

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, January 22, 2013

6:00-9:30pm

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

**Commissioners Absent:**

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom, Michelle Kunec, Tom Armstrong, Tyler Bump, Jay Sugnet, Diane Hale, Julie Ocken

**Other City Staff Present:** Tim Heron, BDS

**Other Presenters:** Keith Leavitt, Port of Portland

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

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Thanks to all PSC members for your work at meetings, in the community, and other work that you've done this past year.
- Update on apartments and parking: The PSC will have a public hearing on the proposal, which is currently scheduled to be held on March 12. The proposal will be shared about a month before the PSC meeting. Staff will include concepts about a threshold level, access and non-car options more generally in the proposal.
- BPS budget update: This year is particularly challenging. In the past 4 years, we have cut more than 25 positions. This year is looking to be 8-18 out of 105 staff currently. All bureaus have been asked to take a 10 percent cut in General Fund; BPS also has large grants ending this year that will impact staffing levels. We are asking Council to address specific issues to fund including Central Eastside of the CC2035 plan; PDC may fund some of this work. Grants from Metro are another possibility. *Chair Baugh* suggested he write a letter on behalf of the PSC to support the BPS budget. The content of the letter will be a discussion at an upcoming officer briefing.
- January 17 was officially named Gary Oxman Day at the County. He is retiring from the County at the end of the month after 28 years. Thank you!

*Commissioner Houck:* The Nature of Cities blog had an entry from Tim Beatley recently about the importance of sounds of nature in the city. The PSC should consider noise and access to nature sounds as part of the Comp Plan update.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from December 11, 2012 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

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

### Historic Resources Code Improvement Project

Hearing / Recommendation: Diane Hale, Jay Sugnet, Tim Heron

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5517906/>

Documents:

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [Proposed Code](#)

- [Memo with Amendments 01/22/13](#)

Diane provided an overview of the project as outlined in the [presentation](#).

The Goals of the project were to:

- Improve review process to preserve historic character
- Create a quicker, easier and more predictable process for proposals with minor impacts

The amendment package applies citywide, but most of the changes are within residential zones.

Staff have met with various stakeholders about the project. In general the community has supported the project, but there are many other issues the public would like to be addressed. Fees are not included in this project, but they are evaluated annually and adjusted by BDS.

When a historic or conservation district is formed, or when an individual landmark is designated, an inventory is completed that identifies resources within the district or individual property as either contributing or non-contributing.

A contributing resource is a building, structure or object that adds to the property's historical significance, based on the established historic period of significance. A non-contributing resource is one that is within the district or on the property of an individual landmark, but doesn't contribute to the significance of the district or landmark, either due to age or to inappropriate alterations.

A property can change from contributing to non-contributing and vice versa if significant alterations or restoration takes place.

There are 3 types of procedures, which vary based on the complexity of the proposal, who makes the final decision, duration, notice distribution and to what body hears the appeal.

Existing exemptions that are not being proposed to change include fences/retaining walls; decks; and rooftop mechanical equipment and solar panels.

Diane highlighted the new exemptions as outlined in the [proposed amendments](#).

A new Type I procedure is being proposed. The purpose of the new procedure type is primarily to shorten the timeline for homeowners for actions that we want to encourage, such as restoration, and alterations that we don't believe will have a great impact on historic significance. The timeline will be shortened by about half from what the process is today.

This new procedure type will have the same notification procedures as the existing Type I and there will be no local appeal, although it would still be appealable to LUBA.

Many of these alterations are currently processed through a Type II procedure, which does allow for local appeal. There have been some concerns from neighborhood representatives about losing the local appeal and took that into account when thinking about which alterations should go through this new procedure type.

The savings in time, and potentially fees, created with this new procedure are due in part to dropping the local appeal.

Alterations of 150 square feet on non-street-facing façades are proposed to be exempt on non-contributing structures and new Type I on contributing structures: "visible from the street" was the original threshold for the project. But in speaking with other cities' planners, the definition was not clear.

If the building is located adjacent to an open space (e.g. a park), the façade facing the park may not be street facing, but be more visible to the public. In this case, it is still reviewed as a Type I for contributing structures and the exemption is limited to 150 square feet of area.

If there are multiple 150 square foot changes done periodically over time, that would potentially destroy the character. In theory, yes this could happen, but BDS is aware of this kind of creep in the permitting process. This can be enforced during the permitting process.

If a home has an open front porch then the owners wish to enclose it with windows, that would affect the character, even if it's less than 150'. This would be subject to review and would likely be approved if the historic character had windows originally. If not, staff would likely offer suggestions for other options.

Even non-contributing buildings that face the street do have a presence in the district. This is why staff removed the exemption from the front-facing facades.

Staff presented [seven amendments](#) to the original memo in the memo dated January 22, 2013.

Addressing fee concerns: The shorter process means a less fee-intense application process. The \$900 base fee currently just covers BDS staff and document preparation. With a shorter and well-defined process (scope-wise), costs can decrease. BDS may feel the impact initially, and the learning curve will be steep for both staff and applicants. But ultimately the discretion for the staff review will be worth it and will reduce fees. The fee structure review will be reviewed in May on the annual schedule.

BDS is looking at reducing fees historic reviews in the coming cycle.

#### Testimony:

- Harris Matarazo, Landmarks Commission: the HLC endorses the amendments with minor recommended revisions as outlined in their testimony letter. The proposal represents the most feasible way to address stakeholder concerns. Landmarks understands this quick project with no budget cannot serve as a full overhaul for historic design review, so compromises are expected as in the New Type 1 process. Guides and resources could alleviate homeowner concerns with the new process and code interpretation.
- Paul Falsetto, Portland Coalition for Historic Resources: PCHR was formed last March in timing with the Landmarks Commission's state of historic preservation presentation to Council and has been working with BDS and BPS. The result was this code improvement process. They are supportive of the goals to provide a process to allow homeowners in historic districts to do the right things for their property. The New Type I process works to this, even without the option of a local appeal process. Request information sheets like what BDS already provides and reporting to the Landmarks Commission will help alleviate the concern about loss of local appeal.
- Jim Heuer, Historic Preservation Community Coalition of Historic Neighborhoods: Is active with the Irvington District as well and the 97 historic design reviews since November 2010 when the district was created. There haven't been that many historic design review cases in the last 10 years, likely due to people not taking the right process. The Irvington Historic District is anxious for the proper processes in place in this New Type I review. The 150 square foot limit is a challenge, but the Coalition is open minded and excited that restorations come under Type I.
- Craig Lewis: Supports specifically the second draft that addresses non-contributing homes in the historic districts. Also supports practical concept of street-facing versus

non. There is still a big communications gap between the standards and the homeowners. This could be addressed prior to the home purchase so all understand the process.

- Tanya Lyn March: One concern is the learning curve - to get fees reduced, there needs to be a “Cliff Notes” document about the review process and the code improvement project. The code changes don’t address the need for greater clarity about the code. The PSC’s recommendation should include this request for staff and for Council to financially support this work.
- John Hasenberg, Oregon Remodelers Association: Remodelers, contractors, architects and designers are included in the ORA. In general the group is supportive of the code revision work. The New Type I process may not be much less expensive than the current process and will still require lots of work. Hopeful there may be a “Type Zero” process in the future to further decrease staff time.
- Barb Christopher, Irvington Preservation Committee and Community Association; Portland Coalition for Historic Resources: Having worked with many reviews, she has worked to get the word out to homeowners. The concern that people have been blind-sided is shared, so we need to have clear information and a user guide to go along with the code revisions. Examples and definitions can be helpful to reduce questions. In terms of the appeal component, there have only been a couple of appeals in Irvington. With the tools to work with homeowners, there can probably be an even better rate. Fees are part of the process, but the PSC should look at that as something that goes hand-in-hand with the project.
- David Sweet, Sabin Community Association: Solar panels should be allowed in historic districts, even if they are visible. Led the Solarize Northeast project in 2010; more installations could have happened, but they were prohibited in historic and conservation districts. Conservation districts are now allowed to have solar panels due to the 2011 State Bill 766, and this could be applied to historic districts as well. Satellites and other apparatus are allowed, as are storm windows (exempt under new regulations), so solar could be as well. It is imperative to encourage clean energy, so historic district residents should be able to do solar as well.
- Tim Askin, Buckman Community Association: This project is a step in the right direction and the Association applauds the amendments plus one: on Page 9 definition of street-facing should include “Any façade bound by two facades facing the street” to clarify. Portland has the highest fees for review, which need to be reviewed. Homeowner notification before purchase is successful in Salem and should be implemented in Portland too.
- Linda Nettekoven, HAND: This is a good first step, but there is still concern about costs and how prohibitive it is to keep a diversity of housing sizes. Local community members are willing to volunteer to help staff communicate the code and the process.
- Dean Gisvold, ICA: The City of Portland is certified by the OR State Historic Preservation Office, so the new amendments must continue to preserve and protect. There have been 15 complaints filed with BDS in the last 27 months from Irvington. Complaints include fees (plus time and process). The local appeal should remain and would go to Landmarks Commission as the current Type II does.
- Kathy Tiekotter: Supportive of amendments to create the New Type I and some exemptions such as for removal of storm windows. Alterations of a small nature could be susceptible to some interpretation (replacing a component versus a full window).

Street-facing versus non- will create problems because alterations could be visible based on landscaping/tree-scaping. Contractors and realtors need to be fully aware of the code and process.

- James Paul Brown: Appreciate efforts to simplify the code but there is still confusion... solar panels should be allowed. Concern about garages that are less than 300 but more than 200 square feet, so this would bring garages into design review. Something that hasn't been addressed is that provisions should be included for a process to inform property owners of the overlay that will restrict their homes. We need a verification process to ensure property owners understand and can opt in to being incorporated into the district.
- William Hawkins: Has paid fees of almost \$30,000 to review for a conditional use and pre-approval process. This does not preserve and protect. He still remains concerned at the complexity and costs to move an historic landmark (currently treated as a demolition, making another fee addition).

Written Testimony:

- Jodi and Alexander Schoenen
- Portland Coalition for Historic Resources (PCHR)
- ORA Code Committee
- Craig Lewis
- Historic Landmarks Commission
- Hosford Abernathy Neighborhood Association (HAND)
- Robert Dortignacq
- Sabin Community Association
- Dean Gisvold

*Chair Baugh* closed testimony for the hearing.

Discussion:

1. How do we address fees?
  - a. If people know there are concrete steps to addressing the fees, this can be part of the PSC's recommendation to City Council.
2. Forms
  - a. Make sure the costs include forms and assistance to the public are included in a next action plan. We updated the code, but the manual and explaining to the public is as important.

Universal access to solar: There was an extended process in Salem. There are many champions for solar not being in historic districts. Panels are only allowed in rear-facing additions in conservation districts as per the State HB. In Portland we could work on this, but to protect the roof shape, solar panels are not yet as integrated (e.g. via solar shingle technology). Staff is adding an exemption for solar panels in conservation districts that previously required an applicant to go through the community design standards. If technology is changing so rapidly, the PSC may not want to include that in the recommendation this evening. Solar systems are not cheap, but they are something that many homeowners may want to do. There will continue to be divergent opinions. This could be a discussion at the PSC at a later date.

Chimney work: Typically, kitchen chimneys are not mentioned in the nominating documents for a historic district, therefore the removal would not be subject to review.

Street-facing façade: We needed to draw a line for the definition, and this code update is specifically for non-contributing homes. The challenge with visible from the street is that

visibility is dependent on vegetation, building orientation, and implementing a standard would be difficult. Street facing is currently defined in the Code and works well. The Cliff Notes document would be created by BDS. This is not yet in an add package for the upcoming budget, but there is a need for it, and the work already done by neighborhoods can make this easier for staff create and provide to the public.

BDS is working on bringing land use fees down, but we need to be cognizant about subsidizing one form of review and the expense of another. Someone will need to pay more with the current fee structure and that is not the Commission's intent.

Notices to property owners in terms of a historic district happens at the State level, but part of why the project came about is because the City is catching up with this State process. We are allowed to help provide the information to homeowners in proposed historic districts, which could be included in the PSC recommendation. The City did this for Irvington and also just sent a notice to Buckman neighbors.

Items still left undone: There is a list for potential code amendments, but it may be a future RICAP effort, possibly historic-specific RICAP, or another option. Some items are more extensive than a RICAP project and would have to be addressed as their own projects/updates.

Motion:

*Commissioner Hanson* moved to

- Amend Proposed Draft as shown in January 22, 2013 staff memo;
- Adopt the Proposed Draft;
- Recommend that City Council adopt Report and amend Zoning Code as shown in Report;
- Direct staff to continue work to clarify and refine the Report and Code language;
- Create and include "Cliff Notes" for when fee adjustments will be reviewed; and
- Have staff return for a one-year check-in with the PSC after the Landmarks Commission retreat.

*Commissioner Valdez* seconded.

*Chair Baugh* restated the motion, and the motion passed.

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

## **Brownfields Study**

Briefing: Tyler Bump

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5516956/>

Documents:

- [Memo and Overview](#)
- [Final Report](#)

This briefing will be held at a later date.

## **Comprehensive Plan Update - Working Draft**

Briefing: Michelle Kunec

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5518059/>

Michelle provided an overview of the Comp Plan, the State-mandated long-range plan that helps us:

- prepare for and manage expected population and employment growth;

- plan for and coordinate major public investments; and
- guide decision-making on land use, transportation, parks, sewer and water systems, natural resources, and other topics.

Key Directions of the plan are to:

- Invest to reduce disparities
- Support youth success
- Build a resilient economy
- Create complete neighborhoods
- Connect people and places
- Design with nature
- Response to local context

The Working Draft - Part 1 was just published and is also available [online](#).

Major sections include:

#### **Vision (draft)**

- Portland is a prosperous, educated, healthy, equitable and resilient city where everyone has access to opportunity and is engaged in shaping the decisions that affect their lives.
- Our thriving economy supports the prosperity of our diverse population.
- Portlanders are connected to their city, their communities, and nature and the city sustains healthy neighborhoods, watersheds and families.
- Our distinct neighborhoods and vibrant downtown are safe, energizing civic and cultural spaces. Our diverse population, innovative businesses and forward-thinking leaders work together to ensure livability for all.

6 integrated goals in align with the Portland Plan to serve as overarching guides for decision-making in the future.

#### **Urban Design Framework**

- Organizing themes of the city including natural areas, greenway and centers.

#### **Goals and Policies: Chapters**

- Community Involvement
- Housing
- Economic Development
- Watershed Health and Environment
- Urban Design and Development
- Public Facilities and Services
- Transportation
- Administration and Implementation

#### **Next Steps**

- Staff is working on the Alternative Scenarios report: background analysis and report, which will come to the PSC for a briefing on 02/12/13.
- Public discussion and feedback: public workshops, PEGs, Community district discussions, survey/questionnaire, comment opportunities online or in writing.

Commissioners can provide feedback in writing or set up a time to meet with staff. Comments are requested by May 1 to keep the process moving forward.

7 workshops will be held in February and March. Each workshop will have a general session as well as breakout sessions for small group discussions.

Longer-term, once the community input for the working draft part 1, we will look at releasing part 2 (Urban Design Framework, Comp Plan Map, List of Significant Projects, Citywide Systems Plan, Transportation Systems Plan), likely late in the summer.

*Commissioner Houck* reiterated that he is hopeful the issue of noise can be reviewed as part of the health section.

## **West Hayden Island**

Work Session: Eric Engstrom

Presentations:

- <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5516957/>
- <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5517913/>

Document:

- [Memo and Chart](#)

*Commissioner Rudd* recused herself from this project update.

Eric provided an outline of the next steps for the WHI project.

- Work Sessions at the PSC will be Jan. 22 and 29 and Feb. 12 and 26
- Release of new plan: March 5
- Public Input taken on plan through March
- PSC Briefing: March 12 about the new plan
- Hearings at the PSC: April 2 and 9 (continuation if needed); public testimony taken
- April 23: Work Session/vote at the PSC (which could be at the April 9 meeting if all testimony is done)

Much of the timeline revolves around financing from the Port. In the [chart](#), a timeline is provided. The terminal operation is assumed to be in 2025, so everything prior to this time is pre revenue. The bottom line shows the presumed window for constructing the CRC.

Key IGA Issues/sticking points include:

- Timing and costs for environmental mitigation, community and housing funds and recreational funds
- Recreation: total cost, “environmentally clean” and disagreement over responsibility for design, engineering, capital improvements
- Fund versus Endowment
- Forest - cost for plantings; percentage improvement; timing
- Shallow Water habitat land use process-standards versus land use review
- Wetland mitigation acreage
- Truck Cap and process for exceeding the cap

Transportation in the IGA:

- North Hayden Island Drive reclassification and reconstruction (3.1.1)
- Improvements designed for tractor trailers, passenger vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians (3.1.1)
- Buffering treatments to mitigate roadway noise (3.1.1)
- City cost sharing up to \$5.25 million (3.1.1.1)
- Port obligation for remainder - they are likely to seek grants (3.1.1.5)
- Trucks capped at 205 trips (102.5 in/102.5 out=205) (IGA -3.1.3 & Code 33.595.220)



- Re-open agreement if no CRC (3.1.4)
- Advocate for regional freight rail improvements (3.1.7)

#### **Natural Resource Mitigation in the IGA:**

- Agreement to retain OS zoning in the future and include 3<sup>rd</sup> party as part of future agreement (4.1.1 & 7.4)
- Forest - Planting and enhancement work on both Government Island and WHI (4.3.3 & 4.3.4)
- Forest - No forest clearing permitted outside dredge area prior to securing federal permits (4.3.7)
- Port allowed to convert up-front forest work to mitigation bank in the event of transfer to a 3rd party if terminal is not built during term of agreement.
- Shallow Water - Impose local land use process for shallow water (33.595.300-500)
- Wetlands - Require early consultation for wetlands, with minimum replacement (4.2.4 - 4.2.5)
- Flood plain - Port required to complete ESA consultation before re-mapping (4.3.7)
- Grassland - Contribution to Western Meadowlark conservation (4.4)
- Additional costs and BES/Parks participation in master planning for the 500 acres (7.2.1)

#### **Community Impact Mitigation in the IGA:**

- Commitment to on-site Best Management Practices (BMPs) (5.2.1)
- Community benefit grant fund (\$100k/yr 10yrs, at least \$25k after based on heavy truck traffic) (5.3.2-5.3.4)
- Manufactured Home Park Grant Fund (\$3.6million) (5.3.5)
- Sequence for future health analysis/HIA and establishment of fund to implement additional mitigation(5.4.3-5.4.5)
- Ongoing Advisory Committee and Good Neighbor Agreement (7.2.2)
- Local Hiring Practice (6.1.3)
- Recreational improvements, trails, parking lot, restrooms and overlook on WHI (\$1.8 million) (3.2.1)
- Park acquisition (Port): 6 acres on East Hayden Island. The Port provides \$7M to the City for design, engineering and capital improvements. The City provides \$1M. (3.2.2.1)
- Operations and Maintenance funding for Parks for WHI rec. improvements and East Hayden Island parks (3.2.4)

#### **Upcoming PSC work sessions include:**

- 1/29 - Environmental and Tribal Involvement
- 2/12 - Community Health and Transportation
- 2/26 - Economic, Finance and Legal

#### **Discussion**

*Commissioner Houck* noted a key issue that is missing is floodplain fill. Staff noted the list isn't comprehensive.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that Senate Bill 766 was not meant to apply to WHI, but the Federal legislation may trump the SB anyway. In the IGA we could explicitly say that SB 766 implications are waived.

- Eric: The potential issue that we can continue to discuss is 766 setting up designations to which we don't want to inadvertently tie our hands that could cut off funding.

*Commissioner Shapiro* - asked about the structure for the community benefit work. That will be addressed and discussed at the work session on February 12.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that in this region we frequently talk about getting grants. This project shouldn't compete with other projects in the region on grant funding, so this needs to be addressed.

- Eric: The term "grant" here includes (and mostly relates to) Federal funding related to transportation and economic development.
- *Chair Baugh* noted there is a defined amount of money; if the grant takes away funding for a specific item, where does the funding go? Can we be sure to manage grant funding to provide for other items that may be left off the list?

*Commissioner Houck*: We have lots of input on the language for the IGA. How will this document change?

- Eric: The documents provided in preparation for the upcoming work session with staff recommendations will be followed up in March with a fully updated IGA.
- The PSC provides recommendations to Council, who becomes the negotiator for the IGA.

Keith Leavitt, GM Business Development and Properties, Port of Portland presented an overview of:

- Port Background
- Financial Structure
- Industrial Land Focus
- West Hayden Island Development

The Port of Portland was established in 1891 with a (current) mission to enhance the region's economy and quality of life by providing efficient cargo and air passenger access to global markets.

Port of Portland facilities include three airports, four marine terminals and five business parks.

When the port leases or sells its property, private developments on Port property, businesses owe taxes as other private uses do.

2011 Economic Impact:

- About 27,000 jobs in Marine and Aviation
- About 31,000 jobs in the Industrial Business Parks
- \$1.7 billion in personal income
- Nearly \$4.6 billion in business revenue
- \$164 million in local and state taxes

Financial Structure:

- Port Annual Revenues: \$278.2 million (2011-12)
  - Aviation funds: \$210.3 million
  - General Fund: \$67.9 million
- 96 percent generated from business transactions
- 4 percent from Tri-County property taxes

WHI resides in the General Fund of this financial structure.

In FY11-12, 44 percent of the Port's revenue was from marine operations. Lots of this is from land leases (private parties have long-term leases and pay land rent). Only 5 percent was industrial development.

For Land Investments:

- General Fund revenues are used for:
  - O&M of Port Marine and Industrial business lines

- Lower Willamette Superfund costs (pre cleanup support)
- Reserves
- Property Tax revenues can be used for:
  - Asset preservation and modernization
  - Debt service payments
- General Fund cash is used for new business investment:
  - Focus on large industrial sites for “traded sector” development and job creation
  - ROI requirements
  - Land sales - allow for reinvestment

These are not dependent on leverage; there are more streams that feed the general fund than there have been previously, which provide financial stability.

The Port looked at large industrial sites that are suitable for traded sector industry. The inventory of market ready, large industrial sites is limited:

- 56 industrial sites were identified with 25-plus net developable acres
  - 9 Tier 1 sites (sites that are 6 months to shovel-ready)
  - 16 Tier 2 sites (7 months to 2.5 years to shovel-ready)
  - 31 Potential Tier 3 sites (more than 2.5 years to shovel-ready). WHI is included in this category.

WHI poses development challenges:

- Port context
  - Mission critical
  - Unique property
  - Patient but “rational” investment
- Public and private financing required
  - Schedule and regulatory uncertainty
  - Port General Fund constraints
  - Timing between development and anticipated future revenues

A big question is how development ready WHI needs to be to be attractive to private funding. Working to get entitlements from a land use perspective is the first step.

*Commissioner Houck:* In the context of the presentation and the IGA timeline, now through 2018, the timeline says “seek terminal developer”. If this takes another 20 years more, what is the impact on the rest of the flowchart?

- This is the challenge. We need to do enough investing to create the optimal point for a third-party developer to come in. The concern is that the outlay of capital prior to the developer investing creates a major cash flow problem.

On WHI, the Port would earn revenue via the lease with the terminal developer and dockage fees from ships. The revenue streams include rent from the land itself and the dockage fees. For example, T5 provides \$3.5M annually.

When did the Port’s mission morph from export to regional economic development agency? There is a void in economic development agencies AND there is money to be made. The Port has relatively good access to capital. The land development side has been working for many year, but it hasn’t been as front and center as it has been over the past 5 or so years.

WHI is a real estate deal. We have to figure out if it will work, if it is economically feasible, which gets to part of the PSC review and decision.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting at 9:45pm.