

CITY OF PORTLAND

West Hayden Island Community Working Group

Tuesday, October 20, 2009

9:30am – 12:45pm

City of Portland 1900 Building

1900 SW 4th Avenue, 7th Floor Conference Room “A”

Agenda

TIME	ITEM	LED BY
9:30am	Convene <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions• Public comment• Agenda overview	<i>Chair</i>
9:45	Approval of September meeting notes	<i>Facilitator</i>
9:50	Climate Change Presentation & Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BPS Presentation (20 minutes)• CWG discussion of assumptions to carry forward into deliberations	<i>Michele Crim, Eric Engstrom, BPS CWG</i>
10:50	Break	
11:00	Scope of Work Presentation	<i>City of Portland</i>
11:30	TAP and online bulletin board update	<i>City of Portland</i>
11:45	Other Wrap-up	<i>Chair Facilitator</i>
Noon	History of Portland’s Harbor (Lunch provided)	<i>Professor Carl Abbott</i>
12:45	Session Closing	

Outline for Climate Change Presentation to WHI Community Working Group
October 20, 2009

Presentation Intent/Goals

The Community Working Group identified a series of possible questions to be answered by the foundation studies. Some of the questions were placed in a category to be answered by Port and City staff. A group of climate change questions were placed in this category. This is a beginning discussion regarding climate change and the potential impacts on West Hayden Island and the upcoming decision-making process. The presentation is intended to generate some discussion and ideas about how the WHI project should address this issue through the planning process. Below is a brief outline of the presentation and a resource list. .

1) Potential impacts of Climate Change on Environmental Conditions

- Weather changes (stronger storms, high winds)
- River flows and erosion
- Flooding
- Sea level
- Species diversity
- Fire

2) The City's Climate Action Plan

- How can the city reduce carbon emissions through the Climate Action Plan and other city plans?
- Overview of the Climate Action Plan
 - i. Carbon emissions and goals (including trees and canopy goals)

3) Potential Global Trend Issues

- Change of global trade routes
- Increased cost of fuel
- What have we learned from Airport futures project?

4) Managing Uncertainty and Risk (Discussion questions)

- How should we consider this information in the context of the WHI project?
- What policies, tools and approaches could the WHI plan incorporate to anticipate, accommodate, and respond to risk and uncertain conditions that result from climate change?

Climate Change Resources:

- 1) [Climate Action Plan - http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=41896](http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=41896) :

In 2007, Portland City Council and the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners adopted resolutions directing staff to design a strategy to reduce local carbon emissions by 80 percent by 2050. The 2009 Climate Action Plan will serve as the 40-year roadmap for the institutional and individual change needed to reach our ambitious climate protection goals in the City of Portland and Multnomah County.

- 2) [ISAB Climate Change report for the Columbia River: http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/ISAB%202007-2%20Climate%20Change.pdf](http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/ISAB%202007-2%20Climate%20Change.pdf)

Northwest Power and Conservation Council,- produced a 2007 report on climate change by the Council's Independent Scientific Advisory Board which details potential hydrological and biological impacts, as well as mitigating actions such as tributary habitat protection.

- 3) [Climate Change: BPA's Initial Roadmap, December 2008 http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/pubs/Climate_Change_2008_Initial_Roadmap_final.pdf](http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/pubs/Climate_Change_2008_Initial_Roadmap_final.pdf)
This initial roadmap describes how BPA has fulfilled its strategic direction related to climate change in 2008. It lays out the baseline of BPA's current activities related to climate change issues.

- 4) www.salmonrecovery.com 2008 BPA Biological Opinion- The recent 2008 Biological Opinion on the operation of the FCRPS describes a 10-year plan for hydro operations and mitigation for fish listed under the Endangered Species Act, including specific consideration of climate change and a number of actions to address potential effects on listed salmon.

- 5) [Climate Impacts Group Washington Climate Change Impacts Assessment \(2008\), which includes the Columbia: http://cses.washington.edu/cig/res/ia/waccia.shtml](http://cses.washington.edu/cig/res/ia/waccia.shtml)

The University of Washington's [Climate Impacts Group](#) has reported on possible impacts to the Northwest region. The most likely scenario would be disruption to normal hydrological cycles resulting in less snowpack and more flooding - affecting hydropower generation, salmon survival and water resources in general.

Washington Climate Action Group has produced a study – *Sea Level Rise in Coastal Waters of Washington State* which offers their predictions for sea level rise in coastal Washington State as well as northern Oregon. Their prediction in the general area of Northern Oregon shows a rise in land due to tectonic plate movement.

- 6) The sea level rise maps I've seen were produced by Eban Goodstein and Bob Doppelt and are at <https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/handle/1794/3047>.

Two maps show the potential impact of a catastrophic sea level rise on the Oregon coast and on the areas of Portland and Tillamook. Maps show a 26 foot and 47 foot rise along the Columbia River.

7) <http://www.globalchange.gov/publications/reports/scientific-assessments/us-impacts/regional-climate-change-impacts/northwest>

U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) is mandated by the [Global Change Research Act of 1990](#). Thirteen departments and agencies participate in the USGCRP, which was known as the U.S. Climate Change Science Program from 2002 through 2008. The program is steered by the [Subcommittee on Global Change Research](#) under the [Committee on Environment and Natural Resources](#), overseen by the Executive Office of the President, and facilitated by an [Integration and Coordination Office](#).

8) "*Ranking Port Cities with High Exposure and Vulnerability to Climate Extremes: Exposure Estimates*", Nicholls, R. J. *et al.* (2008), *OECD Environment Working Papers*, No. 1, OECD Publishing. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/16/58/39720578.pdf>.

9) *Planning for Climate Change Impacts on US Ports*, White Paper 2008, US EPA.

10) Seattle City Lights: <http://www.seattle.gov/light/>

[Resolution 30316](#) (2002) adopts a Citywide minimum goal of 7% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2010.

[Resolution 30359](#) (2001) adopts specific actions, strategies and timelines for Seattle City Light to meet its zero net emission goal through energy conservation, new renewable energy, and CO₂ mitigation

11) Carbonfund.org:

http://www.carbonfund.org/site/pages/carbon_calculators/category/Assumptions

This site offers carbon formulas to calculate amount of CO₂ per ton of shipment by rail, truck, air, and ship.



City of Portland
Bureau of
**Planning and
Sustainability**

Sam Adams, Mayor
Susan Anderson, Director

Planning

1900 S.W. 4th Ave., Ste. 7100
Portland, OR 97201-5350

Phone 503-823-7700
FAX 503-823-7800
TTY 503-823-6868


Sustainability

721 N.W. 9th Ave., Ste. 195
Portland, OR 97209-3447

Phone 503-823-7222
FAX 503-823-5311
TTY 503-823-6868

www.portlandonline.com/bps

An equal opportunity employer

 Printed on recycled paper

M E M O

October 13, 2009

To: West Hayden Island Community Working Group

From: Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Subject: Recommended Changes And Clarifications To The Scope Of Work For The WHI Foundation Studies

The Community Working Group and the Technical Advisory Pool have recommended a number of changes and requested some clarifications to the scope of work for the Consultant Foundation Studies. City Staff identified eight main themes in reviewing all of the comments received. Below is a description of these themes. Themes 1-4 are currently out of scope. In order to proceed with Themes 1-3 the City would need to find additional funding to support this work or identify items in the current scope that could be eliminated to add these items. Theme 4 as proposed below can be accomplished by City staff. Themes 5-8 are issues raised by CWG and TAP members that will be clarified within the scope of work. A complete list of CWG and TAP comments, with city staff and consultant responses, is attached to this memo.

Out of Scope Themes:

- 1) **Recreation:** Many comments stressed the importance of adding a recreation section that looks at recreational uses and values as opposed to addressing it as a subset of ecological functions providing human benefits within the Environmental Study. Entrix has provided a proposal to address the benefits of recreation, including 1) current recreational activities on and around the island, 2) the economic contribution of these activities, 3) forecast recreational activities under different development and no-development scenarios and 4) access complementary and conflicting relationships.
- 2) **Mitigation Opportunities:** Entrix has prepared a proposal addressing some of the mitigation concerns by CWG and TAP, specifically, the following framework has been suggested: 1) Assess the planning area habitat creation, restorations an enhancement opportunities, 2) What is the sites value for mitigation? (e.g. invasive species removal, shoreline restoration, creating off channel habitat), 3) Assess the mitigation values of key sites in the study area and how they relate to each other, and 4) Review River Plan target restoration sites as an example of City mitigation policy.
- 3) **Input From Natural Resource Agencies To Understand Their Perspectives On The Natural Resource Values Of WHI:** Entrix will gather and analyze information received from TAP members. With an expanded scope of work, more extensive interviews of agency personnel are possible. Entrix could prepare a set of questions to agencies about the project and include the official responses in an appendix to the report. Or, agency concerns and comments could be collected, categorized and summarized as a section of the study.
- 4) **Quality of Life:** CWG member stressed the importance of adding a component on quality of life issues, specifically taking a look at impacts to adjacent communities. City staff can produce a preliminary report that will 1) provide a look at some examples of neighborhood impacts and how they have been addressed through other projects –e.g traffic, noise, dust, light, power corridors, access to recreation, and buffer areas, and 2) conduct a series of facilitated discussions with neighborhood groups to get a preliminary list of concerns about potential development on WHI. After City Council check in, if the project moves forward to look at different development scenarios, a component of the design workshops could look at different site layouts and consider quality of life research conducted by staff.

Clarifications to the Scope

5) **Preliminary Approach to Environmental Framework:**

- **Considerations for a Dynamic System:** The analysis will be focused on evaluating the existing conditions of WHI natural resources, and potential changes to these conditions from development (or enhancement). The study will incorporate critical information on natural resource trends in the study area that would substantively affect evaluations of ecosystem function with and without development (or enhancement).

- **Rating Approach:** The ENTRIX overall assessment of quality and value possesses more level of detail than a simple three-tier approach of low, medium, and high (or 1, 2, 3). The assessment is based on rating each primary ecosystem function (e.g. nutrient cycling, flood control, etc) provided by a resource such as wetlands. The analysis will then merge the rating of each ecosystem function provided by a resource to produce a cumulative rating for the resource. This cumulative rating, which is expected to be a numeric value resulting from combining and potentially weighting each ecosystem function rating, can then be split into more than three tiers.

The assessment of quality takes into account the conditions and complexity of WHI resources, while the assessment of value takes into account the size and abundance of WHI resources in the context of the surrounding area (location). When combined, the quality and value assessments will thus include considerations of size, location, and complexity.

6) **Distinction Between Foundation Studies And State And Federal Mandates And The Permitting Process:**

The foundation studies are one input into the larger planning process that the City is leading. These studies will identify if there are any fatal flaws with proposing multiple uses on West Hayden Island. The planning process will offer a framework for potential future development and provide zoning for the site. As part of the planning process, the city will conduct an Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy Analysis (ESEE) which compares the benefits of different competing uses. This planning process is not a federal or state decision making process. There is no development being proposed at this time, however, an inventory of state and federal regulations will be put together as part of the larger planning process to inform all parties of the processes and requirements.

7) **Limiting Definition Of Marine Industrial And Marine Cargo To Deep Water Access**

Only: The definitions of Marine Cargo and Marine Industrial will be updated to emphasize deep water access. The emphasis will be on industries that take advantage of the unique feature of deep water access and the rail component.

8) **Marine Industrial Consultant Study:**

The work from BST Associates will inform the Economic work product, but will be evaluated in the context of other forecast sources such as earlier work by BST, Oregon economic forecasts, and City forecasts. Economic forecasting is typically a niche task of a few specialized firms, and BST has developed similar marine cargo forecasts throughout the Pacific Northwest. The BST contract is with the Port because they have an open, ongoing contract. This helped expedite the process and was a cost effective means of getting the work accomplished in a timely manner.

Comments on the Scope of Work for the West Hayden Island Foundation Studies

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Background & Objectives	<p>1) Background: Suggestion is to add references to state & federal permitting process and explore federal, state, and local regulations applicable to a potential development action on WHI--identify and consider in the foundational studies process (Susan Barnes, John M.)</p> <p>2) Background: Entrix should give consideration to state and federal mandates that will influence the viability of any potential development. Scenario. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: This planning process will offer a framework for potential future development and provide zoning for the site. This not a federal/state decision making process. There will be an ESEE which compares the benefits of different competing uses. Part of the larger planning process will include an inventory of state and federal regulations.</p> <p>3) Background: Entrix should look at both existing and <i>potential</i> natural resource function on the island (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: Potential natural resource function can be considered in a study of Mitigation, Restoration, and Enhancement. The current scope will address the effects that varying scales of proposed development would have on the baseline function.</p> <p>4) Add a sentence that describes plan district as a framework for allowing specific development types and restoration/enhancement activities. (Port)</p> <p>Response: This sentence will be added.</p> <p>5) Add to 1st sentence of scope document --“including marine industrial, preservation of urban natural wildlife habitat, conservation of wildlife habitat for a regional public nature park, the no-build option....(T. Helzer)</p> <p>Response: The scope of work document has been updated to reflect some of these examples of natural resource preservation.</p> <p>6) Environmental. Study Area:</p> <p>a. Add 150 square mile contiguous ecosystem...(T. Helzer)</p> <p>Response: We do not want to place a 150 square mile limitation on study area. The area may end up being larger than this.</p> <p>b. Study area should also include potential areas for mitigation (Bob S)-</p> <p>Response: There is more discussion of mitigation below. There is nothing in the Study area description that indicates that mitigation areas would not be discussed. If mitigation areas exist or are planned on WHI, their current/baseline function will be evaluated. Sites on WHI with restoration/mitigation promise will be identified and potential enhanced function levels analyzed in a Mitigation, Restoration, and</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Background & Objectives	<p>Enhancement evaluation.</p> <p>c. The scope should also contain alternate locations for the proposed project (John M.) –</p> <p>Response: The economic study will be evaluating development demand as well as site suitability for marine industrial development in other locations as well as on WHI. The Environmental Foundation Study will analyze potential impacts to WHI ecological functions from the types of economic development (types of locations, size of land area, etc) identified in the economic study.</p> <p>7) Economic Study Area Definition: a. 2nd sentence - Add marine related and "Regional Nature Park" activity. Bias exists in this draft that natural wildlife habitat has no "net revenue" value. (T. Helzer).</p> <p>Response: Assessing the value of natural wildlife habitat and other natural resource functions is an integral part of the Evaluation Framework designed by ENTRIX. The purpose of the environmental study will be to assess the quantity, quality, and ecological value of WHI natural resources. Ecological value based on ecosystem function will be based on an assessment of WHI resources in the context of the greater study area. The separate proposed Recreation Study will identify the recreation value of WHI resources.</p> <p>b. The definition should include lands outside of Portland that could accommodate future industrial land needs as well as impact the long term viability of WHI development. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The Study will include lands outside of Portland.</p> <p>8) Natural Resources definition: Add to last sentence: ..economic, quality of life, recreational..and societal value.</p> <p>Response: As noted above assessing the value of natural resource functions is an integral part of the environmental study and will be further clarified within the Evaluation Framework section of the document.</p> <p>9) Functional Values definition: Add to line 4 – channel dynamics and wildlife habitat, “as well as the 150 mile contiguous ecosystem, net revenues to local and state governments and regional and local retailers, and environmental education interests of the region’s public and private schools”.</p> <p>Response: The definition will not limit the study area to 150 square miles because it may end up being larger than that. We believe the definition captures the socio-economic and related societal benefits.</p> <p>10) Marine Cargo definition: Liquid bulk should exclude importation, storage and/or conversion of liquefied natural gas.</p> <p>Response: Assuming that it is not a feasible option, less likely option the analysis would exclude this as an option.</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Background & Objectives	<p>11) Clarify “Marine Industrial” definition and how it is used through the Scope. Our focus is on the value of this site because of its location on the deepwater channel (Anne S.)</p> <p>Response: For the purposes of this study, the uses to be explored will be those that are reliant on deep channel access.</p> <p>12) Omit sentence, page 2 of Objectives section (Port-TAP)</p> <p>Response: This sentence will be rewritten: A secondary objective of the Study is to provide background information for the current planning process.</p> <p>13) Environmental Objective:</p> <p><i>a.</i> The first iteration of Environmental Analysis should be equivalent in its application for all locations identified in the region that could service the purpose and need of the proposed project. (John M.) –</p> <p>Response: As part of the economic study, alternate sites will be looked at (and reviewed for site suitability from an ecological perspective), but this is not a federal EIS at this stage. Although the Study area will incorporate regional influences, the Environmental Foundation Study is explicitly considering potential impacts from West Hayden Island potential areas of development.</p> <p><i>b.</i> Document current and potential resource conditions on WHI (Bob S.) –</p> <p>Response: Current resource conditions will be considered the Baseline conditions. Potential resource conditions resulting from varying levels of development on WHI is a key element of the Environmental Foundation Study. Additionally, <u>potential</u> enhanced natural resource function from management activities is being considered as part of an expanded scope addressing Mitigation, Restoration, and Enhancement.</p> <p><i>c.</i> Omit in first sentence that this study will “build upon existing data and studies. (this assumes validity and reliability have been verified) – (T. Helzer)</p> <p>Response: The consultants will be reviewing past documents for their validity and reliability as they build upon existing data and studies.</p> <p><i>d.</i> Include in 1st sentence that the larger ecosystem and value of WHI natural resources includes looking at the economic, social, environmental and energy components... (T. Helzer)</p> <p>Response: The inclusion of these components is captured in the larger ecosystem.</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
	<p>14) Econ. Objective: Study should address need & alternatives (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: A new paragraph will be added to the scope: Both the Environmental and Economic Studies will help the City/CWG understand the tradeoffs that will happen. Researching alternate sites and this site will be key to the future decision making process. These studies are important to understanding what different alternatives may exist. Typically, Alternative Sites are evaluated under the premise that there is a preferred site (under EIS format). One of the underlying goals of the Foundation Studies is to provide the analysis to begin to consider if WHI could be a preferred site for development based on both economic and ecological values.</p>
Environ 1: Preparation	<p>1) Port should not be called out as a separate entity from CWG. Is Port part of City’s project review team? (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The Port is the property owner and funder of the project; they are a distinct government entity with a public mission and part of the Project review team with the CWG and City.</p>
Env. 1.3	<p>1) Study area – should contain alternate locations of proposed project—and all sites should be evaluated for the site attributes that contribute to the life-cycle requirements... (John M.)</p> <p>Response: The intended framework of the study focuses on functions provided by habitats and habitat-forming processes. This is not a species-effects analysis, but the habitats and their seasonal functionality will be assessed in light of different footprints by suggested levels of development. Description of explicit life history habitat requirements and how area habitats are providing for those, although very important in understanding species productivity and population viability, cannot be addressed for each of the myriad of species associated with Planning area. Rather, specific habitat types and the range of functions they provide (for all wildlife species as well as humans) will be evaluated.</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Env. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3	<p>1) Clarify historical context- ODFW recommends 1850 timeframe. (Susan B.) 2) Clarification: will 1850's General Land Office Surveys being used. (John M.)</p> <p>Response: We did not specify a specific time frame to the historical context but we can include 1850 as the starting point.</p> <p>3) Trend information should be presented in context with species and habitat recovery goals of the region w/ emphasis on Lower Columbia R. and Willamette R. North Reach. (John M)</p> <p>Response: This is not a policy document to present recovery goals of the region.</p> <p>4) Timeline for completion of this task is not reasonable. Deadline of Oct. 20 will result in regurgitation of existing documents rather than any sort of substantive analysis. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The City has move the timeline back to accommodate more time for TAP, City and CWG review of consultant products.</p> <p>5) Natural resource section seems heavily focused on historical and less importance on existing or <i>potential</i> –interest is in what role WHI plays currently and could play in the future. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: See previous comments on baseline/ existing and potential function. The scope is influenced by the typical construct of Foundation Studies; that is, there is not necessarily a specific project being evaluated. The Environment that a Project or Program may occur in is described, as well as expected effects to the functioning of the environment based on potential disturbance or development.</p> <p>6) Recreation should not be slipped in under natural resource function- important, but separate issue. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The reference to recreational value in this section is important to identify recreation as an ecological function with human benefit. ENTRIX has prepared a separate proposal that would provide a more in-depth examination of the quality and value of existing and potential (enhanced) recreational opportunities on WHI.</p> <p>7) Entrix should look at functions in terms of how they contribute to City policy objectives: Climate change, Grey to green, urban tree canopy...(Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: This is the City's responsibility, not the Consultants. The City will review how findings of the studies contribute/relate to the City policy objectives.</p> <p>8) 2.3C- Quality Assessment- How does this relate to existing assessments (Title 13) which gives island a "high value". Also how does this capture the complexity of how habitats on WHI affect one another as well as integrity and function of surrounding habitats? (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The City's Natural Resource Inventory is a refinement of Title 13. The NRI is a complex model that has received extensive</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Env. 2.3	<p>peer review including issues of proximity and connectivity. The City’s recommendations will provide more specific detail.</p> <p>9) 2.3D- Entrix should look also at how changes on WHI might affect the function of other natural resource sites in the region. The document appears to suggest that other sites duplicate the function of WHI when in fact they are part of a network. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: Other sites are part of the network. The assessment of WHI value and quality will incorporate synoptic and/or integrative perspectives of how WHI resources influence and are influenced by adjacent similar habitats (which may make that habitat type more productive), and dissimilar (which make those habitats more diverse).</p> <p>10) Entrix should have a specific task of meeting and talking with natural resource agencies to understand their perspectives on the natural resource values of WHI. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: Some agency perspectives will be garnered from field trips, provided materials, and individual contacts as needed with members of the Technical Advisory Panel. With an expanded scope of work, more extensive interviews of agency personnel are possible. Another possibility would be to send questions to agencies about the project and include the official responses in an appendix to the report. If interviews were to be completed, ENTRIX could assemble agency concerns and comments throughout the process and incorporate where feasible into the ongoing analysis, or if out of scope, could categorize and summarize as a deliverable.</p> <p>11) There does not appear to be placeholder for filling data gaps – field surveys? (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The current scope and budget do not include this piece. This project is focusing on synthesizing and analyzing currently available data. If ENTRIX identifies a data gap they will inform the project team and we will determine what is feasible within the scope or potentially if BES could help fill any gaps that may be identified.</p>
Env. 3.1-3	<p>1) Three tiered system for natural resources may result in too little information. Static or snap shot approach to WHI natural resources is not sufficient—need to look at trends similar to economic approach. (Sebastian D.)</p> <p>2) Entrix relative value scale may be too coarse for use in comparing ecological assessments for the purpose of alternative project site selection (John M)</p> <p>3) High, medium, low value system may not work for WHI—site valuable for size, location and complexity (Bob S)</p> <p>Response: In the proposed Framework, the overall assessment of quality and value is more nuanced than a simple three-level approach of low, medium, and high. The analysis merges the rating of each ecosystem function provided by a resource to produce a cumulative rating for the resource that can then be split into more than three tiers. The assessment of quality takes into account the complexity of WHI resources, while the assessment of value takes into account the size and abundance of WHI resources in the context of the surrounding area (location). When combined, the quality and value assessments will include the variables of size, location, and complexity.</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Env. 3.1- 3	<p>The use of static in regards dynamic natural resources is somewhat of a misnomer. The analysis will be focused on evaluating the existing baseline conditions of resources on WHI, and potential changes to these conditions from development (or enhancement), but will incorporate critical information on natural resource trends (both on WHI and in the study area) where such information would substantively affect evaluations of ecosystem function with and without development (or enhancement).</p> <p>4) Comparing value of habitat to the value of development is not acceptable. The document should stress what Entrix discussed at 9/15 meeting –look at continuum of Development Options and how the Environmental, Economic and Social values change as you move along the continuum. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The purpose of the scope of work is to identify the value of WHI resources from both an ecological and economic perspective, and to identify how these values would change as you move along a continuum of development options. The effect on ecological values (tradeoffs) with different levels of development will be assessed in the limiting factors analysis and embodied in the response curves that will be developed in the Environmental Foundation Study. ENTRIX will integrate findings from the environmental and economic foundation studies by showing the tradeoffs between economic and ecological values. Policy makers can then use this tradeoff information in their decision-making.</p> <p>5) Evaluation Framework appears predecisional and out of sync with Federal & State alternatives analysis and mitigation frameworks (John M)</p> <p>Response: The City will do an ESEE which will compare the benefits of different competing uses. But this project will offer a framework for potential future development and provide zoning for the site. This is not a federal/state decision making process.</p> <p>6) Existing site uses and site mgmt should factor into value assessment and framework—e.g. BES sanitary sewer facility, utilities and power lines, dredge material placement. (Susan B)</p> <p>Response: Description of current conditions, management practices, and facilities will be part of the baseline description. Emphasis will be placed on describing how the existing management practices and infrastructure are likely to be affecting current ecological functions and habitats.</p> <p>7) ODFW recommends the following be incorporated into this section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ODFW fish recovery plans -Applicable OARs related to protected fish & wildlife -Oregon Conservation Strategy -ODFW’s Fish and Wildlife Habitat Mitigation policy -City’s Terrestrial Ecology Enhancement Strategy <p>Response: ENTRIX is working on a specific Mitigation/Restoration study option for which many of these documents would be critical. Within the existing scope, these documents will be useful to review in the context of the limiting factor analysis.</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Env. 3.1- 3	<p>8) Add some additional mitigation research (Katy Weil)</p> <p>Response: ENTRIX is working on this scoping for this additional analysis.</p>
Env. 4. 1-3	<p>1) This states that the response curves are “in terms of the total ecosystem”. I would take that to mean the study area. (Port- TAP)</p> <p>Response: Response curves are expected to reflect the response of ecosystem functions on the WHI planning area to development.</p> <p>2) Describe predicted habitat changes over time to predict changes in ecosystem functions and quantify impacts to natural resources.....to demonstrate “no net loss” of natural resources functions and values the time element needs to be addressed. (Susan B)</p> <p>Response: See comments on Section 3.1-3. Changes over time will be taken into consideration especially with regard to interpreting the no net loss of function principle. A functional loss may be determined by comparing expected ecological functioning under a future development scenario with the current baseline that is assumed to move into the future into a dynamic way. ENTRIX understands that no net loss of ecosystem function is a guiding principal for the study effort and suggests that an analysis of avoidance, mitigation and enhancement opportunities be undertaken.</p> <p>3) Limiting factors need to: (Comments from Bob S.)</p> <p>a. Consider how development on WHI undermines function of the system of natural areas-</p> <p>Response: See comments on 2.3D and 3.1-3 (comment 4).</p> <p>b. Consider how development on WHI affects city’s ability to meet policy objectives.</p> <p>Response: This is the City’s role as part of the larger plan.</p> <p>c. Consider availability of mitigation opportunities to replace any lost natural resource value.</p> <p>Response: This is being addressed in a mitigation framework/proposal that will be reviewed as a potential addition to the scope of work.</p> <p>4) Response curve: ignores manner in which different natural resources affect one another –</p> <p>Response: Relationships between functions and resources are being considered in development of the evaluation framework. Interdependence between the resources and functions will be included in the framework.</p>
	<p>1) How about in the context of Metro’s employment land regulations and the City of Portland’s Economic Development Strategy and</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Econ. 1.1	<p>Economic Opportunity Analysis? (Port- TAP)</p> <p>Response: City will add a sentence to section 1.1 that references this information.</p> <p>2) Decision process framework: Add Federal to align state and local policy. Should also include Federal mandates and there should be a corresponding section in the Environmental Foundation study (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: This is part of the larger planning process. The city will review the federal regulatory framework as part of the larger planning process, but we do not have a specific development proposal right now to go beyond this.</p>
Econ 2.1	<p>1) Historical trends should not be Portland –centric. Maritime commerce in Portland is also closely related to Lower Columbia River.... (Sebastian D)</p> <p>Response: We have a limited scope and are looking at historical trends in Portland. It would be hard to look at history outside of the region under the current scope.</p> <p>2) Historical trends should be broad beyond the City- put into regional context that includes other west coast ports (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: Same answer as above</p> <p>3) Section 2.2:</p> <p>a. Not clear on why Economic Impacts of the Harbor is being done- we are looking at a specific parcel not the entire working harbor. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: We need to know impacts of the industrial harbor and the impacts on the harbor in general to understand the impacts on WHI, which is a part of it.</p> <p>b.All interviews should be public (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: Confidentiality of these interviews is normal practice. That confidentiality allows firms to give us information on firm-based competitive strategies that might be considered given different infrastructure development alternatives. Assuming consent is provided by those interviewed, notes from these interviews will be made available to the public.</p> <p>c. Environmental stakeholders should be included in interview group (Bob S.) –</p> <p>Response: ENTRIX will review the positions of all stakeholders as part of the work. Environmental stakeholders will provide information for the environmental foundation study.</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
Econ 2.1	<p>4) Under purpose- add need and alternative site analysis (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: A sentence will be added to the purpose statement of this section to mention the importance of understanding alternatives.</p>
Econ 2.4	<p>1) This low medium high ranking process may be critical to the outcome of the study. For example, I would imagine that, like the City's NRI, a water front site with access to a deep water channel might have a value of 3, while because it may necessitate millions of cubic yards of fill that may be worth a 1. Like the NRI, the end result is a higher value. And what characteristics are equivalent to SHAs? Within 1 or 2 miles of an interstate interchange? Adjacent to a main line rail line? (Port- TAP)</p> <p>Response: ENTRIX will evaluate site suitability in Task 4 of the Economic Foundation study.</p>
Econ 3	<p>1) Section is too broad. Only development on island that would be allowed would be for cargo facilities. (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: The definitions of "Marine Cargo" and "Marine Industrial" will be updated to include an emphasis on deep water access. The emphasis will be on industries that take advantage of the unique feature of deep water access and the rail component.</p>
Econ 4.2	<p>1) Clarify "understanding the coastal site suitability criteria—should "coastal" be included (Anne S) –</p> <p>Response: The word coastal will be deleted.</p> <p>2) Site Suitability - Need to include Columbia Corridor in general and Vancouver (Bob S.)</p> <p>Response: These areas are already included based on the definition of the study area.</p>
Econ 5.2	<p>1) Land is also taken out of economic use through mitigation, infrastructure and other competing land uses—these should be considered too. (Sebastian D)</p> <p>Response: The consultant team will consider potential future loss of land base due to mitigation, infrastructure and other competing land uses.</p>
Econ 6.1	<p>1) Cut 20-40, Add 50-100 and larger than 100 acres. These numbers are more appropriate to rail served marine cargo handling sites. (Port-TAP)</p> <p>2) Evaluate large sites 20-40 acres and over 50-what about sites between 40 and 50? (Anne S)</p> <p>Response: These acreages were included in the scope merely as examples. The actual size of proposed parcels for development will be determined through the analysis of future land needs.</p>
Econ 6.2	<p>1) Consultant should take into consideration transportation access requirements as well as site size. (Sebastian D) –</p>

Task #	Summary of Proposed Changes and Clarifications to the Scope of Work (City Staff/Entrix responses in blue)
	Response: These will be taken into consideration.
Econ. Exhibit A Econ. Exhibit A	1) Omit Marine Industrial consultant- not part of original CWG review (T. Helzer) 2) Close collaboration with BST is unacceptable if contract is under the Port (Bob S.) Response: The work from BST Associates will inform the ENTRIX work product, but will be evaluated in the context of other forecast sources such as earlier work by BST, Oregon economic forecasts, and City forecasts.
Integration	1) This integration effort needs to be fleshed out. It is unclear what the outcome is beyond the “how developed” and “how to be used.” (Port- TAP) Response: The integration effort is designed to demonstrate how the two studies can be used together to evaluate potential tradeoffs between development, ecological function, and possibly recreation and mitigation potentials. Without this piece, the two studies may stand alone as separate foundation studies, but the CWG and other stakeholders will not be provided with suggestions for how the results may inform decision making. Until the research is completed, it will not be clear exactly what form this will take, but the form will follow key elements of both studies that have the potential to alter overall assessment and ultimate outcomes. 2) Need more information on Dan Tormey, his role was not originally discussed by CWG (Bob S.) Response: A resume is available for review.