

West Hayden Island Project Phase II

FACILITATOR'S REPORT: ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

NOVEMBER 12, 2012



November 6, 2012 Draft

This is a rough draft. It is a work in progress. The AC has not reviewed or voted on this report. As a result, the contents are subject to change between now and the end of the process. Ultimately, the contents will conform to the AC's recommendations, whatever they may be.

Text highlighted in yellow = facilitator/staff follow-up



**We are committed to providing equal access to information and hearings.
If you need special accommodation, call the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability at 503-823-7700,
City's TTY at 503-823-6868 or
Oregon Relay Service at 1-800-735-2900.**

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Please see the project website at: www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/whi

Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner
Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7400
Portland, Oregon 97201-5380
Phone: 503-823-3329
Email: Eric.Engstrom@PortlandOregon.gov

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/whi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. **Introduction**
.....
- II.
.....
Background and Process Overview
.....
 - A) Background
 - B) Process Overview
 - 1) Project Timeline
 - 2) West Hayden Island Working Group
 - 3) West Hayden Advisory Committee
 - C) Conclusion
- III. **Advisory Committee**
.....
 - A) Membership
 - B) Charge
 - C) Objectives
 - D) Principles
 - E) Major Process Steps
 - F) Decision-Making
- IV. **Public Involvement Overview**
.....
- V. **Summary of Consultant and Staff
Studies/Reports**
- A) Consultant Reports

- 1).....
 onsultants
- 2).....
 oncept Planning
- 3).....
 arbor Lands
- 4).....
 ost and Benefits
- 5).....
 inancial
- 6).....
 ealth

- B).....
 taff Reports
 - 1).....
 atural Resources
 - 2).....
 conomic, Social, Environmental, and Energy
 Analysis
 - 3).....
 ecreation
 - 4).....
 egulatory Requirements
 - 5).....
 ancouver Port Coordination
 - 6).....
 and Management
 - 7).....
 orth Portland Rail
 - 8).....
 ransportation Modeling
 - 9).....
 nvironmental Mitigation

VI.

Final Votes

.....
.....

- A) Voting Protocol
- B) Topic-by-Topic Final Votes

VII. **AC Recommendations**
.....

- A) General Areas of Agreement on Major Topics

- B) General Areas of Disagreement on Major Topics

- C) Financial Package

- D) Final Report Voting

VIII. **Conclusion**
.....
.....

IX. **Appendix**
.....
.....

- A) Advisory Committee Collaboration Principles

- B) Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

- C) Topic-by-Topic Final Votes

- D) Advisory Committee Letters and Minority Reports

The Portland City Council adopted Resolution 36805 to guide the current phase of the West Hayden Island (WHI) process. It directed staff to propose a Concept Plan and Legislative Proposal for Zoning and Annexation. During the fall of 2010 and winter of 2011, staff began the additional background research, hiring the consultants to work on the technical reports and set up a new project Advisory Committee (AC) consisting of members of business and environmental groups, community members and regional agency interests.



Several technical reports and studies have been completed, both by outside consultants and City staff. Staff worked with the AC to develop a draft proposal for the City Council to consider, in accordance with its resolution. A draft proposed was released in June 2012 for AC consideration. Staff hosted several open houses in June and July of 2012 to provide additional opportunity for community input. An updated proposal was issued on August 14, 2012. Open Houses were held on September 12, 2012 and on November 7, 2012. The final Advisory Committee was held on November 9, 2012

- A) General Areas of Agreement
- B) General Areas of Disagreement
- C) Conclusion

Insert at End

Respectfully Submitted by Sam Imperati, process facilitator, on behalf of the current AC:

Susan Barnes, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Andrew Colas, Colas Construction
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Pam Ferguson, Hayden Island Resident
Don Hanson, OTAC Consultants and BPS Planning & Sustainability Commission
Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership
Brian Owendoff, Capacity Commercial Group
Emily Roth, Portland Parks and Recreation
Sam Ruda, Marine Director, Port of Portland
Bob Tackett, NW Oregon Labor Council
Victor Viets, Hayden Island Resident

II. Background and Process Overview

A) Background

WHI was owned by Portland General Electric (PGE) for many years. In 1983, while under PGE’s ownership, the island was included in Metro’s Urban Growth Boundary “to satisfy a long term regional need for water-dependent deep water marine terminal and industrial facilities” (Metro Ordinance No. 83-151). In 2004, as part of a regional process to distinguish industrial lands, Metro identified WHI as a Regionally Significant Industrial Area with characteristics that lend it to industrial uses. In 2005, Metro designated WHI a Moderate Habitat Conservation Area as part of the Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods program. Metro made the designation based on the high value of development potential and the high value of the natural resources. Metro directed the City of Portland, in cooperation with the Port of Portland, to create a district plan for WHI.

B) Process Overview

The planning process for WHI has been divided into two phases. Phase I covered the initial project research up to the summer of 2010 (up to the adoption of Council resolution 36805). We are now completing Phase II, which included additional technical studies and the development of a concept plan and a [legislative proposal](#) for City Council to consider in accordance with their Resolution (36805) (Attachment A).

1) Project Timeline

Timeframe	Milestones	Public Events
Winter 2008 – Summer 2010	Environmental and Economic Foundation Studies and City Council Resolution	Community Working Group Meetings / Open House, City Council
Fall 2010 – Winter 2012	Concept Plan / Technical Studies	Advisory Committee Open Houses / Office Hrs. City Council Work Session
Spring – Fall 2012	Staff Proposal for annexation and zoning	Advisory Committee, Planning and Sustainability Commission, City Council and Port Work Sessions, Open Houses / Office Hrs.
Winter 2012	Planning and Sustainability Commission and City Council deliberation on annexation and zoning	Advisory Committee Recommendations, Public Hearings, and Action

2) WHI Community Working Group (2008 – 2010)

In late 2008, a City-initiated planning effort for West Hayden Island began. This planning process was to build on the planning work being done on the [Columbia River Crossing \(CRC\)](#) project and the East Hayden Island Neighborhood Plan. Mayor Sam Adams created a [Community Working Group \(CWG\)](#) and directed staff to hire consultants to provide key [economic and environmental studies](#).

These studies were intended to help determine whether West Hayden Island could be developed for multiple uses, including marine industrial, habitat and recreational. The studies were also intended to help determine whether the land could accommodate these uses while retaining its natural resource qualities and provide economic value to the region.

In early 2009, the CWG was tasked with providing City Council with a recommendation based upon the studies' findings. To help the CWG evaluate the data and to develop a recommendation, the City hired ENTRIX to perform additional research and create the set of foundation studies, including:

- [Economic Foundation Study](#)
- [Environmental Foundation Study](#)
- [Recreation Analysis of West Hayden Island](#)
- [Integrated Report of Findings](#)

The CWG met for 17 months, with over 76 hours meeting time. In June 2010 the CWG produced a [report](#) that articulated points of commonality and the most critical differences in members' perspective or rationales to aid the City Council in deciding how next to proceed (Full report is included in Attachment B under Public Involvement Process). But the CWG could not reach agreement on a recommendation. On July 29, 2010, after considering the CWG's input and hearing extensive public testimony, City Council passed a resolution directing the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to continue planning efforts. Resolution 36805 directed BPS to prepare a proposal with at least 500 acres of open space and no more than 300 acres for future deep water marine terminal development.

As part of this resolution, the Council directed staff to produce and coordinate several additional studies to help inform any future planning decision. Council asked staff to analyze the costs and benefits of developing part of the island, review the feasibility of other lands in the Portland Harbor for terminal development, consider nature-based recreational opportunities and expand upon a local impacts report produced by the City to assess impacts, such as traffic, noise, dust and light on neighboring properties.

3) WHI Advisory Committee (2010 – 2012)

With City Council adoption of Resolution 36805, Phase II of the WHI planning process began. Council directed staff to propose a Concept Plan and Legislative Proposal for Zoning and Annexation. During the fall of 2010 and winter of 2011, staff began the additional background research, hiring the consultants to work on the technical reports and set up a new project Advisory Committee (AC) consisting of members of business and environmental groups, community

members and regional agency interests. The AC was guided by a set of Collaboration Principles. **Appendix A.** Notes of every meeting and Work Session were taken and can be found at **Appendix B.** During the fall of 2010 staff also hosted a community involvement summit meeting.

Several additional technical reports and studies have been completed; both by outside consultants and City staff (see Attachment C for a full description and list of studies). The studies have also been posted on the project's website. The studies focused on rail configuration, harbor lands inventory, terminal operational efficiencies, cost/benefit analyses, regulatory requirements, natural area land management options and local impacts. Staff has also worked on an update to the Environmental Zoning Program for the area around Hayden Island; including completion of the Hayden Island Natural Resource Inventory (NRI), which documents the existing environmental resources and special habitats in the area, and the Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Analysis to evaluate trade-offs associated with varying levels of natural resource protection.

Some of this work helped to inform a base concept plan that was developed by the project consultant, Worley Parsons, with guidance from the project AC. Staff and AC members hosted Concept Plan open houses in October of 2011 (See Attachment B for the full public involvement report). The concept plan was requested by the City to help determine whether economically viable marine terminals could be built within the 300 acres area defined by City Council, while also providing opportunities for natural resource protection and enhancement and passive recreation on the remainder.

Using the concept plan as a reference point, staff worked with the AC to develop a draft proposal for the City Council to consider, in accordance with their resolution of 2010. A draft proposal was released in June 2012 for AC consideration. Staff hosted several open houses in June and July of 2012 to provide additional opportunity for community input. The proposal included:

- Consideration of annexation
- Comprehensive Plan designations and Map Amendments
- WHI Plan District with zoning maps and code
- A draft Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the Port of Portland and the City of Portland

Staff hosted several open houses in June and July of 2012 to provide additional opportunity for community input. An updated proposal was issued on August 14, 2012. A PSC briefing occurred on August 14, 2012. The AC held the following work sessions:

Transportation – September 7, 2012
Finance – September 21, 2012
Environmental – September 28, 2012
Health – October 22, 2012

Open Houses were held on September 12, 2012 and on November 7, 2012.

Insert Open House Photos

III. WHI Advisory Committee

A) Membership

The West Hayden Island Advisory Committee (AC) was one of the primary means of ensuring that the public had opportunities to provide meaningful input into the planning process. AC members were selected to represent key stakeholder interests and to create a balanced committee to guide the planning effort. AC members were appointed by the Mayor's Office.

Table 1: West Hayden Island Advisory Committee Members (August, 2012)

Representative	Organization	Alternate
Susan Barnes	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	
Andrew Colas	Colas Construction	
Andy Cotugno	Metro	
Pam Ferguson	Hayden Island Resident	Tom Dana
Don Hanson	OTAC Consultants and BPS Planning & Sustainability Commission	
Chris Hathaway	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	
Brian Owendoff	Capacity Commercial Group	
Emily Roth	Portland Parks and Recreation	
Sam Ruda	Marine Director, Port of Portland	Greg Theisen
Bob Tackett	NW Oregon Labor Council	Graham Trainor
Victor Viets	Hayden Island Resident	

NOTE: Bob Sallinger, Audubon, resigned on X/Y/2012

B) Charge

The primary function of the WHI Advisory Committee in Phase II is to serve in an advisory capacity on the West Hayden Island Project and related programs. Members of the Advisory Committee will help ensure that: the project objectives are being met, the project stays on track, the work is done in a transparent way, and the result is within the framework of City Council's Resolution 36805 and is consistent with the IGA and Work Plan adopted by the City Council and the Port. Members of the Advisory Committee will help:

1. Shape the scope and accuracy of technical reports to City Council regarding additional questions about possible marine industrial development on WHI;
2. Shape the language of a plan district for possible habitat, natural resource and recreation improvements and possible future marine industrial development on West Hayden Island, which should include requirements and standards that (may or will) guide future development activities; and
3. Consider and integrate public input as part of their guidance to City staff

C) Objectives:

The AC process was guided by the following objectives per their early agreement.

1. Evaluate information and assumptions presented by staff and consultants, pursuant to City Council Resolution 36805.
2. Produce a long-term vision and long-range plan for West Hayden Island that may serve as a foundation for an annexation decision to be considered by Council in December 2011.
3. Define desired types of industrial development, recreational use, and/or environmental protection and restoration opportunities.
4. Define a street plan, land use, and open space concept plan, based on the City Council's parameters.
5. Identify needed infrastructure improvements and a strategy for phasing public and private investment to support the recommended vision or address deficiencies to serve existing development.
6. Identify future actions and policies that will enhance the quality of and facilitate further development of the recommended West Hayden Island vision.
7. Coordinate West Hayden Island planning with the Environmental Program update for East Hayden Island and the Columbia River southern bank.
8. Complete the West Hayden Island planning process by December 2011.

D) Principles

The evaluation principles developed by the CWG should serve as core values to inform the proposal. A good, multiple-use option will provide for:

1. A net increase in ecosystem function.
2. A positive contribution to regional economic health (e.g. jobs, wealth).
3. An economically viable port facility.
4. A positive contribution to the local community (e.g. health, transportation, property value, recreation facilities, and opportunities).
5. An addition to, not competition with, the regional port system.
6. Public access opportunities to West Hayden Island.
7. Sustainable scale for any use included as part of the option.
8. Flexibility to accommodate the unknown future.
9. Taking advantage of the unique aspects and opportunities of the site.
10. Consideration of impacts on multiple time periods i.e. current, mid-range, and future.
11. Consideration of impacts on multiple geographies, i.e. local, sub-regional, and regional levels.

E) Major Process Steps

The AC process was guided by the following major process steps per their early agreement.

1. Create site development alternatives (300 ac. terminal and 500 ac. habitat).
2. Develop WHI Evaluation Criteria based on CWG Working Principles and others to be developed.
3. Evaluate and modify alternatives to get a preferred alternative.
4. Develop an agreed to approach and perform a cost/benefit analysis of preferred alternative.
5. Conduct Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy Analysis on preferred alternative
6. Make recommendations regarding:
 - a. The preferred alternative including:
 - i. What conditions should be included as part of the initial zoning and annexation agreements.
 - ii. What issues/conditions can be addressed as part of an eventual development review process.
 - b. Whether costs outweigh benefits for the preferred alternative

This legislative proposal is based upon a [Concept Plan](#), which was developed in conjunction with an outside consultant, to provide guidance for open space, natural resource protection and industrial development. The proposal includes draft comprehensive plan changes, zoning code amendments, maps and a draft intergovernmental agreement (IGA). These will all be requirements for annexation into the City. City Council will ultimately vote on the complete package, which will include the recommendations made by the Planning and Sustainability

Commission. The table below provides a brief summary, and the phases are described in greater detail below.

F) Decision-Making Process

The Committee serves in an advisory capacity and its input will inform project activities. The Committee is not a decision making body.

The Planning & Sustainability Commission will make recommendations to City Council, who will make all final decisions regarding the concept plan(s) and annexation. As an advisory body, this committee should strive to craft and recommend approaches and solutions that are workable for a wide range of needs and interests, including feasibility of terminal development and should work towards completion of several concept plans by December 2011.

The group should engage in open and constructive dialogue to ensure that potential solutions are well tested and that diverging opinions are aired, discussed, and documented.

IV. Public Involvement Overview

Public Events Hosted by WHI Team:

- 21 Advisory Committee meetings
- 30 HILP and HiNoon meetings
- 10 other neighborhood and homeowner association meetings
- 15 meetings with interest groups and other parties
- 8 open houses and office hour sessions
- 20 other presentations, briefings, technical work sessions, tours, etc.

Insert Photos

V. Summary of Consultant and Staff Reports

Add links to below studies

This project has included a considerable amount of background research and the production of several studies. In addition to the foundation studies for Phase I, below is a summary of staff and consultant work that informed the Advisory Committee process. The AC was very involved in the creation of the scope of the studies and consultant selection.

A) Consultant Reports

1) Concept Planning: Worley Parsons developed a concept plan for West Hayden Island based upon the City Council resolution to protect at least 500 acres as open space and allow marine terminal development on up to 300 acres. This concept serves as a planning basis to draft zoning recommendations and an annexation agreement for Planning & Sustainability Commission and council consideration.

Key takeaways from the Base Concept Plan include:

- It is possible to fit a rail loop for 10,000-foot long unit trains within the 300 acre footprint.
- The concept plan includes three marine terminals (processing autos, grain, and dry bulk) and two dock facilities.
- The facility can meet the acreage and dimensional parameters within the Council resolution.
- The concept plan preserves large areas of the island for natural resource protection and enhancement.
- The concept plan allows for access to either be from a new bridge from Marine Drive, or from an extension of North Hayden Island Drive.

2) Harbor Lands Analysis: The study reviews the most recent Cargo Forecasts done for the Portland Harbor to determine the potential need for marine terminal land and considers the redevelopment potential of certain sites along the Portland Harbor for future Marine Terminal use. In addition, the study determines whether the Port of Vancouver may have excess capacity to absorb additional demand, and analyzes ways to measure industrial land efficiency along the harbor lands. Key takeaways include:

- There are two sites in the Portland Harbor that may include enough vacant land (Time Oil and Atofina sites). Both sites would require the acquisition of additional land, and both have infrastructure and contamination issues that could be barriers to development. Neither site meets the dimensional requirements for modern “unit train” rail access.
- The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability has completed a number of inventories of vacant land in the Portland harbor, which are summarized in the ECONorthwest report. The effective supply of land in the Portland harbor is 50 to 174 acres. The range reflects the outcomes of several different studies, with a range of assumptions about

how “vacant” is defined, and how constraints may impact the effective use of land – such as contamination, and environmental resources.

- The number of new marine terminals necessary to meet these capacity shortfalls varies based on the commodity type, and assumptions we make about terminal size. The ECONorthwest report summarizes that information. They estimate that between 51 and 1,457 acres of land will be needed to meet projected demand for new marine terminals through 2040. Assuming the middle of the forecast range, the need is estimated at 570 acres.
- The Port of Vancouver has about 350 acres of vacant land in reserve for future marine terminal growth. ECONorthwest estimates that the regional need for new marine terminals will be 570 acres through 2040 (assuming the mid-range in the cargo growth forecasts). Unless cargo volume growth is on the low end of the expected range, there is not enough land in Vancouver to meet the regional need by itself.

3) Costs and Benefits Analysis: The study considers the benefits and costs that may accrue to the public over time if West Hayden Island is developed in accordance with the Concept Plan. This is compared with a baseline (no build) scenario. Key takeaways include:

- The report considers the effects of the development scenario with the baseline scenario on natural resources, recreation, local impacts and port economics (expressed in terms of 100-year Net Present Value).
- Development would reduce the value of the ecosystems services provided by WHI natural resources by \$4.5 to \$11.5 million (100-year NPV).
- Anticipated mitigation is estimated to cost \$24.5 million (including operating/maintenance costs), and creates \$1.9 to \$5.9 million of ecosystem services lift (100-year NPV).
- Development creates between \$1.5 and \$5.0 million in additional recreational benefits (100-year NPV).
- Recreational improvements shown in the concept plan may cost between \$2.4 and \$5.3 million (including operating/maintenance costs) (NPV).
- Traffic, air quality, light and noise were identified as impacts that have been known to have economic effects or effects on property values. For example, air pollution costs associated with traffic may range from \$.02 to \$.04 per vehicle mile traveled. Port-related rail traffic might have a one-time impact on the property values for homes within 275 meters of the development. Given the number of homes in that zone (8), they quantified this impact as \$33,440. They estimated the cost of traffic-congestion related impacts as \$23,500 annually. The report cautioned that these are illustrative examples, and recommended additional work to evaluate health impacts via a Health Impact Assessment.
- Port operations would need to generate at least \$5.5 million in net economic benefit per year to produce a sufficient level of benefit to offset the expected local costs.
- This amount of benefit is a fairly small portion of the potential job and income amount that the port would generate overall – for example experts estimate 2,300 to 3,600 jobs could result from development of a marine terminal on WHI. This includes direct jobs, induced jobs and indirect jobs. Together, these jobs could generate \$200 to \$300

million in personal annual income, and \$18 to \$30 million in annual state/local tax revenue (in Oregon and Washington).

4) Financial Work Session

Add Summary

- Port estimate of viable market cost per sq. ft.- \$5-7
- Discussion of different cost elements that feed into cost per sq. ft. of a future WHI:
 - Fill – to make project shovel ready
 - Environmental mitigation
 - Transportation
 - Community benefits
- Assumptions about public/private investments, and future developer responsibilities
- Consultant completed an analysis of other state Port financial structures

5) Health Analysis

Add Summary After Final Health Report Comes Out on 11/7/12.

- Partnership with Multnomah County, OPHI, Upstream Public Health
- Draft completed 10/8/12
- AC/Expert Work Session 10/22/12
- Revised draft (date tbd)
- PSC Briefing 11/13/12

B) Staff Reports

1) **Hayden Island Natural Resource Inventory (NRI):** This work includes updating an inventory of existing natural resources for all of Hayden Island as well as the south bank of the Oregon Slough. This work provided natural resource background data for the concept planning and ESEE work. Key takeaways include:

- West Hayden Island is a mosaic of features including forests, woodlands, grasslands, wetlands, open areas and shallow water area that function together as one habitat unit.
- Its location at the confluence of the Columbia and Willamette Rivers and on the Pacific Flyway for migrating birds is unique in the region.
- Over 200 wildlife species, included federally-listed fishes, use WHI and the surrounding Columbia River
- Although impacted historically by agricultural activities and on-going dredge material placement, all of WHI is a high-ranked riparian corridor and wildlife habitat area.

2) Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Analysis: This analysis identifies the range of positive, negative, mixed and neutral consequences of allowing, limiting, or prohibiting industrial, recreation, and open space uses on WHI. Key takeaways include:

- This trade-off analysis arrays the consequences and produces a recommendation for the decision makers to consider.
- The recommendation is made within the context of local, regional, state and federal regulations, goals and policies.
- The recommendation is to limit development of WHI to approximately 300 acres of marine terminal uses:
 - allow marine terminal development on land within the IH zoned areas,
 - limit in-water development of docks,
 - limit recreation to areas east of the BPA power lines, and
 - require mitigation for impacts to resources within open space areas.

3) Recreation Analysis: This memo draws on previous recreational work done for the Hayden Island plan and ENTRIX in phase 1 of this project. The memo identifies local recreational needs, opportunities to meet those needs on West Hayden Island, or on property just east of the railroad and ways to reduce the negative impacts between recreation and natural resources and recreation and marine terminals. Key takeaways include:

- Previous studies and planning processes indicate that Hayden Island is deficient in public recreation facilities.
- Low-impact recreation opportunities on West Hayden Island must be sensitive to the existing natural resource function.
- The base concept plan provides opportunities for low impact recreation such as trails, potential non-motorized boat launches and wildlife viewpoints.

4) Regulatory Requirements Analysis: This report reviews federal, state, regional and local environmental regulations and policies that could affect future development of WHI. Examples include Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, and Environmental Protection Agency’s Strategic Plan for the Columbia River, the State’s Estuary Partnership Management Plan and Federal Emergency Management Agency requirements. Key takeaways include:

- There are several overlapping regulations and policies that address natural resources on WHI. Specific regulatory requirements are difficult to predict until there is a specific proposal.
- State and federal regulations apply to in –water resources and the floodplain. Other resources, such as forests and grasslands, are not regulated at the state or federal level, but can be regulated at the local level.
- The final base concept plan, if developed as shown, would require mitigation, both on- and off-island to achieve no-net-loss of ecosystem functions. This mitigation is above what would be required solely through existing regulations.

- There are different areas off-site that could receive compensatory mitigation. The port is proposing work on Government Island.

5) Vancouver Port Coordination: This analysis looks at advantages and opportunities for increased coordination between the Port of Portland and Port of Vancouver as well as some research on interstate Port Authority logistics. Key takeaways include:

- Formal and informal coordination has increased more recently among the ports. One example is the deepening of the Columbia River.
- Greater coordination and/or sharing of operations may be possible if both parties agree to the benefit.
- Creation of bi-state, joint port authorities require an arduous process involving both state governments and an act of Congress. NY/NJ is the only current example related to marine ports.

6) Land Management Options: This analysis discusses options for how natural resource lands could be managed over the long term, including proposals for long term ownership, and strategies to pay for land management activities. Key takeaways include:

- There are several options for long term ownership and maintenance, but port mitigation activities may be best on port-owned property.
- Creating a master plan for the on-going management of the natural resources and recreation areas is important to achieve long-term goals.
- A financing strategy is important to get up front, through the use an agreement to ensure adequate funding in the future.

7) North Portland Rail Study Analysis: This analysis reviewed previous rail and freight studies with an emphasis on reviewing congestion issues within the rail corridor in North Portland, Vancouver and the bridge, and summarized the recommendations from these reports for improving efficiency. Key takeaways include:

- There are several studies that have considered congestion issues along the rail lines (BNSF & UP) in North Portland. Most expect congestion to increase.
- Speed limitations on either side of the bridge are a greater impediment to efficiency than the bridge itself. Track improvements that increase the speed of freight trains in the vicinity of North Portland and Peninsula Junction would provide benefit to both freight and passenger trains.
- Long term goals to accommodate high-speed passenger rail would require large-scale improvements made to the entire line, including the potential for a dedicated track along the entire corridor.

8) Transportation Modeling Analysis (produced by PBOT): Phase I of this transportation analysis was conducted for what was determined to be a reasonable high impact traffic generation scenario for a 300 acre Port development

site that includes two auto import terminals and one bulk marine facility on WHI. Phase II provided a detailed operational level analysis at the intersection level. Key takeaways:

- The high impact scenario was modeled with and without a WHI bridge, using the Hayden Island Neighborhood plan future street network and the CRC Option D interchange design
- The high impact scenario generates up to 2,050 daily vehicle trips, including 516 trucks. PBOT report explained that 12% of the 2035 Hayden Island traffic would be attributable to the Port development. This number is the average Port impact on all the different links in the model that was studied on Hayden Island. This modeling number is useful only as a way to understand the total system-wide impact, but it is not a representation of the impact at any one location.
- The PBOT modeling suggests that in 2035 about 22% of the anticipated traffic in the vicinity of the manufactured home community would be port-generated.
- The modeling suggests that all intersections, except for one off-island, are projected to operate at the level meeting both City and ODOT mobility standards in 2035. Several intersections may be close to their capacities, and mitigation could be required.

9)

Environmental Mitigation

- The Proposed Draft IGA released on August 14, 2012 included floodplain forest mitigation actions for development impacts to 149 acres of existing forest on WHI. Following the goal of achieving a net increase in ecosystem functions and using the City's Forest Mitigation Framework (March 22, 2012), staff determined that the forest mitigation actions proposed in the IGA achieved 88% of the obligation (see Attachment A). This left a gap of 12% to get to full mitigation and some additional actions necessary to achieve a net increase in ecosystem functions.
- Since the release of the Proposed Draft IGA staff have held a Mitigation Work Session with the Advisory Committee and met with Planning and Sustainability Commission members, ODFW, Audubon, LCREP and the Mayor's office to develop options that achieve a net increase in ecosystem functions.
- Table 1, below, is a summary of the options, including the Port's and Audubon's proposals. The table uses the City's Forest Framework methodology for determining percent obligation and uses the EconW methodology for determining costs (see Attachment B). Following the table are explanations and maps of Options A and B.

Table 1: Summary of Forest Mitigation Options						
Forest Mitigation Element		Proposed Draft IGA	Option A: Maximize WHI + GI	Option B: No WHI Actions	Port Proposal	Audubon Proposal
WHI	Protect remaining forest	234 ac 16%	313 ac 21%	313 ac 21%	313 ac 21%	313 ac 21%
	Enhance remaining forest	145 ac 23%	224 ac 35%	NA	NA	145 ac 23%
	Re-establish forest	NA	22 ac 7%	NA	NA	NA
GI	Enhance existing forest	296 ac 18%	296 ac 18%	296 ac 18%	100 ac 6%	NA
	Re-establish forest	174 ac 31%	174 ac 31%	174 ac 31%	150 ac 27%	NA
Off-site	Grant to 3 rd Party	NA	NA	\$10.4M (+50%)*	NA	\$30M (+44%)
~ % obligation		88%	112%	+100%	54%	+100%
~ Cost		\$20.4M**	\$23.6M	\$26.7M	\$9.4M**	\$32M

* Used Sauvie Island site as proxy to calculate amount needed to fill gap. Land value is included.

** Port and City IGA Scenario do not incorporate value of Government Island and WHI land

Table 2: Option A – Maximize Floodplain Forest Mitigation on WHI				
Total Impacted Acres = 148.5				
Mitigation Action	Acres	Effective Mitigation Ratio	Acres Mitigated	Percent Obligation Achieved
Protect remaining forest on WHI	313	10 : 1	31	21%
Enhance remaining forest on WHI	224	4.3 : 1	52	35%
R-establish forest on WHI	22	2.1:1	10	7%
Re-establishment floodplain forest on Gov. Is.	174	3.8 : 1	46	31%
Enhanced floodplain forest around plantings on Gov. Is.	302	11 : 1	28	18%
Total			167	112%

Table 3: Forest Mitigation including the Sauvie Island Surrogate Site				
Total Impacted Acres = 148.5				
Mitigation Action	Acres	Effective Mitigation Ratio	Acres Mitigated	Percent Obligation Achieved
Protect remaining forest on WHI	313	10 : 1	31	21%
Re-establishment floodplain forest on Gov. Is.	174	3.8 : 1	46	31%
Enhanced floodplain forest around plantings on Gov. Is.	302	11 : 1	28	18%
Protect Sauvie Island Site	206	15:1	14	9%
R-establish forest on Sauvie Island	133	2.5:1	53	36%
Enhance forest on Sauvie Island	73	11.5:1	6	4%
Total			178	119%

VI. Final Votes

A) Voting Protocol

At the November 9, 2012 AC meeting, the voting members were polled on the Draft WHI Annexation Proposal and contents of this transmittal. The AC's collaboration Principles defines the 1-2-3 voting protocol as follows:

- **"One"** indicates **full support** for the proposal as stated.
- **"Two"** indicates that the participant **agrees with the proposal as stated, but would prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it full support.** Nevertheless, the member will support the consensus even if his/her suggested modifications are not supported by the rest of the group because the proposal is worthy of general support, as written.
- **"Three"** indicates **refusal to support** the proposal as stated.

Please note, not all members who were seated on the AC participated in the full process. The vote tally below contains the names of all voting members, whether they participated or not. Some members submitted formal resignations during the process, and their names have been removed.

B) Topic-by-Topic Final Votes

See Appendix D

VII. AC Recommendations

Highlights of the Advisory Committee Recommended WHI Annexation Proposal with an emphasis on the Areas of Agreement and Areas of Disagreement follows.

A) General Areas of Agreement on Major Topics

Insert Summary Chart

B) General Areas of Disagreement on Major Topics

Insert Summary Chart

C) Financial Package

Insert After Meeting

D) Final Report Vote

Taken as a whole, do you support the Final Report, as amended by today's votes?

Voting Members (Alternate)	Interest Represented	Final Votes		
		1	2	3
Susan Barnes	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife			
Andrew Colas	Colas Construction			
Andy Cotugno	Metro			
Pam Ferguson	Hayden Island Resident			
Don Hanson	OTAC Consultants and BPS Planning & Sustainability Commission			
Chris Hathaway	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership			
Brian Owendoff	Capacity Commercial Group			
Emily Roth	Portland Parks and Recreation			
Sam Ruda	Marine Director, Port of Portland			
Bob Tackett	NW Oregon Labor Council			
Victor Viets	Hayden Island Resident			

E) AC Letters and Minority Reports

All members had the opportunity to submit letters of support or additional information if they voted "1" or "2," or a "minority report" if they voted a "3." Please see [Appendix D](#) for letters and minority reports. The letters discuss the following topics:

Add Brief Themes Summary Post Final Meeting

VII. Conclusion

Insert Post Final Meeting

Insert Names of AC Subcommittee members

Respectfully Submitted by Sam Imperati, process facilitator, on behalf of the Advisory Committee Members:

Susan Barnes, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Andrew Colas, Colas Construction
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Pam Ferguson, Hayden Island Resident
Don Hanson, OTAC Consultants and BPS Planning & Sustainability Commission
Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership
Brian Owendoff, Capacity Commercial Group
Emily Roth, Portland Parks and Recreation
Sam Ruda, Marine Director, Port of Portland
Bob Tackett, NW Oregon Labor Council
Victor Viets, Hayden Island Resident

VIII. Appendix

	Document	L:ocation
A)	Advisory Committee Collaboration Principles	Web Link
B)	Advisory Committee Meeting Notes	Web Link
C)	Topic-by-Topic Final Votes	Attached
D)	Advisory Committee Letters and Minority Reports	Attached

Appendix D – Final votes

1) Transportation Impacts and Mitigation

Topic	Options/Terms	Further Reading...	Recommendations
1. Bridge	Build a bridge from WHI to Marine Drive		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
2. NHI Drive	Reconstruct North Hayden Island Drive (NHID) w. improved sub grade, bike and pedestrian facilities, and enhanced buffer. + Transportation System Plan (TSP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) designations – change NHID to higher level freight classification, add to project lists + Remove bridge from TSP and RTP project lists, but add TSP policy to allow us to revisit in future if need is identified	Proposed Draft, Section IV, Comp Plan Amendments, pages 18-29. Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 105-107	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
3. Truck Cap	Cap of 175 - The proposed zoning code limits heavy truck trips to a maximum of 175 trips daily. City Council would need to amend the zoning code to change that cap.	Proposed Draft, Section V, Zoning Code Amendments, pages 58-59	A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN B) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN C) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus
Select One: A, B, C	A) No Heavy Truck Cap		
	B) Cap of 205		
	C) Cap of 225		

			MAJ – MIN
4. Exceed Cap	Allow an option to exceed the cap via Land Use Review?		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
5. CRC Timing	CRC must happen before Port development. If CRC is not built, require new transportation study and City Council consideration of IGA and zoning code amendments.	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 105-107	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
6. Ramp Advocacy	Advocate for onramps on/near NHID, away from community street and LRT station		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
7. Rail Spur	The Port and City agree to make a good faith effort to secure funding for the rail access spur to WHI		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAG - MIN
8. N. Portland Junction and CRC rail	The Port and City agree to make a good faith effort secure funding for North Portland Junction and Columbia River rail bridge improvements	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, page 107	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
9. OTHER?			

2) Community Impacts and Mitigation

Topic	Options/Terms	Further Reading...	Recommendations
1. Trailhead	Build trailhead with parking and comfort station, and trail to north beach	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 107-108	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
2. Trail	Build trail to meadow or south shore		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
3. Non- Motorized Boat Launch	Build a non-motorized boat launch on south shore of WHI, on Oregon Slough		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAG - MIN
4. Community Park	Purchase land for a new community park east of railroad on Hayden Island		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
6. Funding	Establish an operations/maintenance endowment to support ongoing operation and maintenance of recreational improvements	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, page 108	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
7. Master Planning	Carry out additional master planning process for the open space area (provision in the IGA).	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, page 116	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
8.. Security	The Port agrees to pay \$70,000/year for Hayden Island security for 10 years above current security funding levels	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, page 113	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN

9.. Future HIA	Require future HIA. The Port will fund an additional City/County health related analysis of the Port's specific development plans, prior to the first federal permit or funding application.	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, page 114	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
10. BMPs	Port best management practices to reduce Impacts (Attachment to the IGA)	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 113, and Attachment F	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
11. Community Grant	Establish a Community Benefit Grant program for other specific mitigation actions (tbd) – discuss amount (current proposal is \$25,000/year)	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 113-114	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
12. Buffer	Keep a green buffer east of the marine terminal footprint - OS-zoned	Proposed Draft, Section V, Zoning Code Amendments, pages 48-51 Zoning Map	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
13. Local Hiring	Implement a local hiring agreement	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, page 115	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
14. AQ Monitoring	Ongoing air quality emissions monitoring/reporting program		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
15. Additional Measures	See Next Chart for Details		
16. Ongoing Input	Establish an ongoing WHI Advisory Committee. The Port, in collaboration with the City will sponsor an Advisory Committee for master planning for open space, grant funding, and on-going on site community relations/site mgmt.	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 117-118	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
17. OTHER?			

3) Health Mitigation Measures

Insert Summary of AC Recommended Health Mitigation Measures

WHI AC Health Mitigation Recommendations			
TOPICS and OPTIONS		Where	A/C (1 - 2 - 3)
Key Topics Have Shading in Left Box			
A. AIR QUALITY			
<i>Dust and emissions from the port operations and construction</i>			
	1	Require that dust generated by marine terminal development or construction activities meet or exceed DEQ standards (note: DEQ standards are more stringent than federal standards)	IGA Existing law
	2	Use a carbon and energy life cycle cost analysis during facility design with the goal to achieve a more energy efficient product with a smaller carbon footprint verses conventional design	IGA
	3	Minimize vehicle idling through design of efficient terminal entry and exit gates, as well as the adoption of an idle reduction policy that prohibits unnecessary idling by trucks and equipment	IGA
	4	Incorporate renewable or alternative energy sources into facilities design where technologically feasible and practical to meet the Port's carbon reduction and energy management plan	IGA
	5	Consider facility designs that enable on-site use of alternative fuels or distribution to transportation providers	IGA

	6	Provide electrical infrastructure and the underground backbone to allow electrification of multi-modes: ships, locomotives, and trucks	IGA	
	7	Conduct long term periodic perimeter monitoring to collect air samples of dust	IGA/exiting Port monitoring/compliance program	
	8	Use dust controls: enclosed silos, bag houses, food oil based sprays for grain dust or non-agricultural products to reduce dust		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	9	Place spouts further in shop holds during loading of material or installation of apparatus to slow material during exit from the spout(e.g. adjustable gates or bullets)		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	10	Enclose conveyors and bag houses		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	11	Enclose all material transfer sites		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
Marine and rail sources				
	1	Install shore-side power at Terminals to allow some ships to completely turn off their engines while in berth	IGA	
	2	Increase on-site diesel engines use of ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel and direct to-rail loading		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	3	Meet the North American Emission Control Area fuel requirements by Increasing use of alternative fuels and fuel efficiency	Existing Law	
	4	Continue efforts already in place to replace older engines including repowering tugboats and the Port's dredging vessel	Existing Port Program	

	5	Develop agreements with railroads (Union Pacific and BNSF) to voluntarily reduce locomotive diesel PM emissions in and around the new terminal rail yard as a pilot based on existing California-wide agreement		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	6	Include in agreements with railroads: preparation of a health risk assessment of new yard to a) determine projected cancer risk from rail activity, and b) suggest specific mitigation steps		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	7	Establish a grant program, lower terminal access fees or other incentives to encourage tug assist vessels to accelerate fleet and engine turnover, repowering and retrofits		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
Heavy duty vehicles on the road and/or Port equipment				
	1	Reducing vehicle idling through more efficient traffic movement	IGA	
	2	Provide truck services such as fueling, repair, bathrooms, food and beverages at the Port to reduce reasons for trucks to enter neighborhood (<i>Port: fueling and repair not normally on terminal sites</i>)		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	3	Work with partners to integrate funding and establish a grant program to accelerate fleet and engine turnover, repowering and retrofits		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	4	Set a goal of having 80% of trucks entering the port meet the 2007 EPA particulate matter emissions standards by 2020, or prior to construction of the new terminal (Port of Seattle, 2012)		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	5	Require clean diesel fleets for publicly funded projects		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

	6	Explore an incentive payment scale to pay higher compensation to contractors who retrofit existing machinery and/or replace older fleet		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	7	Switch to cleaner-burning engines and fuels in cargo-handling equipment		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	8	Retrofit older equipment with diesel oxidation catalysts, which breakdown harmful pollutants before they are emitted from an engine		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
<i>Light duty vehicles on the road</i>				
	1	Implement transportation demand management programs where employees are provided incentives for carpooling, bicycling or using alternative transit	<i>Existing City Policy</i>	
	2	Consider operations and transit improvements		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	3	Support Metro’s regional transportation planning process to reduce vehicle miles traveled	<i>Existing City Policy</i>	
	4	Improve fuel efficiency and increase use of cleaner fuels (future reductions will also be seen with stricter emission and fuel standards)	<i>Existing Federal Law</i>	
	5	Conduct regular area air quality monitoring along North Hayden Island Drive		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

Rail and motor vehicle-related emissions			
1	Consider purchasing the parcel of land for sale northeast of the rail line - plant it with trees, and turn it into a park in order to buffer the North side of the existing manufactured home park from rail-related air pollutants		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
2	Purchase and plant additional trees on resident property located within 300 meters of North Hayden Island Drive		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
3	Install air ventilation and filtration in residential units in buildings along NHI Drive and near Interstate-5 (UC Berkeley Health Impact Group, 2010)		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
4	Maintain existing tree cover and plant low-maintenance trees		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
B. Noise and Vibration			
1	Utilize separated rail crossings to eliminate train whistle noise: As per the Worley Parsons concept plan every opportunity to avoid onsite road/rail crossings is to be pursued. This limits the need for train horn noise during terminal operations.	IGA	
2	Incorporate mitigation of air-borne and ground-borne noise and vibration during facility design and construction	IGA	
3	Establish programs to monitor and minimize noise and vibration during operations. Incorporate community feedback on noise impacts through use of the community advisory committee	IGA	

4	Follow the City of Portland’s noise code (Title 18) or the World Health Organization’s Guidelines for Community Noise (whichever is more stringent) in Port development and operations and in future land use and development planning (especially related to sensitive uses like schools or health services centers)	<i>Title 18 is existing city code</i>	
5	Require trucks operating to and from the port to meet noise guidelines such as those included in the City of Portland’s noise code (Title 18) or the World Health Organization’s Guidelines for Community Noise (whichever is more stringent)	<i>Title 18 is existing city code</i>	
6	Develop a forested buffer between future terminal development and residential areas	<i>Part of current zoning proposal</i>	
7	Restrict freight vehicles on local services streets and streets in close proximity to residential areas	<i>Existing City Policy</i>	
8	Install traffic calming devices to reduce traffic speeds. Slower speeds create less traffic noise than higher traffic speeds.		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
9	Utilize “quiet” pavement materials where possible to reduce road noise on truck routes on Hayden Island		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
10	Mandate longshoreman’s association training on railcar breaking techniques to reduce train car noise impacts		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
11	Conduct a noise study, coordinated by the City’s Noise Control Office, that focuses on both indoor residential and outdoor noise levels to help develop appropriate mitigation strategies		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
12	Implement long term, year-round noise monitoring at the terminal perimeter		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

	13	Install sound insulation in new construction and upgrade existing residences to minimize noise exposure.		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	14	Create sound walls to noise exposure		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	15	Minimize use of trucks within the Port – explore other options for movement within the property		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
C. LIGHT				
	1	Develop and implement a site lighting plan including Dark Sky standards, designed by a certified lighting specialist at the beginning of the project, in coordination with facility and site planning experts and including regular updates to evolve with technology.	IGA	
	2	Improve lighting fixtures by using shields, and angle lights to where they are needed to limit glare on neighboring communities	IGA	
	3	Maintain existing vegetated buffer around future terminal footprint and limit lighting around terminal edges	Current zoning proposal	
	4	Incorporate lighting zones that balance facility lighting needs with natural resource areas during facility design	IGA	
	5	Utilize Dark Sky Design guidelines for facility lighting with full cutoff lenses	IGA	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	6	Turn light off when not in use, or use a timer or sensor to turn off lights.		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

	7	Use minimum wattage and warm white tones allowed meeting federal/state standards.		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	8	Adopt the Dark Sky Model Lighting Ordinance, created by International Dark Sky Association, and the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, at the City of Portland, and implement compliant port lighting. Lighting ordinances establish regulations on fixture types to help mitigate light pollution and light trespass to neighboring properties. Relevant ordinances have been passed in Oregon municipalities including Wilsonville, Eugene, and Bend.		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
D. TRAFFIC SAFETY				
	1	Consider constructing the rail and Hayden Island Drive road improvements as some of the first elements of the project, so that this mode could be used for the delivery of materials and equipment	<i>IGA and current zoning code</i>	
	2	Prior to each terminal phase, review construction management plans with HiNoon and Advisory committee to address traffic, noise and vibration	<i>IGA</i>	
	3	Identify and reserve a suitable construction staging area in North Rivergate that could be used for the proposed barge access during the first phase of construction	<i>IGA</i>	
	4	Review of local street routing choices and West Hayden Island Bridge. Consider keeping trucks off town center streets through the Jantzen Beach Super Center Development (Tomahawk Island Drive).	<i>TSP amendments</i>	
	5	Consider traffic calming devices and buffers between roadway and residential areas	<i>IGA</i>	

	6	Provide adequate lane widths and overall roadway widths for truck streets for safe operating conditions and to reduce the potential of curb, signage and street tree damage. But these widths should be taken into consideration with the other roadway users (pedestrians, cyclists)	Existing City Standards	
	7	Provide separation between cyclists and pedestrians and vehicles with a multi-use path. This would provide maximum separation from traffic on NHID and contribute to the recreational environment of the island.		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	8	Consider tools such as signage and signalization for improving pedestrian crossing safety. These include signalized intersections that serve both traffic and pedestrian crossing functions, pedestrian signal changes such as increased pedestrian crossing times, and flashing beacons.	Existing City Policy and design Standards	
E. COMMUNITY DESIGN AND SOCIAL CONNECTIONS				
Social Connections				
	1	Create a community center on the Island, though land acquisition or donation		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	2	Create an island shuttle service with discount fares for residents		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	3	Designate floating homes as an historic district/heritage site (which may help preserve the structures)		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

Housing related health conditions			
1	Provide realty and relocation assistance services for residents		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
2	Create land trust/limited equity housing cooperative at manufactured home community		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
3	Create a fund for upgrade and replacement of mobile homes		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
Economic Instability			
1	Create a housing trust fund		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
2	Create a low-interest loan fund to be accessible by island residents, including preferential programs for manufactured and floating home residents		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
3	Consider a Port buyout of residential properties near the development site, particularly for land that hosts manufactured homes		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
F. EMPLOYMENT			
Occupational Safety			
1	Work with Oregon OSHA to ensure that workplace safety best practices are strictly adhered to in the design and operation of future port facilities	Existing Policy	

	2	Use the Federal Highway Administration’s Highway Safety Manual when designing transportation improvements related to the Development Scenario		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
		<i>Economic Opportunity</i>		
	1	Implement a local hiring agreement to giving North Portland residents priority for jobs on WHI created by the development. The agreement should include specific outreach to Hayden Island residents.	<i>IGA</i>	
	2	Give preference to minorities and minority-owned firms when hiring workers and contractors	<i>Existing City and Port Policies</i>	
		G. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY		
	1	Ensure that bicycle and pedestrian network improvements related to the Development Scenario provide HI residents with safe, convenient access to new outdoor recreation opportunities created by the Development Scenario. Consider:a. developing recreational trails and potential non-motorized boat launch on WHI consistent with concept planb. developing public trail head facilities on WHI with small parking area, interpretative signagec. purchasing adjacent land east of railroad bridge for recreational and buffering improvementsd. developing a community center with nature based/cultural focus on Hayden Island	<i>IGA</i>	
	2	Follow the City of Portland’s best practices for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure planning and design (contained in their Pedestrian Design Guidelines and the Bicycle Plan for 2030) when planning new bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure related to the Development scenario	<i>Existing City Code</i>	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

	3	Ensure with street improvements to Hayden Island Drive that bicycle and pedestrian improvements are made connecting to future CRC improvements. Also considering safety crossings and modal separation for Island community	Existing City Code/Policy	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
	4	Promote and improve the local and regional accessibility of new outdoor recreational opportunities via media campaigns and way-finding infrastructure		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

4) Natural Resources/Environmental Mitigation

Topic	Options/Terms	Further Reading...	Recommend?
1. Zoning Setback	Terminal development is setback 100 feet from the Columbia River	Proposed Draft, Section V, Zoning Code Amendments, pages 50-57	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
2. Docks in Shallow Water	Docks not in shallow water, except limited allowances for access ramps		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
4. Buffer Zone	Buffer zone on west of IH zoning		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
5. Trail Location	No trails allowed west of the BPA power lines – that area for natural resource conservation	Proposed Draft, Section V, Zoning Code Amendments, pages 48-57 and 70-79	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN
6. Low Impact Recreation	The zoning code limits the recreation to low impact activities, including trails, viewing areas, small trailhead area		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN

<p>7. Shallow water mitigation</p>	<p>State and federal permit will determine this (no formal City role)</p>		<p>VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
<p>3. Docks select one A or B</p>	<p>A) Establish minimum mitigation and process to review docks in IGA</p>	<p>Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 109-110</p>	<p>A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
	<p>B) Require local Land Use Review for dock - in Zoning Code</p>	<p>Proposed Draft, Section V, Zoning Code Amendments, pages 80-90</p>	<p>B) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ - MIN</p>
<p>4. Wetland mitigation Select one: A, B or C</p>	<p>A) State and federal permit will determine this (no formal City role)</p>		<p>A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
	<p>B) Establish minimum mitigation acres in IGA</p>	<p>Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 109-110</p>	<p>B) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
	<p>C) Establish standards for mitigation in zoning code</p>	<p>Proposed Draft, Section V, Zoning Code Amendments, pages 80-90</p>	<p>C) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>

<p>5. Forest Mitigation Methodology</p>	<p>Use the City methodology to calculate the amount of forest mitigation</p>	<p>City Methodology white paper distributed to AC in previous meetings</p>	<p>A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
<p>6. Government Island select one: A, B or C</p>	<p>A) Port’s Government Island planting and enhancement proposal (150 acres and 100 acres)</p>		<p>A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
	<p>B) City’s Government Island planting and enhancement proposal (174 and 296 acres)</p>	<p>Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 111-112</p>	<p>B) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
	<p>C) Don’t support Government Island work</p>		<p>C) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
<p>6. West Hayden Island select one: A, B, C or D</p>	<p>A) West Hayden Island enhancement work (145 acres)</p>	<p>Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 111-112</p>	<p>A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
	<p>B) West Hayden island forest enhancement work (224 acres - to reach net ecological improvement)</p>		<p>B) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>
	<p>C) Don’t support these actions on WHI</p>		<p>C) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN</p>

7. Implementation	D) Grant to third party to reach net ecological improvement, or to replace any of the above actions		D) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
	Implementation of GI and HI work by BES		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
	8. Timing	Timing of clearing – wait until rail is ready to permit	VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
9. Permanent Protection	A) OS zoning and Plan District as the primary protection mechanism	Proposed Draft, Section V, Zoning Code Amendments, pages 49, 50, and 61-100	A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
	select one: A, B, C or D	B) OS zoning and Plan District + covenant to prevent removal of zoning	B) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
	C) Conservation easement		C) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
	D) Ownership transfer		D) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN

10. Grassland select one: A or B	A) Grant to third party for conservation work to benefit Western Meadowlark	Proposed Draft, Section VI, IGA, pages 112-113	A) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
	B) Don't support grassland mitigation		B) VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
11. Floodplain	Require balanced cut and fill		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
12. Shallow Water	Review through code or keep in IGA as a future process?		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
13. Wetlands	Standards in A) Code, B) IGA, or C) Keep the future process in the Proposed IGA?		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
14. Grasslands	Require \$1.5M towards Western meadowlark habitat conservation?		VOTE: 1 – 2 – 3 #s: Result: Consensus MAJ – MIN
OTHER?			

