

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, May 7, 2013

5:00 – 9:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

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

**Commissioners Absent:** Andre' Baugh, Michelle Rudd (recused)

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom, Julie Ocken

*Vice Chair Shapiro* called the meeting to order at 5:02p.m. and provided an overview of the agenda.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the April 9, 2013 PSC meeting.

*Vice Chair Shapiro* asked for any comments for the consent agenda. *Commissioner Smith* moved to approve. *Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

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

(Y9 – Gray, Hanson, Houck, Ovalles, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

### West Hayden Island

Hearing: Eric Engstrom

Documents:

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [Amended Proposed Draft for West Hayden Island](#)
- [West Hayden Island Natural Resources Inventory Proposed Draft \(April 2013\)](#)
- [West Hayden Island Natural Resources Inventory Proposed Draft Appendices \(April 2013\)](#)
- [West Hayden Island Economic, Social, Environmental, Energy Analysis Proposed Draft \(April 2013\)](#)

Eric gave a brief overview of past work done on the WHI project. These items included the PSC's hearings in November 2012, which directed staff to lead the commission in work sessions from January through March about specific topics of concern or ones that needed further information.

Based on the PSC's direction from those work sessions, staff revised the draft, which is the topic of this hearing. Next week will be a follow-up to tonight's hearing if needed. May 28 will be a work session to talk about what the commission heard from the public as well as about potential additional amendments. Staff plans to return a document to the PSC with responses to issues and testimony in writing on May 21 with the staff amendment package slated for discussion on May 28. A PSC vote may be at that meeting or in June or July.

Representatives from Tribal Governments will speak first tonight. Like in the previous WHI hearings, 3 representatives from the WHI Advisory Committee will provide opening comments as well followed by general public testimony.

Written testimony that has been received to date has been uploaded for the commissioners'; this is all part of the record.

Tribal Representatives:

- Jonalee Squeochs, Environmental Coordinator, Yakama Nation: Concern with the proposal to annex and zone the 300 acres as industrial. This impacts fisheries and health of Columbia River and is contrary to the guidance to preserve, protect and enhance natural areas. Salmon is paramount to the tribe's culture, religion and health. Annexation doesn't provide for resource protection; this is an irreplaceable ecosystem. Regionally, industrial zoning goes against salmon recovery. The risk outweighs benefits or gains on WHI.
- Dianne Barton, Water Quality Coordinator, CRITFC: CRITFC represents 4 tribes (Umatilla, Warm Springs, Yakama, Nez Perce). She offered thanks for the coordination and consultation with tribes in the IGA in section 7, but it is far from complete in aiding salmon runs. Industry on WHI will threaten gains that have been made in restoration, and the IGA is too vague about where and when shallow water floodplain mitigation will occur. The proposed plan is not staying ahead of the curve regarding NEPA and other environmental quality goals. CRITFC does appreciate that the plan establishes a WHI district with environmental regulations and asks that tribal concerns with individual permit applications are addressed should the plan go forward.

*Commissioner Gray* noted comments about sewer and stormwater and asked what it would take for tribes to support the plan.

- Tribal leaders don't see any actions. Tribes are in opposition.

*Commissioner Houck* noted he was pleased about the tribes' comments on the floodplain. This is important for tribes; CRITFC's focus is habitat and viability of mitigation plans.

Invited Testimony from members of the WHI Advisory Committee:

- Keith Leavitt, Port of Portland: Shared an appreciation of the work staff has done over the past 4 years. The Port remains excited about the opportunity with WHI as it is a once-in-a-generation piece of property. The market is there long-term for marine industrial development, and we are in a market window right now. The Port doesn't have capital to fund projects in advance, so they will need to have a lease structure with a private party to fund site preparation and mitigation efforts. Financially, the site prep is roughly \$60M (fill and other projects to move it to market-ready). The mitigation price on the proposal is about \$80M. The Port proposal from December was \$100M, so there is concern about the gap. The City's proposal is close to \$12/square foot, but the market for industrial land is \$6/square foot; the Port's proposal was about \$7-8/square foot. The overall size of mitigation is the most concerning.
- Victor Viets, Hayden Island Community: Topics and issues from before are still the same for the community. There is no certainty on mitigation issues and no need for a port project. The Port has not been doing well aside from Port Terminal 5, losing tonnage in the past 10 years. Containers have declined in the last 18 years. Auto shipments have increased less than .5 percent per year in the last 32 years. There is nothing documented showing a need that we're trying to meet showing in Portland. The needs have been defined for the Lower Columbia Basin as a whole. Fully loaded ships will not be able to get up the Columbia, but these larger ships will be accommodated at other West Coast ports and are not appropriate now to incorporate into WHI. The CRC project is still undecided and unfunded, so we don't know how that project will impact the plan and the island either.
- Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership: Thank you for the approach to WHI. The planning and decision process was falling apart towards the end of 2012, but the PSC

established a realistic schedule with the work sessions earlier this year. City staff has followed through, and the new IGA is better, yet it still falls short on environmental issues. Columbia River main stem islands are irreplaceable. Mitigation efforts will take years to mature to function as they do on WHI currently. Focusing on forest mitigation, the current draft goals are dropped from 110 to 101 percent enhancement, but 1 percent is not measureable. Floodplain impacts are in the IGA, but the project is still insufficient for the river to engage with the floodplain. We need to review the area compared to a 2-year flood event to provide habitat. There IGA doesn't require mitigation on WHI itself, but there is room on WHI to do some mitigation. Environmental mitigation costs should not come at expense of taxpayers.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about "who pays". He appreciates that mitigation shouldn't compete with other publicly-funded projects, but, for example, we fund economic development in a number of ways.

- We are specifically talking about environmental mitigation. There is a limited pot of money, especially for natural resource mitigation. Funds shouldn't be diverted from other projects.
- We need the Port to explain what economic value they're bringing to justify the public investment.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked for an elaboration about 2-year floodplains.

- This is the standard Bonneville Power Administration uses to evaluate projects that they fund, and they fund most of the projects on the Lower Columbia. This is a proxy for inundation periods between January and July when juvenile salmon are swimming downriver and need that place. The 2-year flood event is a measure to compare projects in different geological areas.

*Commissioner Houck* noted we'll need a visual presentation of what's being discussed in terms of floodplain mitigation. Floodplain mitigation must be for 2-, 5- 10, and 30-year basis as well as 100 year flood event to account for full range of ecological functions of the floodplain. This river is tidally influenced, too.

*Commissioner Gray:* As a point of process as we're winding down on the hearings, can the Port give their comments about economic development?

- The Port has provided written testimony. There is a little over a \$4/square foot difference between the land value assessment in their work and in the City's estimates. Port jobs create good economic benefits with good living-wage jobs.

Testimony:

1. Tim Helzer: Discussed the Port's plan as if it were an investment prospectus. It includes nothing specific about what marine services will generate a profit. Most development costs are vague and incomplete. There is limited compensation for destruction of natural habitat; air and livability; and the addition of trucks. There is no clear market demand, and the benefits are doubtful. The possible return on investment won't be until 40 years from now.
2. Beverly Bookin: 30 years as land use planner including advocacy for an adequate land supply for jobs. The plan is overly-costly and the mitigation package doesn't balance the regional economic benefits. The mitigation package includes requiring 1.030 acres of restoration to off-set 130 acres of disturbance, but that is a ratio of 8:1 instead of "roughly proportional to the nature and extent of actual impacts." We need a more balanced package. We first need to determine what is related significantly of the 130 acres of impact. Then we need to look at the price tag. It's not clear all the environmental mitigation is necessarily attributable to a new Port facility.

3. Robert Bernstein: The Port offers nothing besides pie-in-the-sky ideas about prospective jobs the Port facility on WHI will provide. Piecemeal mitigation doesn't work. Port is not willing to ante up its own money to build. We need a better deal or leave it undone.
4. Pamela Treece, ED Westside Economic: Supports annexation of the site. Over 105 Washington County companies ship through the Port. We want to ensure financial viability of the Port. Portland is 12<sup>th</sup> in the top 100 port cities, 3<sup>rd</sup> for fastest growth of exports. A majority of consumers live outside of U.S., and we need to accommodate an increase in commodity movement. Over 143,000 jobs are related to trade, and the future WHI Port development could create \$198-240M with State and local taxes of \$18-30M that would go to social services including education. Make a balanced recommendation.
5. Stefan Karlic, HILP: There is no comprehensive business plan. We are thankful to BPS staff, but unknowns have worked against creating a feasible business opportunity. Government Island mitigation is too far from WHI. There is no need through 2050 for export expansion.
6. Lucinda Karlic, HILP: Against industrialization of WHI, and the Port has not proven a need for an additional port facility. Industry will negatively impact the manufactured home community, a number of which are owned by elderly residents who will have trouble getting to services and needs with the traffic increase. Many residents who can, will leave, and the new way of life and health won't be restored.
7. David RedThunder: Hayden Island resident. Portland is the only U.S. city with the amount and diversity of wildlife it has in the city. Agencies don't want to look at Hayden Island because they have to maintain the wildlife there. But we're talking about the future and need to recognize all its wildlife. There is already too much dredging that has been done on the island.
8. Laurie Wall, Inland Sea Maritime Group: Spoke about the recreation mitigation issues. ISMG has a draft concept plan for a public park that includes a motorized and non-motorized boat ramp, and the plan is supported by many. The proposed location would serve as a gateway to the Port's facility. There is a serious lack of access for boaters to the Columbia River right now. Schooner Creek Boat Works would be able to use the proposed ramp.
9. Kevin Flanigan, Inland Sea Maritime Group: Supports annexation for the marine terminal with increased recreational mitigation efforts for the community. The Oregon State Marine Board noted that more motorized boat access is important to the Columbia River. Development would offer softscape throughout the open space on Hayden Island, but there are limited ways to get a boat in the water. A boat ramp in this location at Canoe Bay, would be out of the current, which would be beneficial for public safety as well. Hayden Island Drive would have to be relocated for sufficient parking with the entrance into Hayden Island realigned to the south. The 3 property owners who would be affected have confirmed they would be willing to work together or sell to accommodate the park.

*Commissioner Gray:* Do you have the concept plan for the recreation development? This was submitted to the PSC via letter from attorney John Pinkstaff. It would be directly east of the train bridge, where the 3 acre park is envisioned, but it would increase the park size to 6 acres.

*Commissioner Schultz:* Is there concern about additional traffic to the park?  
The proposal recommends an additional bridge for all users of Hayden Island.

10. Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society of Portland: Thanks to the PSC for your work. This has been an improved process, more deliberate and better. There is still significant work to do. Proponents for development hide behind Goal 9 to find new industrial land even if it degrades the environment and destroys natural areas. We need to use thoughtful planning. No place in the U.S. calls out for more inter-Port cooperation than Columbia River ports. We can't develop Hayden Island while that remains unresolved. Risk and burden are both on the side of the public.
11. Pia Welch, Portland Freight Committee: Family-wage jobs should be built upon with the proposed Port facility. We need to balance this with equitable environmental and community mitigation.
12. Jodi Guetzloe Parker, Columbia Pacific Building Trades: Represents a coalition of labor unions that work together to build projects. There are concerns with the City's approach to WHI. This is prime industrial lands, but with only 300 acres for job creation, it won't create much. There is a great need for balancing the environment with local community needs. We should favor the working class and creation of family-wage jobs. A new terminal would generate revenue for schools, fire, police, and other basic services, and would help create an international commerce network with numerous benefits.
13. Mike Williams, Business Oregon: The Portland region competes nationally and internationally with other ports. Annexation can make this project feasible. Studies show shortages of industrial land available for development in the Portland and metro area, especially for shovel-ready sites. This site brings many key attributes. The Port is a valued partner and creates jobs but not at the detriment of the environment. We encourage the Port to develop and reinvest at a new Hayden Island facility.
14. John Mohlis, Building and Construction Trade Council: Supports responsible Port development on WHI. He is representing workers and families, so economic basics are key. Portland has many amenities but if you can't afford them, it doesn't matter. The proposal seems to be getting more expensive as time goes by. We need to confirm the development now to create higher-wage jobs and to grow the tax base. Find a middle-line proposal with the 300/500 acre split.
15. Micah Meskel: Doesn't support annexation. Native wildlife and parks the city offers and unique and essential as a natural resource. The value of this habitat is what Portland has prided itself on protecting. We need to protect and restore HI in its entirety.
16. Tinsley Hunsdorfer: There is no way to mitigate. WHI should be protected as a wildlife reserve. The proposed development doesn't show any confirmed benefits for city and region.
17. Debbie Deetz Silva, Columbia Corridor Association: The Port has invested in good faith to fit development into 300 acres while conserving, enhancing and mitigating. This third amended proposed draft incorporates new features that show a doubling of costs for the Port to develop. The City's costs are far outside the market value, even if you assume a premium for marine industrial lands. Does it make sense to recommend a proposal that the Port Commission can't accept?

18. Tom Dechenne, NB&S: Supports the annexation. Use of the industrial land is paramount. We should leverage the industrial land to create other less-industrial jobs on other land sites. Balance is important regarding land development and open space.
19. Joe Esmonde, IBEW #48: Equity is part of sustainability, which incorporates jobs. PCC is training people for these jobs, and the new Port facility would put these trainees to work. Years ago Portland was more of a thriving and industrial city. We need to help those who are trying to make a good income. We can't keep shutting doors for the future workers.
20. Graham Trainor, Oregon AFL-CIO: There is concern with economic health of the city and region. Need triple-bottom-line opportunities create family-wage jobs. Portland can be a good place to live if you have a high-wage job. As Mayor Sam Adams said, Portland needs to make this decision now. We need to balance jobs with community and environmental impacts. The current draft plan is not balanced – we need to advocate for a balanced and economically viable proposal.
21. Martha and Jerry Anderson: WHI resources need to be protected. If we can't afford to do it right, then we shouldn't proceed forward. It seems like we're waiting for a miracle. Funding issues and resources are not the question. The people in the community are the key factor. Sacred sites and people are the heart of the issue.
22. Brian Owendoff: WHI AC member. The public conversation has been largely quiet about triple-bottom-line benefits of the project. The process has been thorough. True sustainability is the progress that meets today's needs without compromising future. Social, financial, environmental opportunities are all included in the WHI proposal, but only if we approve the \$5-7/square foot range cost of land as the Port proposes.
23. Norm Eder, Manufacturing 21 Coalition and Westside Economic Alliance: There is value and need for the Port's expansion plans. It creates diversity and opportunity for living-wage jobs in Portland. Mitigation requirements reduce the chance that businesses will locate though because of the high projected costs.
24. Darren Glebe, IVOE Local 701: Represents workers who operate heavy equipment. Supports the Port's proposal.
25. Mike Ryan: Let it be. Opposes annexation for an industrial marine facility. Hayden Island is irreplaceable, and it's impossible to mitigate the damage that will be done.
26. Chris Bakken, Schooner Creek Boat Works: Supports the park and boat ramp, which offers access to residents and visitors who bring business to the island with a positive impact. Portland has an underutilized asset in the river.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about motorized boat impacts on WHI, noting he saw a number of high-speed boats in the Ross Island lagoon this weekend. Boats were racing around the lagoon at 45-50 miles per hour right under the bald eagle nest. Concerns that will have to be addressed if there is a motorized boat launch near the natural area on West Hayden Island. There is a lack of enforcement at Ross Island and the same is likely to be true at West Hayden Island.

27. Ron Schmidt, Hayden Island Neighborhood: Hayden Island is the only inhabited island in Portland, which should be welcoming. WHI should not be developed. North Portland Neighborhood Chairs network is tired of their area of the city being dumped on. Even the EconNW report and Multnomah HIA questioned the development.

28. Travis Williams, Willamette Riverkeeper: Confluence areas are richer in native species. Given history of development on Portland rivers, and the superfund site, could we clean up those sites to provide some opportunities for industrial land instead of developing on WHI? WHI is unique in location and function as a meaningful floodplain. Costs to develop would create jobs initially, but after that it's not clear. Could some of the other current sites provide opportunities? We need a reality check.
29. Bernie Bottomly, PBA: WHI is critical to provide family-wage jobs. The region's average wage compared to cost of living is out of balance. There are two areas of strength in manufacturing and international trade. There are a number of economic benefits with skilled jobs, good wages and income taxes to fund public services. We should maintain and expand international trade via our export initiative. Tourism and the environment are also to be balanced. WHI can be an exemplary model for jobs, environment and community.

Regarding SB 240: liability stays with the organization that takes out the loan. The bill as currently structured (if it passes) has no loan funds allocated in it. In this instance, if it were to apply, the Port would make the expenditure and would be reimbursed by the State. The bill was brought by the Oregon Business Plan Coalition, which includes the PBA.

30. Walt Evans, Pacific Northwest International Trade Association: Represents the leading advocacy group of international trade in OR and SW Washington. A cost-competitive marine facility will support the traded sector economy and will build competitive advantage. We will connect our region with businesses around the world. 300/500 is a good balance.
31. Herman Kachold: Hayden Island resident since 2007. Rail-to-ship, ship-to-rail won't create value-adding jobs. The biggest concern is that we'll have 300 acres ready to go and no one shows up to build; then how do we restore it? We should leave it alone. There is enough development on Hayden Island already.
32. Mike Connors, representing Hayden Island Enterprises, the manufactured home park owners: The amended plan and IGA is an improvement. But it still has deficiencies. The housing fund is an important element in the mitigation proposal, but it should not be an option to be used to relocate residents out of the community. Staff wants to defer this conversation for a later time, but it's so important that it needs to be addressed as part of this process. The park historically has close to a 100 percent occupancy rate. There are no limitations on the number of residents that the fund could be used to relocate. Relocation option undermines the stability of the park and the high occupancy rate. Any funds to relocate residents out will impact those who remain and the value of the homes left. This project cannot happen without the CRC, and the IGA doesn't sufficiently address the contingency if the CRC doesn't happen, is scaled back, or is delayed significantly. The transportation analysis that says this project can pencil out is based on the original CRC. The IGA says that if the CRC doesn't happen the parties will work to find a solution, but it doesn't provide for a public process to see if the project can still work. The definition of "completed" is that it is funded, not actually built. The only plan that works for the community is the off-set alignment with the traffic signal, which ODOT agreed to, and the City includes as a possible alignment.
33. Chris Harder, PDC: Portland is a trade city. 96 percent of world's consumers are outside of the U.S. Trade is a key component of Portland's economic competitiveness, and we need sufficient access to markets. Obama's export initiative and the Brookings Institute support enhancing Portland's export strategy that seeks to double our own

exports in the next 5 years.

34. Deborah L Heckhausen, Hayden Island Mobile Home Community HOA: The Port and BPS are ignoring function, feasible and need for a port facility. It destroys natural habitat. The proposed location will be .5 mile from the community, plus a new truck route adds noise. An additional 600-1000 workers will also make more traffic on the island, which is already difficult. With or without the CRC, the project obstructs traffic flow on the island. The rail yard creates air quality and human health consequences.
35. Art Lewellan: Opposed to development on WHI. We do need to create jobs, but not on the island. The port facility will create a choke-point. Global warming predictions suggest flooding will be more frequent, and the rail line doesn't account for floods.
36. Deanna Sawtelle: Questions the economic benefits that are being used to justify the new Port facility. The full ecosystem needs to be maintained. The 300/500 split is not a fair compromise because it ruins an in-tact ecosystem. The 300 acre development is in the heart of the natural area, with the 500 acres dispersed, decreasing ecological function. Opposes development, but if moves forward, full mitigation needs to be done and funded.
37. Virginia Ross: An advocate for living wage jobs and also for protecting ecosystems and wildlife. The Port is trying to gain support with the promise of jobs without evidence that jobs will be created in the next 10 or even 40 years; there are no guarantees. Mitigation falls short. If the Port maximizes current resources, they could create living-wage jobs with benefits. There are continual labor strikes at the Port. The major negative impact will fall on established wildlife areas and on residents of WHI.
38. Tom Dana: Opposed to boat ramp because of air/noise/traffic pollution. If WHI is developed, there will already be more pollution. Businesses and labor associations are vague and have no numbers to back up their position. The Port's current grain and auto terminals are only doing minimally better than in 1982, during another recession. The manufactured home community is getting hit hard. Offering money to move away is implicitly saying we're going to destroy the community.
39. Pamela Ferguson, Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community HOA: Worried about the demise of the manufactured home community. If the park can't make money off site rents, their investments decrease. A marine industrial site on an island with limited roadway doesn't make sense. The HIA gives a grim picture with the industrial site nearby, especially for the devaluation of homes and decreased livability. Residents in the older homes will be most affected and won't be able to pay mortgages elsewhere even with the down payment via the fund. WHI development will be a loss of business for Oxford Suites as well. Tourism and leisure is a question if the hotel is less than a mile away from a port facility – who will want to stsy there?  
  
*Smith:* What sort of home funding package would make the deal work?  
Down payment assistant is good for a new home, but then you're leaving people with a mortgage that live on limited income or who have owned their homes for years and don't currently have a mortgage.
40. William Mikey Jones: PSC needs to let the corps, who does mapping for FEMA, assess the FIR map. The floodway has been becoming filled in throughout the. PSC members have not looked at the ownership map.
41. Andrew Polta: Opposed to development of WHI. This area is unique and important and irreplaceable land. We should make the best use of existing land. We can't replace or



mitigate for habitat loss, but Port continues to drop and shirk costs of mitigation (which could be tax payers). Moved to Portland because the city proudly maintains its urban green spaces.

42. Jeff Swanson, One Northwest Consulting LLC: Portland has an industrial land shortfall. Combined traded sector activity creates 71,800 jobs; \$3.5B personal income; and \$7.1B business revenue annually. 1.6 jobs are created by 1 job on traded sector lands, which drive job growth as a key leverage point to reduce income inequalities.
43. Barbara Wilson: WHI should be permanently protected as a wildlife sanctuary. Is humankind the only life form that can be allowed to live on Earth? We need to allow other life forms to exist. If we reduce the size of the wildlife sanctuary, you are taking away the ecosystem and opportunities for habitat. There is no guarantee about jobs, and there is no penalty if the expected jobs don't come to fruition.
44. Candace Larson: Industrial development on WHI is not worth it. It doesn't provide mitigation. It doesn't respect low income or native people. The proposal doesn't pencil out for anyone. It is time for Portland to make a decision, but please vote no.
45. Rob Mathers, Working Waterfront Coalition; Kinder Morgan: The WHI plan is unrealistic and unbalanced. Make course corrections to remove roadblocks and then forward the plan to Council.
46. Daniel Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper: Columbia River has taken huge efforts for salmon recovery. Mitigation is unsure and inadequate as outlined in the plan. We're dealing with shallow water and floodplain habitat, so they are not easy to replace. There are lots of coal and oil exports along the river that are taking up space for other terminals such as those proposed for WHI. Mitigation to protect salmon is supposed to be proven to be effective (in place, in kind, in time) but will be difficult to achieve.
47. Jim Howell. OR Association of Rail and Transit Advocates: Do not forward this plan to Council, especially before ODOT's Passenger Rail Study is complete and both the rail and CRC issues are fully resolved. Don't put the cart before the horse. There is no feasible demand on Hayden Island.

*Commissioner Smith:* If the next 3 Port terminals should go to Gateway, what if we need 6 new terminals? If the next 3 don't go to WHI, where do they go?

- Excess sites in Vancouver need to be assessed.
- Longview's existing Alcoa site, being targeted for a massive coal export site, could be an option. It's a big site, and the Port of Longview has also recently purchased another site that is a brownfield.

48. Martin Slapikas, HiNoon: HiNoon comments from the November hearings remain relevant. All three legs of the sustainability stool are required. There is no interest from the Port to form a joint port authority, but a joint facility is possible with political support. The Port's vision statement says it supports sustainability, but it doesn't show in the Port's ideas for WHI.
49. Richard Carhart: Designation of Hayden Island Drive as a truck route, in lieu of a bridge, will cause major negative impacts to the livability of residents, to the redevelopment of Jantzen Beach shopping center and will increase traffic. Recommend that the plan is amended to include a new bridge to accommodate increased traffic.
50. Susan Lindsay: WHI is truly unique. By its very definition, it is not a place to be diminished or partitioned. It should be supported and protected for generations to

come.

51. Brianna King: Moved last year to Portland because of conservation-minded thinking in planning. Disappointed to hear of potential development on WHI. There is no way to mitigate the ecosystem that is established on WHI. We can't consider any mitigation to make an equal or improved habitat; the sum of the parts is not equal to the whole in this case.

Written Testimony:

- Mary Ann Schwab
- Joseph Thiebes
- Joe Livingston
- Hayden Island Business Park Association
- Linda Caso
- Liza Burney
- William Mullen
- Jimme' Peters
- Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes
- Audubon Society of Portland
- Kyna Rubin
- Roberta Schwarz
- Schooner Creek Boat Works
- Brad Miller
- Gerard Mildner
- Melinda McCoy
- Noah Jenkins
- Alder Creek Kayak & Canoe
- Tricia Sears
- Diane Gasperin
- Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee
- Willamette Riverkeeper
- Jennifer Parks
- Dianne Foster
- Rachel Brooks
- Bernie Bottomly, PBA
- US DOI - Fish & Wildlife Office
- Linda Zook
- Beverly Bookin
- Timme Helzer, PhD
- Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council
- International Union of Operating Engineers Local 701
- One Northwest Consulting LLC
- Martin Slapikas, HiNoon
- HiNoon
- Port of Portland
- Lori Ubell
- Mark Wheeler
- Gerry-Anna Jones
- Neva Knott
- James Lanz
- Sue Caouette
- Ariel Shultz
- Mike Wells
- Mark McCuddy / McCuddy's Marina
- Wayne Shuyler / OR State Marine Board
- Inland Sea Maritime Group, LLC
- Timme Helzer
- Robert Cecil
- Donna Murphy
- Susan Coulson
- Laura Belson
- Steven Rander
- Westside Economic Alliance
- Tricia Knoll
- Karla Ksenzulak Davis
- Dell Goldsmith
- Lynn Herring
- Jeff Ramsey
- Brian Campbell
- Jim Howell
- Canoe Bay LLC and SDP LLC
- Stefan Karlic
- PP&R
- Seth Tane
- PNITA
- Gunnar Paulsen
- Dani Denneberg
- Hathaway Koback Connors LLP, representing Hayden Island enterprises
- Columbia Corridor Association
- William Jones
- Art Lewellan
- Jim Howell
- Pam Gurnari
- Mendi Menefee
- Bruce Barbarasch
- Stefan Karlic
- Aarisa Smith
- Hava Dennenberg
- Meg Ruby

*Vice Chair Shapiro* closed oral testimony. Written testimony will be open through May 14 at 5 p.m..

**Discussion and Follow-Up**

Commissioners will formulate their questions and send them to staff for review and response, also by May 14.

Staff will send written response to public testimony and other bureaus' comments with a recommendation for staff amendments to PSC members on May 21.

May 28 could be the date the PSC makes a recommendation to Council. Or the commission will at least start to formulate a recommendation at that meeting.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted she will likely be out of town on May 28.

**Adjourn**

*Vice Chair Shapiro* adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator