



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NAME	Port of Vancouver Berth 8/9 Extension and Efficiency Project
PROJECT NUMBER	A19.0198.02
DATE	10 April 2023
TIME	3:00PM
VENUE	Microsoft Teams
SUBJECT	Pre-Application Meeting
CLIENT	Port of Vancouver

ATTENDEES

NAME	ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
Matt Harding	Port of Vancouver	mharding@portvanusa.com
Monty Edberg	Port of Vancouver	medberg@portvanusa.com
Thane Giles	Port of Vancouver	tgiles@portvanusa.com
Patty Boyden	Port of Vancouver	pboyden@portvanusa.com
Nicole Lutton	Port of Vancouver	nlutton@portvanusa.com
Sara Tilley	Northwest Seaport Alliance	stilley@nwseaportalliance.com
Amaia Smith	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)	amaia.smith@dfw.wa.gov
Laura Inouye	Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology)	lino461@ecy.wa.gov
Meghan Tait	Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology)	meghan.tait@ecy.wa.gov
Kinsey Friesen	US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	kinsey.m.friesen@usace.army.mil
Keith Jones	City of Vancouver	keith.jones@cityofvancouver.us
Brian Carrico	WSP, Project Manager	brian.carrico@wsp.com
Dan Gunderson	WSP, Senior Environmental Scientist	dan.gunderson@wsp.com
Robert Bennington	WSP, Senior Environmental Scientist	robert.bennington@wsp.com

MEETING NOTES

NOTES

Matt, Monty, Brian and Dan presented the attached presentation. The following were questions, comments and discussion on items presented.

Benching/Shoreline:

Laura Inouye/Ecology:

- Where is the “benched” material going and does it need to be characterized? Recommended further discussion as the design progresses.
- Does the extension of Berth 9 mean a future need for maintenance dredging at the new berth? Matt noted that no changes to the dredge prism are proposed as part of this project, and that dredging for the berth would be addressed through the port’s maintenance dredge permits.

Keith Jones/City:

- Excavation below the ordinary high water mark for the benching will require a shoreline conditional use permit. Keith acknowledges that the impacts may be partially offset by the habitat improvements and new habitat created associated with the benching.
- Shoreline conditional use goes through ecology and hearing examiner – Keith noted the importance of having a complete JARPA package, including mitigation documentation, with shoreline application.
- City will waive the requirement for site plan review as the shoreline permit will address these requirements, and the City’s pre-application meeting can also be waived due to limited involvement with other departments. Mike Swanson is City stormwater contact.
- If agencies (USACE, WDFW, Ecology) are comfortable with mitigation strategy, this will help the hearing examiner. Include information on consultation with agencies (such as this meeting) in application.
- Keith recommended the port request a specific timeframe in the permit applications to accommodate the potential worst-case construction schedule. Permits typically include a 2-year period in which construction must commence, and a 5 year window for completion. If more time may be needed it can be included in the permit request.

Brian Carrico/WSP:

- Excavation within the benched area can likely be performed in the dry, as an impact minimization measure.

Habitat Impacts:

Amaia Smith/WDFW:

- Greatest concern is impacts from overwater shading from the aprons and extension.
 - Out-migrating juvenile salmonid concern.
 - Impacts to fish behavior? Are they pushed into deeper water and subject to predation? Does dark benched area create predator habitat?
- WDFW encourages a thorough assessment of impacts from new overwater shading.
 - Encourages the team to consider design elements that could reduce impacts from shading if possible.
 - Asked about feasibility of grating or equivalent design features? Acknowledges that WDFW grating requirements are developed for residential docks, and may not be applicable to port structures.
 - Sara Tilley/NW Seaport Alliance:
 - NMFS would not encourage grating due to potential to affect stormwater capture/treatment.

MEETING NOTES

- Overwater shading would be of less concern within the apron areas, as these areas are surrounded by existing overwater cover and any fish accessing these portions of the shoreline would already pass through shaded areas to get there.
- Recommended further conversations regarding impacts and mitigation as the project develops. NMFS prefers the use of mitigation banks and other fee type mitigation opportunities while WDFW prefers to see applicant proposed mitigation.
- Will port be proposing to use credits from creosote pile removal at Terminal 1 on this project? Sara Tilley thinks would likely be difficult on federal side, but could be used as part of state/local mitigation.

Lead Agency:

Kinsey Frieson/USACE:

- As project progresses identify lead federal agency so agencies can discuss resource allocation if MARAD is not the lead agency. This is dependent on the grant win.
- Determination of lead federal agency could affect whether Sara could handle the ESA consultation and whether SLOPES could be applicable (if it fit project).

Vessel Traffic:

- WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval jurisdiction is limited to construction activities, vessel traffic is not considered part of this and outside their scope.
- Vessel traffic should be considered under SEPA. Since SEPA is required for 401 process, that will be the mechanism for Ecology review.
- Vessel traffic will be factored into Section 7 consultation, but not anticipated to result in a need for mitigation. Would be addressed in the incidental take statement.

Other:

Meghan Tait noted no concerns.

Laura Inouye:

- Indicated the need to look at possible contaminated sediments and the need to review maps and existing data
- Noted that the inclusion of fish mix gravel in the benched area could help address antidegradation standards and characterization may not be needed.
- Recommended careful consideration of the potential need for dredging downstream of the existing berth to accommodate vessel approach, to avoid the need to modify or require new permits later.