



**EAST INDUSTRIAL PARK PROJECT**  
**SUMMARY OF SPECIAL COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Wednesday, April 16, 2008, 5:30–7:30 p.m.**

The Port of Camas-Washougal held a special Commission Meeting on Wednesday, April 16, 2008, from 5:30-7:30 p.m. at the Port offices, 24 South “A” Street, Washougal, Washington. The following is a summary of the meeting proceedings and the public comments provided during the meeting. The meeting agenda and sign-in sheets are attached.

**Opening & Introduction**

The meeting began with welcoming comments by Commissioner Bill Ward. Port staff members Executive Director David Ripp and Director of Planning and Development Scot Walstra introduced themselves. Commissioner Ward turned the meeting over to David, who made a few additional opening comments and introduced the members of the consulting team (Karyn Criswell and Don Hardy, JD White, a division of BERGER/ABAM Engineers, Inc., and Tess Jordan, E.D. Hovee & Company, LLC).

Scot gave a brief overview of the history of the East Industrial Park site, the project, and its status. Scot then turned the meeting over to Karyn.

**Review Structure & Agenda**

Karyn outlined the purposes of the meeting:

- Review by Port Commission, staff, and public of the draft alternatives analysis prepared by the consultant team,
- Obtain preliminary Commission feedback on the analysis; and
- Hear initial public comment on the analysis.

Karyn then described the process and structure of the meeting. Its first half would be a Commission workshop at which the consultants would present their information to the Commission, answer questions from them, and hear their feedback. A short break would follow, followed in turn by comments from the public.

**Report Presentation and Commission Discussion**

Karyn, Don, and Tess then presented an overview of the Alternatives Analysis Technical Memorandum. The report was available to attendees as a handout and selected information was shown on a projection screen. The team reviewed the purpose of the alternatives analysis and the summary of findings (see below).

*Purpose of Alternatives Analysis*

- Evaluate extent to which each alternative is consistent with the guiding principles.
- Identify measures/metrics for each guiding principle.
- Assign a preliminary rating for each metric.

*Summary of Findings*

- Neither alternative was found to be significantly more consistent with the guiding principles/ metrics.
- Alternative 1 appears to be only slightly more consistent.
- Blending the two alternatives with additional performance standards may result in an alternative that is more consistent.

The consultant team then reviewed the assumptions and rationale for each metric and the guiding principles, answering questions from the Commission during the presentation. The team then discussed the three tables below.

**Alternatives Analysis Summary**

<b>Guiding Principles and Related Metrics</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>
GP 1: Land use conflicts are minimized		
Minimizes land use conflicts with existing Port tenants	High	Low-Moderate
Minimizes land use conflicts with wildlife refuge	Unknown	Unknown
GP 2: Entitlements are maintained		
Likelihood of maintaining entitlements	High	Low-Moderate
GP 3: Economic impact.		
See Table 2 below.		
GP 4: Recreational opportunities and public access		
Provides for continued use of levee trail and waterfront	High	High
GP 5: Selling port property.		
See Sell or Retain Property Summary Table below.		

---

**Economic Impact Summary**

**Guiding Principles and Related Metrics**

**Relative Comparison**

GP 3: Economic impact. The economic impacts of a different range of uses must be equal to or more favorable than the economic impact of the range of uses that is currently permitted.

Land value today

Equal

Land value 20 years from now

Equal

Tax revenue 20-year net present value (NPV)

Alt. 1 is more favorable

Wages 20-year NPV

Alt. 2 is more favorable

Job density 5 years from now

Equal

Job density 20 years from now

Alt. 2 is more favorable

**Sell or Retain Property Summary**

Alternative 1

Alternative 2

GP 5: Disposition considerations

Type of industry would be viewed favorably, albeit cautiously, by the Port comprehensive plan

Moderate

High

Meets a level of employment of at least seven jobs per acre

High

High

Encourages capitalized users

Unknown

Unknown

Environmental responsibility

Unknown

Unknown

Diversifies industrial base

High

Low-Moderate

Acceptable inventory of Port property remaining

Unknown

Unknown

There was some discussion concerning the current platting process and it was clarified that Phase I of the East Industrial Park Extension proposes a 26-lot subdivision with lots of varying sizes. Commissioner Ward noted that he would like to discuss the issue of aesthetics and commented several times later in the meeting, saying that he was interested in discussing what the site looks like, conditions of sale or lease, and whether it should be an industrial park rather than just an industrial site.

Commissioner Alan Hargrave stated that aesthetics are difficult because perspectives vary based upon the eye of the beholder. He suggested it might be appropriate to retain ownership of the property along the levee and wetlands in order to maintain control. He also had additional comments.

- How do you attract aesthetically pleasing users?
- Perhaps moving them within the park. He requested examples of this.
- Concerned that the East Industrial Park could be made too restrictive, which would slow the build-out of the industrial park or drive away potential buyers.

Commissioner Ward noted that it would be nice to have uniformity within the industrial park.

### **Public Comment**

Following the presentations, attendees took a 10-minute break. Commissioner Hargrave reconvened the meeting and began accepting public comments. A summary follows of comments by attendees:

Rich Hamby, Washougal resident

- Regarding the guiding principles, it seems like a few things got dropped out of consideration. The Port's mission says diversify the economic base and that is really what should be considered.
- Mystified at the suggestion that business park users will not want to drive through the industrial park. Yet, we do not know what people would want to look at from the dike trail.
- It is not just the visual aesthetics, but the noise as well. Business park is quieter than industrial development.
- The quality of the experience needs to be considered.
- Users of the interpretive trail in the refuge should also be considered.
- Does not see lack of visibility from Highway 14 as an impediment. There is some visibility. A lot of these slight disadvantages would be outweighed by the outstanding view.

Commissioner Hargrave asked Tess Jordan to address Mr. Hamby's comment about what business park tenants look for in a campus.

Tess replied that corporate campuses want their names in big letters at the head of their driveway. A controlled entry is important to corporate campuses. While this is one issue, the return to the freeway through most of the industrial area would be much more problematic to a potential corporate tenant.

Mr. Hamby added that the Port has two proposals from people who want to buy the property and they see the area as ideal.

Later during the public comment period, Commissioner Hargrave asked Mr. Hamby which alternative he preferred and whether he had a preference as to whether the Port should retain or sell the property. Mr. Hamby stated that he did not have strong feelings regarding retain versus sell. He stated that he believes that property taxes are better for schools if the property is sold; if this is the case, then the property should be sold. If the property is sold, the Port needs to set standards for its development, such as uniformity standards. He noted, "It is the experience of what I am walking by when walking on the levee trail that is important, not who is paying the taxes."

Wilson Cady, Audubon Society, Columbia Gorge Refuge Stewards

- Take a long view of the uses of this land. It is an historic site. Lieutenant Broughton claimed the land for England. There is a lot of history in the scenic area. A lot of businesses would not mind being there.
- Yes, Camas and Washougal were at one time believed to be too far out. The same was true for the Lacamas Lake area, and look what we have now.
- The Columbia Gorge is not going to move. More and more people are going to come here.
- Port needs a targeted campaign to bring in clients it wants.
- Port of Camas-Washougal had landscaping standards in the 1980s, but they have not been used.
- The Port has control over allowable uses. In the 1980s, the Port considered, but did not allow a Union Carbide plant. We were told it would be controlled. There is a toxic plume from the Port of Camas-Washougal under the refuge now. The controls have not worked.
- Need family wage jobs.
- There is a lot more than wintering waterfowl on the refuge.
- The refuge is a significant intersection of two flyways, north-to-south and east-to-west migration routes, which is what makes the refuge valuable. Two-thirds of all the species of birds located in Clark County can be seen at the refuge.
- Described the new interpretive center and pathway to be constructed at the refuge that will attract many more visitors.
- Referenced 2001 Economics of Wildlife Watching Report. Provided data on the economic impact of the industry.
- Important to preserve aesthetics from the levee trail. There is a list of different groups that are guided on the trail. People walk to get by the industrial portion of the site.
- The Port's role is to serve the entire community.

Commission Hargrave asked if there is an alternative preference of retain versus sell. Mr. Cady replied that he thinks the Port should retain control.

Jeff Guard, Washougal resident

- Expressed his appreciation for and applauded the Port's process, stating that it is encouraging.
- The challenge is going to be finding the right mix of uses.
- Keep an open mind on other options.
- As former Washougal City Mayor, and former Councilmember, it was always the City's goal to connect the trail with downtown.
- Make sure SR 14 is done in an aesthetically pleasing manner.
- Regarding the transition from the entrance to the site, the Port is encouraged to develop a consistent landscaping plan so there is a consistent look. Can the Port upgrade older areas of the industrial park?
- It is important to work closely with partners, like the City, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Washougal School District.
- This is an opportunity to be unique.
- Continue to use the process to evaluate individual proposals, using cost-versus-benefit analysis.

Martha Martin, Washougal resident

- Do what is most economically beneficial to the community. Maintain control and make sure aesthetics are addressed.
- No other place can say that they are at the mouth of the Columbia River Gorge.
- Do you want to look at the muted color palette of a brick four-story building or natural colors?
- There are tangibles that deal with quality of life and health. There are studies out there that should be considered.

Mr. Hamby provided the following additional comments:

- Be a good neighbor.
- Need to make sure new stuff is good for tenants and does not hurt them.
- Create a soft edge between the Port and the Gorge. It is not hard to imagine how it could be stepped down.

### **Next Steps**

At the conclusion of the public comment period, Karyn reviewed the next steps in the process. She indicated that the Port would accept written comments on the draft alternatives analysis through April 30, 2008. These comments will be compiled and provided to the Port Commission for its consideration in advance of a potential decision on the future direction of the East Industrial Park at the regular Commission meeting on May 5, 2008.

Commissioner Ward stated that he sees May 5, 2008, as the beginning of a long process. The Port would like to see some examples of what could be done, including visioning and covenants codes and restrictions (CC&Rs).

Commissioner Hargrave added that perhaps the Port should update its comprehensive plan. He noted that the Port has done it at the airport. He stated that it would be a good idea to update the comprehensive plan for the waterfront.

Commissioner Hargrave stated that he does not know if he is ready to make a decision on May 5. He suggested talking about 1) what additional information the Port needs, 2) what might be the right mix of uses, and 3) at what point the Port should accept private proposals.

Commissioner Hargrave stated that he sees the mix of uses as market-driven and is not sure the Port should get involved in that.

Karyn suggested that perhaps the Port ought to define its vision for the East Industrial Park more clearly before soliciting proposals for the site. Commissioners Hargrave and Ward agreed that this would be prudent.

Commissioner Hargrave thanked the public for participating in the process and the consultant team for their work. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:50 p.m.

**EAST INDUSTRIAL PARK PROJECT ~ SPECIAL COMMISSION MEETING**

**Wednesday, April 16, 2008 – 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.**

**AGENDA**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Topics</b>
5:30	Commission President Alan Hargrave	<b>Opening &amp; Welcome</b>
5:35	David Ripp & Scot Walstra	<b>Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project/property history and current status</li> </ul>
5:40	Karyn Criswell	<b>Review of Structure &amp; Agenda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Review draft alternatives analysis</li> <li>○ Preliminary Commission feedback on analysis</li> <li>○ Public comment on alternatives analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Description of process/meeting structure</li> </ul>
5:45	Karyn Criswell & Don Hardy, JDW; Tess Jordan, E.D. Hovee; Port Commission & Staff	<b>Report Presentations &amp; Commission Discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives Analysis Technical Memorandum</li> </ul>
6:30	All	<b>BREAK</b>
6:45	Public	<b>Public Comment</b>
7:25	Karyn Criswell	<b>Next Steps</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written public comments on alternatives analysis accepted through 4/30/08. Oral commentary accepted at public hearing on 5/5/08.</li> <li>• Commission will deliberate and decide on future direction of the East Industrial Park (tentatively 5/05/08).</li> </ul>
	Commission President Alan Hargrave	<b>Concluding Remarks</b>

**Handouts:**

- Alternatives Analysis Technical Memorandum
- Comment forms

**PLEASE NOTE:** Public comment will be taken only during the public comment portion of the agenda. Those wishing to comment must sign up on the sheet provided and their comments may be limited to 3 to 5 minutes, depending on the number of people who wish to speak. Forms are also available for those who prefer to provide written comments.