

Jeremy Byron Tennant, and I live at 1133 NE Holman St., Portland OR, 97211
J.Byron Tennant <j.byrontennant@gmail.com>

Process:

-Why was the Pembina Pipeline and proposed Terminal 6 Environmental Overlay Zone (E.O.Z.) amendment forwarded to the public input process, when it seems clear that many key questions remain unanswered?

-In Portland, historically we have unique and cherished opportunities for public input in government decisions. Has this process been an example of "best practices" in terms of time spent by PSC, BPS, and informed, active citizens?

-Is it incumbent upon citizens involved in the public input process to inform local leaders of the basic considerations required to make sound decisions, as well as the potential consequences and precedent influenced by these decisions?

-Should the public input process be required to judge of the accuracy, honesty, and veracity of claims made by proponents of major projects? What negative consequences may result from this approach?

-Should a case such as the proposed Terminal 6 E.O.Z. amendment be hastily reduced to technical interpretation as the result of an apparently fast-tracked process, with so much at stake in terms of precedent?

Specifics and Apparent Factual Discrepancies:

-How much land is immediately at stake in this process? At the spoken testimony, I heard 62 acres. This represents about a 50% discrepancy in excess of figures commonly circulated in news outlet reports.

- It appears several last-minute commitments were proposed by Pembina in order to placate various interests. How many of these commitments were guaranteed in writing, and can we expect more delayed announcements on or near March 17th? Is there a deadline for input from proponents of the code amendment which allows reasonable response time?

-I am hearing that the 62 acres, as amended, would provide 35 or more permanent jobs at a pay rate of \$50,000 or more. These numbers, as presented, would seem to guarantee \$1,750,000 total salary for a jobs-per-acre ratio of .56 jobs/acre. Why am I reading \$7,000,000 per year in news reports? Could more jobs-per-acre be achieved by alternate use of the land, as currently protected by the E.O.Z.?

-What is a "permanent job"? Are permanent jobs guaranteed in a written contract?

-If the Terminal 6 E.O.Z. amendment is approved, will a competitive bidding process then ensue, to ensure equitable opportunities to apply for development of the land in question?