIVE

Access to the Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community is provided via private street intersections on North Hayden Island Drive. Additional analysis of these intersections needs to be conducted to ensure they will operate acceptably in the future with development of the proposed WHI Project.

Both the WHI Project and CRC traffic studies indicate that these projects create future traffic issues at the existing Begonia Avenue intersection with North Hayden Island Drive, the primary access for HIMHC. Neither of these studies determined the mitigation that will be constructed to

maintain the HIMHC's operations. The mitigation, timing, and funding need to be determined to ensure the Begonia Avenue intersection with NHID will meet performance standards and operate safely in the future.

Future traffic volumes on North Hayden Island Drive will increase in the future, particularly with the proposed WHI Project and the elimination of the WHI Bridge. The City's traffic study doesn't analyze any intersections west of the Begonia Avenue intersection on North Hayden Island Drive. Additional analysis needs to be conducted to confirm that the other private street intersections serving the HIMHC will operate acceptably in the future with construction of the proposed WHI Project.

Year 2006 weekday PM peak hour traffic counts show 890 vehicles on North Hayden Island Drive near Begonia Avenue. The City's traffic study shows 880 weekday PM peak hour vehicles at this location in 2035. Additional information is needed to understand what roadways 29 years of growth on Hayden Island and the proposed port traffic are utilizing, particularly considering North Hayden Island Drive is the only currently existing public roadway in the area.

CONCLUSIONS

As outlined above, additional information and analysis is needed to confirm the traffic impacts and improvements associated with the WHI Project to ensure the surrounding transportation system will operate safely and meet the applicable performance standards.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if I can provide additional information.

Sincerely,



Christopher Stanley, P.E.
Principal