

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, February 26, 2013

6:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd (left at 7:15 p.m.), Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

BPS Staff Present: Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Jay Sugnet, Morgan Tracy, Julie Ocken

Other experts/presenters: Glen Bolen, Fregonese Associates; Greg Theisen, Port of Portland; Mike Connors, on behalf of mobile home park owners; Kaitlin Lovell, BES

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and provided an overview of the agenda.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- BPS has started open houses for the Comp Plan update. There is one tonight and the next on Thursday in SE at Franklin High School.
- The [Bucks for Buildings](#) program is a limited time offer for rebates to energy improvement to commercial buildings. Commissioners received an informational card about the program.
- PSC members will soon receive notice to participate in the Climate Action Plan update steering committee. We are also recruiting broadly, so please feel free to share the information when you receive it.
- The Historic code project is at Council tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. *Commissioner Hanson* will attend to represent the PSC.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the February 12, 2013 PSC meeting

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.

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

Barbur Concept Plan

Hearing / Recommendation: Morgan Tracy, Jay Sugnet; Glen Bolen, Fregonese Associates

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5567214/>

Documents:

- [Staff Memo to the PSC](#)
- [Barbur Concept Plan](#)
- [Proposed Amendments Memo](#)

Commissioner Smith introduced the project and was a member of the Community Working Group for the project. The only disappointment was limited engagement of the Somali community on the corridor; even though multiple outreach efforts were made we could not secure their participation in the Community Working Group, but they were represented at the open houses. This is part of the Metro SW Corridor project, and this is the piece about Barbur

as a place – the land use component. We are taking a street designed in the 1950s and updating it for 2025. There is a strong relationship to the freeway (I-5), which contradicts making it a great place.

Morgan provided background about the project. This project is the Concept/Direction phase of the planning process. Implementation and policy changes will come after the broader SW Corridor work. The Barbur Concept Plan is a geographically specific plan. Barbur is a regional corridor – a major street that serves as a key transportation route for people and goods.

This corridor received top priority for the region’s next High Capacity Transit in the adopted 2010 Regional Transportation Plan. The boulevard naturally falls into four distinct segments.

- North: Lair Hill feels like an inner neighborhood with classic street grid and, sidewalks. OHSU and the National College of Natural Medicine are here.
- The woods: Once past Hamilton, you enter a wooded gateway between the central city and the areas further south. No commercial centers.
- Historic Hwy: Area between Fred Meyer and Barbur World foods comprised of strip commercial and auto oriented uses. Some office space.
- Far Southwest: Barbur crosses I-5. This is near where PCC-Sylvania campus is located.

The project builds on a number of past projects including:

- Barbur Streetscape Plan
- SW Community Plan
- High-Crash Corridor Study
- Portland Plan

Major public outreach included direct mail, meetings and events, community working group and technical advisory group meetings and three community forums.

A large part of the reason that we are doing this plan is the broader Metro-led SW Corridor Plan. This planning effort is looking at the large corridor between the Central City and Sherwood to establish some form of high capacity transit.

The plan includes more than high capacity transit; it is a mobility corridor study looking at all modes of travel. This is a different approach, leading with land use, identifying the places to connect, what those places need to thrive and then determining how best to connect them.

Barbur has “good bones” with more jobs than residents. Higher education attainment and a number of major learning and medical institutions are near or along the corridor. There are lower lease and rental rates as well.

Challenges for the corridor include steep slopes, critical gaps in bike lanes and sidewalks. Auto oriented development pattern leaves few places like Multnomah Village where you are apt to stop in, shop a while and take a stroll. The road was built as a highway, but after I-5 went in, it retained its “throughput design” for moving vehicles. While the lower lease and rental rates show Barbur’s opportunity to come up to meet the market, the current rates of return make it more difficult for new projects to pencil out.

The Community Working Group created a vision for the corridor to make it a more enjoyable place for everyone who uses or commutes on the corridor.

Using the information gleaned from the existing conditions and needs, opportunities and constraints reports, staff worked on the preferred concept.

Some areas lent themselves to alternative main street concepts including a typical main street alignment; others are more suited as parallel main streets, separated slip road or perpendicular main streets.

Staff polled the community to gauge the relative level of preferred development intensity (from modest improvements to high density). Both the forum and online polls showed a preference for medium mixed-use.

The resulting preferred concept shows “pulse points” along Barbur. They are located in areas with greater connectivity across I-5 (to serve neighborhoods on both sides) and have existing basic services (e.g. groceries), or connect to key destinations.

There are seven focus areas, three of which staff highlighted:

- At the far north end of the corridor is the Kelly area; OHSU and National College of Natural Medicine are here. PSU is also anticipating growth and may expand to this area. To take advantage of that, additional connections over I-405 would be beneficial.
- In the Historic Highway segment, near the Fred Meye, is the SW 13th Focus Area. A perpendicular main street prototype was applied to take advantage of the quieter side street.
- Crossroads: This is also known as the West Portland Town Center Area. It is where I-5, Barbur, Capitol Highway and Taylors Ferry all converge. This is also where the only southbound on ramp to I-5 after downtown (4 miles to the north) is located. As a result, there is significant congestion around the area, stifling redevelopment potential, and the prospect of additional development creates concerns for nearby residents who struggle with the current traffic levels.

The concept plan contains a number of draft recommendations (in the back of the report) intended to carry forward the community’s expectations for:

- Safety improvements.
- Fixing infrastructure deficiencies.
- Improved connections from and between neighborhoods.
- Reducing traffic noise and air quality impacts.
- Creating a walkable and enjoyable boulevard that has a distinct sense of place.

A couple of key findings also emanate from the report:

1. Minor zoning changes. A lesson learned during the Southwest Community Plan process was concern about intrusion of high density into single family established neighborhoods. The concepts in this plan can be accomplished within existing zoning entitlements, with the exception of two potential areas:

- The four acres of converted right of way at the Ross Island Bridgehead could be zoned more intensely.
- Following additional Town center area-specific planning, the West Portland Town Center area will need to be rezoned to realize the anticipated population levels - but this will be contingent on the transportation and other infrastructure investment package.

2. Most notably, for Barbur to really change, high capacity transit is the catalyst. With a reconstructed roadway and investment in multi-modal enhancements, the market analysis shows that this creates the atmosphere where property owners and lenders can see greater return on their investments.

There are other tools in the recommendations that can help kick start this investment, but absent a permanent, reliable, high quality transit system these tools can not sustain the type of change that is needed to transform Barbur.

Staff is seeking the PSC endorsement of the plan to:

- Recommend that City Council adopt the plan by resolution.
- Recommend that staff continue to be involved in the SW corridor plan and subsequent decisions.
- Recommend incorporating the language changes to the plan's recommendations as noted in the memo from staff dated February 26, 2013.

The [amendments](#) incorporate clarifications to strengthen the language about securing funding for safety and active transportation investments, incorporate the freeway ramp reconfigurations, and change the West Portland Town Center recommendation. Staff originally recommended that, due to transportation and other challenges, the town center designation may need to be reconsidered. However, following conversations with SWNI, a different approach is being forwarded. The new language recognizes the importance of pursuing the Town Center and that the challenges must be addressed as part of a subsequent town center planning effort, transportation and funding strategy.

Commissioner Smith added that part of the report analyzes gentrification risks (which are very low) in the report, included in an extensive appendix.

There is a walkshed map that shows how far focus/station areas are within a variety of amenities and other hubs, linking the project to the Portland Plan's goals.

Commissioner Schultz noted the amendment about leaving the town center concept.

- Jay: This was to raise the issue – investment into multi-modal improvement have been lacking in this area in the past. The town center designation is important to keep and strengthen instead of changing to a main street.

Because this is a concept plan, Council will confirm as a resolution (non-binding policy) until regional decisions on transit are made the City will return with more detailed planning .

The Woods section has narrow bridges and steep topography. To improve bike/pedestrian access, there is still discussion going on. The main impediments are the two viaducts, and there are conversations about analyzing going from a 4-lane to a 3-lane crossing. The bike lanes disappear on the viaducts. There is also a desire to look off of Barbur (e.g. Slavin Trail) that runs parallel to Barbur. Parts of the community are advocating for a road diet to improve access, but ODOT has been reluctant to analyze the idea.

Commissioner Houck mentioned he was disappointed to see the trail from SW Iowa to Terwilliger missing. This is an important connector of the 40-mile loop.

- This is not in one of the focus areas, but it is on the list of projects for the larger SW Corridor. The Red Electric Trail is also identified in the Needs, Opportunities and Constraints section of the report (p.13) as well as referenced in the recommendations (p.46) as an important active transportation project.

The bridge over 405 will be dependent on PSU growth projections and investment.

Testimony

- John Gibbon: Adopting the plan doesn't complete the Southwest Community Plan. It revitalizes the 99W corridor but leaves undone part of the Barbur Envelop, south of the Crossroads. Keeping the Barbur plan focused on Barbur is good and includes market-driven work. The town center language helps to highlight deficiencies. When Metro makes its decision, the City will have to make an additional planning decision to include the Barbur Envelop. Getting communities to transit is a key component in the full plan. The connections will be controversial but doable with regional transportation help.

- Marianne Fitzgerald, President SWNI: The neighborhood association is pleased with staff's responsiveness to community comments and in the efforts to include as many people as possible in the process. Funding is the important piece, since the City has made little investment in the crossroads area even since the town center designation. Sidewalks and bike paths are key to support the amenities of the town center. We need to invest in infrastructure to slow down traffic.
- Ian Stude, Vice Chair, Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee: The BAC supports this plan but notes that ODOT must be an implementation partner. Changing from highway to an urban street needs to be emphasized in the report recommendations. We should look to implement bike improvements before SW Corridor project since the SW Corridor is 15-25 years out, relying on funding that's not yet confirmed. Be bold. Concepts on page 43 can be a game-changer in the Crossroads area. The BAC does not support widening sidewalk on viaduct bridges because it instead supports a road diet; the pending viaduct bridge project should not impede working on that vision.

Written Testimony

- Roger Averbeck
- Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.

Chair Baugh closed testimony for the hearing.

Discussion:

The PCC Sylvania campus is included, but there is still a question about how to connect high capacity transit to it. The SW Corridor Plan will study to see benefits and impacts. It's similar to the OHSU connection.

Commissioner Smith: We are specifically looking at the Portland portion, the Barbur Concept Plan, but there are questions from the SW Corridor Plan that would be of interest to the PSC. Would it be useful to have a discussion about the full corridor in front of the PSC?

Chair Baugh noted this is a great plan, but it is a cart-before-the-horse in terms of the update of the Comprehensive Plan. He recommended to forward the commissioner's recommendation to Council but not to invest in the Barbur Corridor yet because not sure we have enough information to say this is the best investment for the city, given the other corridors that could move the 12 Portland Plan measures of success forward best.

Commissioner Smith is reluctant not to invest in any neighborhood. We have lots of investment needs in East and SW Portland in terms of infrastructure. There are short-term tactical investments that we shouldn't get in the way of. The high capacity transit portion may make sense to wait. There are many layers to this and timing will be critical.

- Safety improvements should be separate, but the question is about if the corridor is where the City wants to invest in for infrastructure investments for growth.

Joe: This concept plan is intended to influence the larger SW Corridor process, being led by Metro with TriMet, ODOT and communities out to Sherwood. The next major decision point in the SW Corridor process will likely be in June of this year, to endorse moving to the next step of planning in terms of an environmental impact assessment. The jurisdictions will be asked to help fund this next step by the end of 2013, at which time we'll have a draft Comp Plan before the PSC.

Commissioner Rudd: When is the improvements discussion? When is the decision about where the funding goes for which portions?

- Joe: The clearest next decision is about moving forward with the EIS; and this still is only about determining the most preferred type of high capacity transit. Right now,

Metro is only trying to narrow down the options to study. For Portland, the transit alignment options are all fairly similar, but Tigard and south, there are other options. With regard to evaluating investments within Portland, this prioritization comes as part of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update, which is part of the Comp Plan development this fall.

Commissioner Houck noted his concern about not moving forward. He suggested that the PSC could share a letter at Council that expresses a concern/consideration about investment priorities.

Commissioner Hanson stated this is a good concept that the SW neighborhoods agree with. We should move ahead because we're not deciding when to spend the money on what; making the decision can help influence work and funding for other sections on the corridor.

Commissioner Smith noted his concern about what this means for regional partnership in developing transit if the plan does not move forward.

City Commissioner Amanda Fritz noted that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is open for public comment through April 8 that the PSC could add its preliminary advice to. Joe's suggestion to look at the RTP and TSP would be a good way to go.

Chair Baugh noted he would revoke his amendment and it could be a comment at City Council instead.

Motion:

Commissioner Shapiro moved to:

- Recommend City Council adopt the Barbur Concept Plan by resolution as non-binding City policy.
- Recommend continued staff participation in the SW Corridor Plan.
- Recommend amendments to the Concept Plan as identified in the February 26, 2013 staff memo.

Commissioner Smith seconded.

Chair Baugh restated the motion, and the motion passed.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Ovalles, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

West Hayden Island

Work Session: Eric Engstrom

Documents:

- [Staff Memo to the PSC](#)
- [Decision Menu](#)
- [BES Floodplain Memo](#)
- [Port of Portland sustainability for WHI](#)
- [Port of Portland comments on WHI wetlands](#)

This is a continuation of the previous 3 work sessions. Tonight's topics include:

- Truck cap
- Sustainability policies / BMPs
- Ownership of open space
- Timing of housing fund
- Floodplain options

Staff met with Native Leaders Roundtable at NAYA this morning. Staff has also had staff level discussions with CRITFC since the last PSC meeting as well about tribal concerns.

The [Decision Menu](#) is the tool we are using to provide options for the PSC's consideration on the topics this evening.

A new IGA and code draft will come in early April. The PSC will have a hearing in early May on this proposal.

Truck Cap

Staff recommend a cap of 205 heavy trucks per day. This will be based on data collected as an average over a month. Truck data should be independently verifiable and enforced through City code compliance.

- *Commissioner Hanson* noted this is a good approach. The fine for overage seems difficult to enforce, so we should stress communication from the Port to the community.
- *Commissioner Smith* was a bit worried about the monthly data. Is there some way to allow a percent variation on a daily basis?
- *Commissioner Oxman* also noted that a bad pollution day could lead to some short-term health impacts. It's hard to imagine there won't be significant daily variation. Is there a voice for the neighborhood in the monitoring process?
 - Eric: part of the proposed IGA is an ongoing Good Neighbor agreement and advisory committee. This is the group the Port would check in with. There is a built-in financial incentive, after the terminal opens, so the community fund is tied to the number of trucks (more trucks = increase in the community fund).
- *Chair Baugh*: The Port should be able to come to the community if/when they know they will exceed the cap for a specific time/day. This could be done outside of the code process.

Eric: The updated language will include some built-in limit in the variability day-to-day truck traffic; neighborhood communication; exception communication to have the community OK it. The numbers should exclude low/weekend days to be more sensitive to the regular pattern of business. Staff can develop options about the cap to codify and track.

Sustainability Policy / BMPs

Greg Theisen, Port of Portland, shared the Port's updated Sustainability policy for WHI. The elements from the vision were built out more and reinserted into the guiding principles. Goal 4 is revised to reflect the broader intent to measure impacts on the environment. Item B was rewritten to emphasize the operation of the facility going above Federal standards, specifically relating to air quality.

Staff suggest to incorporate the Port policy document by reference into the IGA, plus add:

- More explicit construction impact practices
- Clauses removed from Airport Futures example
- Measure for reduction of diesel emissions
- Existing BMP document will be attached to Policy, representing a working document of BMPs at this time

Commissioner Houck asked for more explicit information about construction impact practices. For example, use of poisons in grain facilities – are these included in the BMPs? This is important to be clarified. It's similar to the question about green infrastructure and stormwater management. Regarding the clauses removed from the Airport Futures example, the current version (#8, page 3) is different from Airport Futures. The other items were brought forward verbatim, but the environmental objectives were not. Why is that the case? In particular, the Airport Futures included "Avoid, minimize, mitigate and restore impacts to

natural resources.” It also included “overall net improvement of wildlife habitat quality, quantity and connectivity.” The current draft (#8) does not. Why not?”

- The Port’s response was that the intent was to capture as much up front as possible (bullet 2, page 2), to improve what is existing. This is still draft, so the input is helpful.

Avoid, minimize, mitigate. This is State and Federal ecological concept and is required. This was a large discussion with the group. We have identified the footprint for the site as part of the planning process, which is part of the assumption.

Chair Baugh: The commission should have a copy of what the Port requires. For example, in terms of diesel emission, can we require trucks to be 2015 compliant?

- Standards will be those that are in place at the time of permitting.

Eric: We will move forward with this as an attachment to the IGA by reference with noted additional items to look at before providing final proposed language.

Open Space Ownership

Staff proposed options:

- The Port may transfer ownership of the OS-zoned acreage. Ownership transfer may only be to a public entity or non-profit land trust like organization.
- The City of Portland, Metro, or the State of Oregon must receive first right of refusal to purchase the property.
- The IGA should stipulate future mandatory conference and negotiation of open space ownership, with that conference/negotiation to occur within the next 10 years.

Commissioner Smith noted that the work “will” in terms of the transfer is preferable. The Port should own the space while being developed, and 10 years may not be the right timeline. But this is a good general approach.

Chair Baugh: The Port said it would own the land for mitigation “in perpetuity”, so this would change from that standpoint.

- Eric: There is not a consensus yet between the Port and City about this.
- Mitigation is a 100+ year endeavor, especially for forests. The capital phase is about 3-5 year, then an active management process within the first few decades. The last decades are for managing the property. A 25-30 year timeline is the intensive work, followed by more of a monitoring period.

Commissioner Houck noted the transfer to a public entity is his preference. The second bullet notes first right of refusal for purchasing.

- Eric: This is correct; the Port views this as an asset that can’t just be given away. The third option recognizes the uncertainty of the superfund work and mitigation efforts. More of this may be resolved in the future.

Commissioner Houck: In the IGA we should include language that addresses ongoing management. There are inappropriate uses going on the island right now that need to be addressed and addressed over time. As the process moves forward, there will likely be more inappropriate access and uses that need to be curbed.

The PSC recommends bullets 2 and 3. We don’t know which entity may want the land in the future. The option for first right of refusal seems appropriate. Staff will explore the question of 10 years or a longer timeline.

Timing of Housing Fund

Staff propose:

- Changing timeline for the planning and disbursement of funds to align with the completion of the stage 2 HIA.

The proposed IGA puts the funding responsibility on the Port. This would occur more in line with the development time frame, when we know more about the specific terminals and impacts. This also better aligns the expenditures with the cash flow the Port can expect.

Commissioner Smith: The timing seems fine, but housing work should lead the development by a little. Is the dollar amount/figure enough? Also, a regional park should be recommended at the Thunderbird site for immediate access to it from the community.

- Eric: The intent with the amount includes assumptions (1. replacement preferable to retrofitting, especially for older homes; 2. percent of old homes (built 1975-1980), cost to replace; 3. tap Federal dollars; and 4. home owner would agree to participate). It is the whole amount required to replace homes, parsed out with these assumptions. This is how we got to the proposed dollar figure. The intent of the IGA was to be somewhat general because there is a built in process that would be triggered to scope the process as part of the next steps, and it doesn't mandate only replacements or only upgrades.

Commissioner Schultz asked about some of the assumptions and if they may be flawed and/or we might not have enough information to make these assumptions at this point.

Commissioner Gray also asked about the amount. How we determine the impact makes a difference. Have we taken a baseline of residents' health and the homes so we know what the effects of the eminent changes are?

- Eric: There would be a baseline as part of the stage 2 HIA. The fund would be implemented after that.
- Joe: This is a bit like the BMPs. We are improving the quality of the home, design features of today's manufactured homes versus in the past. As a way to improve the exposure, we believe this is a good practice. It will improve overall circumstances and is a worthy investment.

We have defined a goal to make the number of improvements to eliminate the older homes (indoor air quality issue) based on the end state.

- *Commissioner Smith* noted we don't know what the Federal funding will be.

Commissioner Oxman: Part of the assumption is to address indoor air quality issues, but that doesn't address the external air quality.

- Eric: This is an off-set in an indirect sense, not direct mitigation of the outdoor air quality issue.
- Joe: It is related to air quality, preservation of mfg housing, improved housing. It's a package, the cost of which will be borne by the project, and is being estimated.

Eric: An amendment would be timeline change and an opportunity to negotiate the amount from a starting point, once we have all the information.

Chair Baugh: These are going to be 50-year-old mobile homes in 2025. Does it make sense to look at full replacement costs in terms of the amount of money we're talking about?

- Eric: The financial assumption was based on full replacement. The reason we didn't limit the fund to just replacement is because there are homes that would only need upgrades.
- Mike Connors, on behalf of mobile home park owners: The fund is a critical part of the mitigation efforts. The replacement component is the best use of the funds. One component is the mention of relocation of residents, which the residents oppose. If the goal is to preserve the mobile home park as an affordable housing resource, this would undermine that. Another way to look at this is to look at mitigation measures to benefit the park as a whole, not just individual homes, e.g. a sound barrier wall. Timing of

funding – it makes sense to look at the specifics down the road when we have more information, but there needs to be a specific funding mechanism in place at the time this project is adopted. The dollar figure proposed (\$3.6 million) negotiation could go both ways if it's determined that is more than requisite for home upgrades and replacements.

Commissioner Smith: There is turn-over at the park. If the development is 10 years out, people will have the decade to make choices. Could we target a relocation program without triggering a mass exodus from the park? Relocation program needs to be designed to ensure stability of the community.

- Mike: The turn-over/vacancy rate for this park is lower than average. The concern with relocation is if we're using funds to offer assistance to leave the park is who is entitled to it. Can we limit that number? If we offer incentives for leaving, vacancy increases costs for current residents. Potentially this makes the park no longer economically viable, which is not a good option.

Chair Baugh: If you want to preserve affordability, couldn't you take the money to preserve the land?

- Mike: We are not looking to be bought out. We want to mitigate and preserve the long-term future of the park in this process. We need to look at how we can best use the funds to protect residents and preserve the park.

Eric: An additional amendment to the time change is to set an amount that is subject to modification later. The funding for the community park will be discussed at the March 26 work session.

Floodplain

PSC's direction to staff was to explore options for replacing and mitigation of 200+ acres of floodplain loss on WHI.

Three potential mitigation proposals for loss of floodplain function on WHI include:

- WHI Culvert Replacement - replace the culvert between Benson Pond and North Wetland with a bridge to improve frequency and duration of seasonal flooding and off-channel habitat
- Levee Breach - purchase agricultural lands and breach a levee to restore floodplain functions
- Levee Breach plus Consolidated Mitigation - in addition to #2, consolidate off-channel, wetland and bottomland hardwood forest mitigation at same site

Kaitlin Lovell, BES: The [BES memo](#) is a relative comparison among alternatives staff looked at. There are floodplain projects that have different elements and costs. This is not a point of departure for discussion about amount of funding for mitigation. Projects on the list are not shovel-ready; these are projects analyzed that are in various states of development.

Assumptions about the floodplain projects include:

- Real-world examples.
- Apples-to-apples comparisons. Construction costs generally did not include design, permitting, land acquisition costs.
- Forest mitigation occurs on WHI in all scenarios.
- One-to-one mitigation. Assumed 200 acres of floodplain mitigation.
- No magnifiers for distance, type of habitat, co-located. Acre-to-acre.
- No assumption of discount rates.

The back page of the memo (page 4) is a summary of the comparisons. There is a spectrum of floodplain mitigation added to others in the mix. It is possible to do floodplain restoration to account for shallow waters, forest and floodplain mitigation.

- Alternative 1 doesn't capture floodplain function but enhances existing.
- Alternative 2 cost is \$2.5 million. It takes an existing culvert to open the floodplain.
- Alternative 3 opens up alternatives. It includes 6 examples, half on public land.

Commissioner Houck asked staff if they had estimates of what literal balanced cut and fill would cost

- For perspective, the costs of fill would be about \$40 million. Excavation could be up to \$100 million.

Commissioner Houck: For a net increase in ecological function, accounting for floodplain loss must be included. He then asked staff BES staff in their professional opinion which option comes closest to addressing the full range of floodplain loss?

- Kaitlin: Alternative 3. This is where you could substitute out some mitigation. Some costs are not included here, so there is still significant work to review.
- Eric: Alternative 1 has a specific site, so it has the most certainty; Alternative 3 has the most uncertainty. The current IGA attempts to put forest mitigation on WHI, Government Island and another TBD site (less than 10 percent). This option would take a larger chunk to the TBD site.

Commissioner Houck: Alternative 3 is clearly what I would choose for the reasons outlined by BES. While closer is better there are opportunities for projects in the Lower Columbia that could address the concern of floodplain loss if necessary.

The low end of the cost is an example that is far outside the geography but is most rudimentary (removing a levy in a floodplain with little revegetation required). Costs increase with increased complexity... e.g. property on opposite side of the levy; major infrastructure costs; gas lines that need to be protected; etc. Cost of land and maintenance is not included in these costs.

There are 2 sites in the target geography that offer 200+ acres for floodplain mitigation.

Commissioner Gray: In making considerations on cost, it would be helpful to see this a bit more granularly. The range is currently too big for me to make a positive decision.

Commissioner Houck prefers to talk about policy. We should be moving to replace all floodplain functions and talk less about costs. We may just need to pick a dollar figure, but we need to be heading to Alternative 3, then we can talk about costs.

Commissioner Hanson noted the costs of Alternative 3 look to be \$94 million. We need more clarity to further discuss this and the other options.

Commissioner Houck: Are there additional other alternatives? Between now and the next conversation, staff could provide other examples.

Chair Baugh: Where can you apply these options in 200 acre sites? If you can't, where can we apply the policy the best way? Are they new projects or additive to existing projects?

- Kaitlin: The field is moving quickly, and what we were able to get was a range of examples of projects we knew about. We're not sure how many other projects are out there being explored. This was a review of projects that are in the works that may come to fruition.
- *Chair Baugh* asked about getting a recommendation about what the best approach would be if funding is available in terms of options that are on the table.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted a fee in lieu of. For example, the Lower Columbia River Estuary Project might have similar efforts that money could be contributed to. Looking at opportunities outside this area is an option and should be part of the conversation.

Staff will return on March 26 to continue to discuss floodplain and discussion of economic and finance options.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator