AGENDA
ASTORIA CITY COUNCIL

July 20, 2015
7:00 p.m.
2nd Floor Council Chambers
1095 Duane Street • Astoria OR 97103

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS (NON-AGENDA)

4. PRESENTATIONS
(a) Goonies Event Update by Skip Hauke, Astoria/Warrenton Chamber of Commerce

5. CHANGES TO AGENDA

6. CONSENT CALENDAR
The items on the Consent Calendar are considered routine and will be adopted by one motion unless a member of the City Council requests to have any item considered separately. Members of the Community may have an item removed if they contact the City Manager by 5:00 p.m. the day of the meeting.
(a) City Council Minutes of 6/15/15
(b) Community Development Department Project Status Update
(c) Resolution Addressing Program Details for the Continued Use and Management of the City Revolving Loan Funds Transferred to Craft3 (Formerly Known as Shorebank Enterprise Pacific) (Finance)
(d) Authorization to Purchase Thermoplastic for Crosswalk Delineation (Public Works)

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS
(a) Resolution Creating a Pilot Program to Allow "Parklets" on Side Streets in the Downtown Area (Public Works)
(b) Carbon Credit Project – Contract Approval for Third-Party Verifier (Public Works)
(c) Heritage Square Environmental Update (Public Works/Community Development)

8. NEW BUSINESS AND MISCELLANEOUS

9. REPORTS OF COUNCILORS

THIS MEETING IS ACCESSIBLE TO THE DISABLED. AN INTERPRETER FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED MAY BE REQUESTED UNDER THE TERMS OF ORS 192.630 BY CONTACTING JULIE YUILL, CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE, 503-325-5824.

CITY OF ASTORIA
Founded 1811 ● Incorporated 1856

July 15, 2015

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: BRETT ESTES, CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: ASTORIA CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JULY 20, 2015

PRESENTATIONS

Item 4(a): Goonies Event Update by Skip Hauke, Astoria/Warrenton Chamber of Commerce

Skip Hauke, Executive Director of the Astoria-Warrenton Chamber of Commerce, will update the City Council regarding the Goonies event that took place in June of this year.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Item 6(a): City Council Minutes

The minutes of the City Council meeting of June 15, 2015 are enclosed for review. Unless there are any corrections, it is recommended that Council approve these minutes.

Item 6(b): Community Development Department Status Report

Enclosed is a status report regarding major Community Development Department projects. This report is provided for information only.

Item 6(c): Resolution Addressing Program Details for the Continued Use and Management of the City Revolving Loan Funds Transferred to Craft3 (Formerly Known as Shorebank Enterprise Pacific) (Finance)

Resolution No. 01-30 was adopted November 5, 2001 to recognize the continued management of revolving loan funds by Shorebank Enterprise Pacific (ENTERPRISE). In 2013 the operations of ENTERPRISE, for Washington and Oregon were rebranded as Craft3 (CRAFT3). CRAFT3 continues to manage $ 113,450 of Revolving Loan Fund assets which provide business loans to third parties and recoverable grants to support economic development and redevelopment opportunities consistent with City goals and strategies. The budget for 2015-16 contains amounts intended to support potential code enforcement under the derelict building program (Astoria Code Section 5.670 through 5.746).

Subsequent collection of code enforcement expenses would be reimbursed to the revolving loan fund. The attached resolution recognizes the rebranding of ENTERPRISE to CRAFT3 and acknowledges the continued relationship for management of the City Revolving Loan Funds, to promote the economic and community development objective of the City. It is recommended that Council adopt the proposed resolution.

Item 6(d): **Authorization to Purchase Thermoplastic for Crosswalk Delineation (Public Works)**

The Public Works Department will be changing the configuration of the crosswalks from painted standard parallel lines to Thermoplastic "continental" style crosswalks. Continental is the style used by the Oregon Department of Transportation on newly painted crosswalks downtown. Thermoplastic is a torch down material that is centered out of the tire path portion of the crosswalk and far outlasts traditional traffic paint. The purchase price for the material is $12,038.00. Fiscal year 2015-2016 Streets budget has funds appropriated for this purchase. It is recommended Council approve the purchase of Thermoplastic from Ennis-Flint for $12,038.00.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

Item 7(a): **Resolution Creating a Pilot Program to Allow “Parklets” on Side Streets in the Downtown Area (Public Works)**

City staff has been approached by two business owners over the last year concerning the potential for their businesses to be able to establish small outdoor commercial spaces in the street rights-of-way adjacent to their locations. In many communities that permit this activity, this is what is referred to as a “Parklet”. In downtowns or older commercial areas where open space is lacking, they are seen as a way to provide more outdoor seating or landscaping, and to enliven the streetscape. The parklet would basically be a deck occupying most of a parking space, approximately 7’ wide by 18’ long, and contain landscaping and seating. It may or may not be in conjunction with a restaurant. They must meet ADA and building standards, and be open to the public on a 24/7 basis. They could be removed in the winter months.

Staff has recommended that they be allowed only on the “side streets” (not Marine Drive, Commercial Street, Duane or Exchange Streets), and that they be in the interior of the blocks and not on the corners. Since this involves the private use of a public right-of-way, staff (including ADHDA staff) has drawn on work done in other cities to develop and adapt several policies which are attached for the Council’s review. The ADHDA Board has reviewed the policies and proposed the idea of doing a two year pilot project for up to two parklet spaces. Once a property owner proposes a parklet project, staff would bring the proposal to the City Council for approval. It is recommended that Council consider the proposal of a pilot project for a two year period, and if approved, adopt the attached resolution.

Item 7(b): **Carbon Credit Project – Contract Approval for Third-Party Verifier (Public Works)**

At the June 4, 2015 City Council meeting, Council approved a contract with The Climate Trust (Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement) to sell carbon credits generated from the City of Astoria Watershed carbon project. The Climate Trust has agreed to pay the City $2, 057,500 over a two-year period (2016-2017) carbon credits. The contract with The Climate Trust requires the City to deliver carbon credits from the City's forest carbon project that are third-party validated and verified as meeting all American Carbon Registry (ACR) standards and requirements. On June 17, 2015, the Public Works Department issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to validate and verify the City's forest carbon project. On July 8, 2015, the City received four responses to its RFQ. Submission were evaluated and ranked by Public Works staff. Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI) of North Lawrence, Ohio earned the highest overall ranking. ESI does subcontract with qualified local forestry consultants to assist with validation and verification tasks. Staff subsequently negotiated a contract price of $29,500 to complete work. This price is within the budget estimate presented and approved by the Council at its June 4, 2015 meeting. It is recommended that Council approve award of the Bear Creek Watershed ACR Improved Forest Management Project Validation and Verification contract to Environmental Services, Inc.

Item 7(c): **Heritage Square Environmental Update (Public Works/Community Development)**

John L. Kuiper of Amec Foster Wheeler will present an update of work completed on the Heritage Square EPA Grant project.

CITY OF ASTORIA **CITY COUNCIL JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS**
City Council Chambers
June 15, 2015

A regular meeting of the Astoria Common Council was held at the above place at the hour of 7:00 pm.

Councilors Present: Nemlowill, Herzig, Warr, Price, Mayor LaMear

Councilors Excused: None

Staff Present: City Manager Estes, Assistant City Manager/Police Chief Johnston, Parks and Recreation Director Cosby, Finance Director Brooks, Fire Chief Ames, Planner Johnson, Library Director Tucker, Public Works Director Cook, and City Attorney Henningsgaard. The meeting is recorded and will be transcribed by ABC Transcription Services, Inc.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (NON-AGENDA)

Karin Temple, Astoria, said she understood the City has discussed encouraging the rescue mission on Bond Street to be less discriminatory and have a more open door policy because any entity that accepts public money should do so. Her point of view was that the rescue mission was run by a church and was not a public organization. Faith discrimination and many other forms of discrimination occur at the rescue mission. While being in close contact with the homeless shelter all last winter, she learned that most of the guests of the homeless shelter would not attempt to get into the rescue mission for various reasons. She was alarmed two weeks ago when two young, clean, well-mannered, homeless men showed up for a service at Grace Episcopal Church and were not accepted. She questioned which narrow slot of Christianity one must fit into to get into the rescue mission. She encouraged City Council to continue enforcing compliance with the non-discrimination policy.

Margaret Frimoth, Astoria, said she was also grateful that the City has supported and insists on a non-discriminatory statement for the use of City funds. The mission is very strict in its beliefs. In her work at the college as the Lives in Transition Director, she learned some students could not go to school if they were at the mission because the residents may hear different opinions. She believed this was a concern that people should know about. She completely supported a non-discriminatory clause for public funds and encouraged the City to continue the policy. The policy makes public services accessible to everyone.

Jack Osterberg, 1711 Grand Avenue, Astoria, asked when Bond Avenue would be repaired and completed. Bond is currently closed to traffic in one direction and while he understood projects take time completing the street improvements is important because the connectivity is essential to pedestrians and motor vehicles. Bond provides the only east/west movement, other than Marine and Commercial, between one part of the city and another. He did not want the City to forget to improve the street and install a nice sidewalk for public access.

Director Cook said the topographic survey of the slide area on Bond was just completed last week. The survey information will be given to the City's geotechnical engineers who will make a final recommendation about how to open Bond Street.

Mr. Osterberg thanked Director Cook for the update and said he hoped the street would be open to two-way traffic with pedestrian sidewalks on both sides of the street.

George Hauge, Astoria, said he wanted to repeat some of the comments he made at the last meeting because there were some people who did not hear him. Several years ago, the City agreed to repay $43,000 for some destruction the City had done at the 9th Street Park. The new Parks Director did spend $8,500 to remove some material and install a sprinkler and sod system a few years ago. However, the City is still more than $34,000 short on its promise to pay back by improving the park. Nothing has been done since the sod and sprinkler system was installed, which was about 18 months ago. More than 20 people attended a community meeting, where ideas for the 9th Street Park were discussed. The ideas went well beyond installing new sod, but nothing has happened. He was sure many people would appreciate a light, not a big glaring light, but something that would honor the night lighting system. This has not been done. For two years, he has asked for ADA compliance at all of the parks. The transportation center is right across the street from the 9th Street Park. A wheelchair

should be able to go from the transportation center to the park, but the curb system at the park prohibits this. ADA compliance upgrades could be done with part of the money the City owes. If the entity that is owed the money forgives the debt, the City should be ashamed for failing to follow through on a promise. The park and the area deserve the attention that the money would allow. He hoped the City would honor its commitment instead of looking for a letter that states the $35,000 debt is forgiven.

- He was also concerned about the replica of the US Custom House. Currently, there are no displays that explain the house, though it looks like there may have been in the past. He wanted to know who was responsible for replacing the displays. The open space in front of the Courthouse also has the same issue. Two years ago, he mentioned street signs along the Riverwalk. He watches people come off the cruise ships with maps. He understood that over the past two years, there has been an effort to put some type of street signs together. However, the signs have not been installed. It would not take much to use sandwich boards or paper to let the 2,000 or 3,000 cruise ship visitors know where 9th, 10th, and 12th Streets are located. There is no 13th Street, so each of the streets should be numbered instead of assuming tourists will know where things are because people might spend time looking for 13th Street. He hoped all of his comments were heard this time.

Director Cosby said Staff has spoken with the agency that awarded the grant for the 9th Street Park. The agency is in the process of writing a letter to the City confirming the City has met all of the necessary requirements and has no obligations to pay back any funds. The letter will be presented to City Council and Mr. Haag once it has been received.

Mayor LaMear noted Mr. Haag continuously mentions that the City has an obligation to spend about $35,000. Director Cosby confirmed this was not accurate. The granting agency has not requested that the City make any additional modifications or repay any funds, but has stated the City completed its duties and they are satisfied.

Mayor LaMear understood at one time, there was a reader board at the US Custom House. Director Cosby clarified there were interpretive panels at the site, which were damaged about a year ago. No resources have been available to replace the panels. The budget for the next fiscal year should allow new panels to be produced. She confirmed that in the past, there was also an interpretive panel along the Riverwalk near the 9th Street Park and adjacent to the trolley stop. Staff can look at putting in another panel at this location.

Mayor LaMear asked what historical information was on the panel near the 9th Street Park. Director Cosby said the panel had information about the cannery and fishery activities along that region of the river and the development history of the park. Rosemary Johnson added that Pacific Power had a power station in the area, which was removed when the City acquired the property. The interpretive sign at the trolley stop discussed the Chinese influence in Astoria because the trolley stop area was part of the Chinatown area.

Mayor LaMear said the original idea was to put the Garden of Surging Waves in the 9th Street Park area. The area has a lot of symbolic importance to the Chinese community. Therefore, she believed it was a good idea to put an interpretive sign in the park. City Manager Estes said Staff would look into this and present some concepts and budget considerations to City Council.

Councilor Warr believed the City had planned to install street signs on the Riverwalk. City Manager Estes said the Streetscape Master Plan was developed last year in conjunction with the Astoria Downtown Historic District Association (ADHDA). The City submitted a grant application for the first phase of the project, which was not approved. He believed the Public Works Department could develop some signage.

Mayor LaMear asked if there was an interpretive sign at the US Custom House. Director Cosby said there used to be, but it was severely vandalized. Sign holders are still in the ground and can be used for a new sign. She added that Staff has applied for two additional grants to fund the way finding signs. The City will receive a decision on those applications in July.

Mayor LaMear believed the US Custom House should be explained. It sits out in the middle and people wonder what the building is; she was glad to hear Staff is attempting to replace the interpretive signs.

Angela Fairless, 846 10th Avenue, Seaside, said she hosts the Hemp Fashion and Live Art Show at the annual Hempstock Festival in Portland. The show features clothing and costumes made of hemp and parts of the cannabis plants in her medical marijuana gardens. People and costumes are painted by using pot leaves as

stamps. She understood her art makes many people uncomfortable, so she has been careful about bringing it to her hometown of Seaside. Painting people with pot leaves is not as socially unacceptable in Portland as it might be in Clatsop County where it is more difficult to find models. However, since the majority of Clatsop County voters voted in favor of legalizing marijuana, she decided to bring a small portion of the live art section of her show to Clatsop County. On Friday, July 3rd at Shively Park, she will host Clatsop's Cannabis Closet Coming Out Party. People will be painted with pot leaves and a community photo will be taken to show support and solidarity for the cannabis plant. She chose Astoria as the venue for the event because it has been uplifting to see how City Council and staff have handled medical and recreational marijuana over the last year and a half. She attended a City Council meeting about a year and a half ago that restored her faith in democracy and mankind. Director Cosby, Julie Yuill, and Chief Johnston have been wonderful to work with. The most important thing to remember about the event is that the laws about public consumption have remained unchanged. It is illegal to consume cannabis in a public area or any area that can be viewed from a public area. As the host of this event, she wants to teach people that this law has not changed. All of her models have been trained to teach people about the laws and she believed most people were pretty good at self-policing. She was confident there would be no issues. She thanked Council and Staff for being so welcoming. On the day of the event, the models will meet at noon to begin their painting and costuming. The public is invited to come get painted at 3:30 pm and the community photo will be taken at 4:20 pm.

Councilor Herzig said Senator Suzanne Bonamici has introduced legislation to legalize the cultivation of hemp in the United States. It is currently legal to sell hemp products, but not cultivate hemp. Her proposal has been well received. Hemp is a great green crop that is very renewable and eco-friendly.

CHANGES TO AGENDA
No changes.

PRESENTATIONS

Item 5(a): <u>Dr. Edward Harvey Historic Preservation Awards</u>

The City of Astoria Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) has selected the 2015 recipients for the Dr. Edward Harvey Historic Preservation Award. The awards are presented each year to recognize property owners who have completed exterior restoration or beautification of a building, which exemplifies the historical attributes of the building or the architectural heritage of Astoria. This year there is one property to be presented with a certificate in the residential category, which is Justin Power for 778 38th Street.

Mayor LaMear gave background information about Dr. Harvey and the history of the award. She recognized members of the HLC and presented a framed certificate to Mr. Power.

City Manager Estes displayed before and after photos of the restoration work done on the property, which at one time was a derelict building. The building has become a sense of pride for Mr. Power and the neighborhood. At the next HLC meeting, the Commission will present an Honorable Mention Award to the owners of Astoria Brewing Company for their renovation work on Andrew & Steve's. The building is Astoria's first mid-century modern designated historic property; the second is Jerry Ostermiller's house.

Item 5(b): <u>State Historic Preservation Office Oregon Heritage All-Star Community Award</u>

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) announced a new program, the Oregon Heritage All-Star Community, to recognize cities that make the most of their heritage resources. By doing so, communities safeguard important elements of the past, advance both "quality of life" and economic objectives, and enhance their unique character. The program has three primary goals: 1) to educate communities about the full spectrum of cultural heritage activities available to them; 2) to encourage communities to expand and strengthen their participation in cultural heritage activities; and 3) to recognize communities, through a "certification" process, that reach an exemplary level of participation.

The program is sponsored by the Oregon Heritage Commission, which was established to secure, sustain, enhance, and promote Oregon's heritage. The nine-member, governor-appointed Commission has broad responsibilities as a connector and catalyst for hundreds of organizations and thousands of Oregonians devoted to preserving and interpreting Oregon's heritage resources. Its programs include the Heritage and Museum grant

programs, technical assistance for heritage organizations, and an annual conference. It also gives annually heritage excellence awards and designates Oregon Heritage Traditions and Statewide Celebrations. The Oregon Heritage Commission created a list of heritage related criteria by which the program can be measured. To be considered as a Heritage All-Star Community, 15 of the 20 criteria need to be met. To receive designation the community needs to submit an application which is reviewed by Oregon Heritage Commission staff and the designation is then approved by the Oregon Heritage Commission.

The City Council approved submission of this application at their December 3, 2012 meeting. Staff worked with the Historic Landmarks Commission to compile the various documents and materials for submittal. The City responded to all 20 of the criteria for designation. Some of the attachments requested for the 20 criteria were not complete as photographs of all of the events or functions were not available; however, at least 15 of the 20 criteria were complete. At the April 2015 Heritage Conference held in Coos Bay, Oregon, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) chose Astoria to receive an All-Star Community designation. Representatives from SHPO would like to present the Mayor and City Council with the award at the June 15, 2015 meeting.

Kyle Jansson, Oregon Heritage Commission, said he presented an Oregon Heritage Tradition award to the Astoria Regatta two years ago, noting the certificate on the wall. About 30 years ago, he lived in Aberdeen and would come to Astoria to visit an aunt. He did not like visiting Astoria because businesses were not open at convenient times. A colleague told him that even 15 years ago, when she and her husband arrived in Astoria on a Saturday evening, the first night of their honeymoon, the only restaurant open was the Pig and Pancake. However, 12 years ago was the first time he came back to Astoria, when the city was beginning to change into a heritage community. Astoria hosted the Lewis and Clark signature event, which brought together 50 Indian tribes and many local governments. The event was an eye opening experience that indicated something was going on in Astoria. Over time, he has come back to visit grant projects his commission has helped fund, to attend meetings and workshops, and to host the Oregon Heritage Conference four years ago. Every time he has come to Astoria, he has discovered a new program or project. Two or three years ago, when the Heritage Commission was considering the establishment of a recognition program for communities that honor their heritage, he believed Astoria would qualify. Astoria will be the sixth city to receive the Oregon Heritage All-Star Community Award. A community must qualify in 15 of 20 different categories to receive this designation and Astoria qualified for 16 of the categories. It is not surprising that Astoria overachieved and he was sure the city would work on the remaining four categories in the coming years. He listed all of the heritage sites and entities in Astoria that were considered as part of their award application, including the historic registries, history museums, school programs, the Main Street Project, heritage tourism, heritage events, and other awards received for its historic preservation and heritage work. He noted that Rosemary Johnson has won several awards for her contributions to Astoria and other cities in the state. He was sure the theatre would be full over the next few weeks. Two of the Oregon Heritage Commissioners, Jan Mitchell and Jerry Ostermiller, have come from Astoria. It is clear to the Oregon Heritage Commission that Astoria embraces heritage as a community value. The City, museums, businesses, and community members make a magnificent effort to preserve and share Astoria's history. This coordinated effort has made local heritage a contributor to the livability of Astoria and to its economy. When the nomination of Astoria was presented to the Commission in April 2015, it was about a 10 minute presentation. Then, there was a motion to approve the nomination. No discussion was necessary because there was no question about Astoria's ability to do great things with heritage. He, Ms. Mitchell, and Mr. Ostermiller presented the Oregon Heritage All-Star Community Award.

Mayor LaMear thanked Mr. Jansen for the award and said the community is very proud of its heritage.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The following items were presented on the Consent Calendar:

- **6(a) City Council Minutes of 5/18/15**
- 6(b) City Council Special Meeting Minutes of 5/7/15
- **6(c) Approval to Execute the Brownfields Redevelopment Fund Technical Assistance Grant for Reimbursement of Costs Related to the Removal of the Underground Heating Oil Tank and Mitigation of Associated Contaminated Soils at the Astoria Senior Center Project Site (Public Works)**

Councilor Herzig requested Items 6(a) and (c) be removed for further discussion.

DRAFT

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Warr, seconded by Councilor Price, to approve Item 6(b) of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

Item 6(a): City Council Minutes of 5/18/15

Councilor Herzig noted the following corrections to Page 4, paragraph 8: "Councilor Herzig did not believe anyone was questioning that the City would not have been able to relocate the tower ~~with~~ ***without*** the influence of the Friends."

Councilor Nemlowill noted the following correction to Page 4, paragraph 6: Mr. Seidel's name was spelled incorrectly as Mr. Zeidell.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Nemlowill, to approve Item 6(a) of the Consent Calendar, as corrected. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

Item 6(c): Approval to Execute the Brownfields Redevelopment Fund Technical Assistance Grant (Public Works)

Councilor Herzig said this item is about the removal of the oil tank and contaminated soil from the Astoria Senior Center Project. He asked Staff for an update on the progress because people have been asking why construction has not yet begun. City Manager Estes said in May 2015, City Council accepted additional grant funds at a special City Council meeting. The funds will allow the project to continue after coming in over bid. Since that meeting, Project Manager Al Jacques has been working with the Project Architect to revise interior architectural plans. The plan revisions will be reviewed by the City's Building Department. Once the plans and final bid amount are finalized, they will be presented to City Council hopefully within the next month.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Nemlowill, to approve Item 6(c) of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

Item 7(a): Ordinances regarding Amendment Request A14-05 on Riverfront Vision Plan Implementation for Bridge Vista Area (2nd readings & adoption) (Community Development)

In 2008-2009, the City of Astoria developed the Riverfront Vision Plan (RVP) to address issues dealing with open space, land use, and transportation along the Columbia River. Significant public involvement opportunities were designed to gain public input. This process was initiated to plan for these issues in a comprehensive manner and to set a framework for the future of the study area. The City's north Riverfront (Columbia River to West Marine/ Marine Drive/Leif Erikson Drive) was divided into four Plan areas of development: Bridge Vista (Portway to 2nd Street), Urban Core (2nd to 16th Street), Civic Greenway (16th to 41st Street), and Neighborhood Greenway (41st Street to east end of Alderbrook Lagoon).

The Bridge Vista Plan Area is generally located from Partway to 2nd Street and the River pier head line to West Marine/Marine Drive. The Planning Commission held four public work sessions on the draft amendments with mailed, e-mailed, and published notification to the general public and to anyone who has expressed interest in the Riverfront Vision Plan implementation process. The project team also conducted a Town Hall meeting for interested community members on January 6, 2015. A presentation to the City Council on the progress made to date was held on March 16, 2015. The work sessions have been well attended and over 100 people attended the Town Hall meeting.

The RVP for the Bridge Vista Planning Area identified Land Use Assumptions and Objectives, which state that *"This area is an appropriate location for new overwater development, should it occur. However, specific areas should remain open to preserve broad view of the river..."* The objectives include:

DRAFT

- Continue to support water-dependent uses within this area, but allow for a mix of commercial and residential uses that support but do not compete with the Downtown core.
- If development is to occur, promote new uses that are consistent with Astoria's "working waterfront."
- Encourage design of new or rehabilitated buildings that respect Astoria's character.
- Encourage new development along the Columbia River to improve and celebrate the River Trail and provide visual and periodic physical access to the water.
- Improve physical connections to adjacent neighborhoods.
- Use setbacks, stepbacks, and other measures to ensure an open feel and continued visual access to the river.
- Work with property owners, including those with existing leases to maximize open areas over the water.
- Change zoning of area west of 2nd Street from Tourist Commercial to other commercial zone.
- Expand (Uniontown) design overlay for the historic district to accentuate the historic area (north of US 30) and create a more prominent gateway for the urban core.

Throughout the RVP implementation process, the Planning Commission (APC) focused on these Assumptions and Objectives and did not attempt to change the Vision Plan as adopted. There was discussion and public comment during the work sessions on the interpretation of these objectives.

Proposed map amendments will include:

1. Rezone the parcels north of West Marine Drive currently zoned C-2 (Tourist Commercial) midblock between Basin Street and Columbia Avenue to C-3 (General Commercial) with a Pedestrian Oriented Commercial District Overlay.
2. Rezone the parcels north of West Marine Drive currently zoned C-2 (Tourist Commercial) midblock between Basin Street and Portway Street to S-2 (General Development Shoreland).
3. Rezone the parcels north of Marine Drive west of 2nd Street currently zoned C-2 (Tourist Commercial) to C-3 (General Commercial).
4. Apply the new Bridge Vista Overlay (BVO) Zone to the Bridge Vista Plan Area.

Proposed text/code amendments will include:

1. Add a new Pedestrian Oriented Commercial District Overlay Zone to allow for smaller commercial development at a pedestrian scale with less automobile dependent uses on the land side of the River Trail in the Bridge Vista Area.
2. Add a new Bridge Vista Overlay Zone to address the standards for:
- over-water and waterfront development including building height, building mass, width of structures, allowable uses, landscaping, and public access to the water, etc.;
- land side development including building heights, setback, stepback, landscaping, and off-street parking; and river access requirements.
3. Add new design standards for development in the Bridge Vista Area.
4. Move the sections on use of native plants from the Civic Greenway Overlay Zone to Article 3 on Landscaping to be applicable to other areas of the Riverfront Vision Plan.
5. Make miscellaneous "housekeeping" amendments related to references to the above noted amendments.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on April 7, 2015 meeting, unanimously recommending that the City Council adopt the proposed amendment as presented. The first reading of the two ordinances was held by Astoria City Council on Monday, June 1, 2015. As part of the motion for the first reading, the City Council made a minor amendment to restrict variances for over water development height limitations. Upon review of the draft language following the meeting, staff determined the prohibitions for variances were already in place. See Sections 14.100.C.1 and 14.100.C.2 of the Code amendment ordinance. Therefore, no new language is proposed. If the Council is in agreement, it would be in order to hold a second reading and adopt the two separate ordinances.

Councilor Price said over the past couple of weeks, she continued to receive a steady stream of communications from constituents who state they are unhappy with her vote to approve the Bridge Vista amendments. However, she continues to support the amendments because they make a huge step towards what she believes everyone wants. The positive aspects of the amendments might be buried in the planning and development code language. She reminded that the list of uses for overwater development and the on-land

aquatic zones, which were displayed on the screen, will be prohibited by the amendments. She hoped the community would agree that this is a good step. The City can continue to refine the code language as necessary. Some constituents have proposed specific area where development should be prohibited while others have indicated development should be prohibited across the entire area. The majority of this Council does not support that, nor does she because she could think of some development that would be appropriate and that the community would like. After hearing her constituent's comments, she reconsidered the Bridge Vista Area by focusing on the area just to the west of the Megler Bridge that includes the Maritime Memorial, the trestle area just west of Stephanie's Cabin where the inlet of the river comes up to Marine Drive, and the area right across the street from the Chamber of Commerce between two Astoria Warehouse buildings. She believed these three areas were the fabric of Uniontown. Part of the wonder of Astoria is experiencing the river every day, not that you need to park somewhere and walk out on the Riverwalk to see the river. She asked Council to refrain from amending the proposed language any further and allow her to ask the Planning Commission to consider the three areas she focused on. She had asked Matt Hastie why these areas were not included and he said these areas simply were not discussed. She believed these areas were important and should be considered. She asked if those areas could be considered by the Planning Commission separate from Council's approval of these amendments. She wanted the Planning Commission to give Council recommendations about how these areas could be included or why they might not be included. She believed three or four months would be enough time for the Planning Commission to develop these recommendations.

Councilor Herzig believed the Planning Commission would like to consider these areas because they are heavily invested in doing right by the people of Astoria. The Planning Commission is tasked with developing recommendations for a few more sections of the Riverfront Vision Plan. He supported Councilor Price's suggestion.

Councilor Price confirmed that she was proposing to move forward with the second readings and adoptions of the ordinances for the Bridge Vista, but was also asking City Council to direct the Planning Commission to consider the view corridor areas she mentioned. The economy is heating up and she believed it was important for the City to put as many restrictions in place as soon as possible.

Councilor Nemlowill said a lot of work has gone into the plan. Staff has worked very closely with the Planning Commission and she asked if City Manager Estes and Rosemary Johnson would like to respond to Councilor Price's suggestion. City Manager Estes said Councilor Price presented her idea to Staff that afternoon. The Planning Commission focused on providing a break in the massing of buildings along the waterfront and the impact to the bridge. Therefore, specific vista areas were not discussed. City Council directing the Planning Commission to consider these areas in greater detail is more of a policy matter.

Rosemary Johnson believed parts of these areas were discussed. The Planning Commission was trying to develop a balance of allowing some development while protecting certain view areas. The Commission did identify some view areas, but the view areas identified by Councilor Price are also good vistas. The Commission can consider protecting the views of more areas. She confirmed for Councilor Warr that the Maritime Memorial was already protected, as it lies within an area 150 feet from the center line of the bridge to the west. The view straight out in front of the memorial is protected; however, the area to the west, looking towards Cannery Pier Hotel, does allow some development. Councilor Price has recommended the view be protected more towards the west to create a bigger vista.

Councilor Warr said he strongly believed part of Astoria's charm was the working waterfront and the interests of investors should be protected. Protecting the working waterfront was an important aspect several years ago when this process began. He did not believe this was any less important now. The area around the Maritime Memorial should be protected, but it is okay. Looking west, one will see the port. Protecting view corridors at the port could potentially hurt the industrial area, which he did not believe the City should do.

Ms. Johnson noted that the port was not part of this plan, so any view protections would only extend as far as the Cannery Pier Hotel.

Councilor Price clarified that she was not suggesting any particular widths; the Memorial has pilings that extend out at an angle to the east and she believed the view could be greatly diminished. However, she wanted the Planning Commission to advise Council on the three areas.

Councilor Nemlowill was unsure about Councilor Price's suggestion. A lot of study had been done and presented on the Riverfront Vision Plan. Not too long ago, there was a fear in Astoria that there would be a wall of condominiums along the waterfront. She will be proud that will never happen once these amendments are approved. She wanted to conduct the second readings. She did not believe Councilor Price's idea had to go away, but she also did not have enough information to direct the Planning Commission to look at the three specific sites.

Mayor LaMear said she received a message from Ted Thomas, who wanted to address this item. However, the public hearing was closed at the last City Council meeting. She believed Councilor Price had an interesting idea. She supported conducting the second readings and passing the ordinances, as well as directing the Planning Commission to take a look at the three areas and consider amendments.

Councilor Herzig said City Council is grateful to the Planning Commission and Staff for all of the work they put into this. They completed their tasks and any discussion of the results is not a reflection on their passion for the City and their investment in the project. However, the people have made it clear this is not what they want. The Riverfront Vision Plan was supposed to embody the will of the people and the people are now saying this not their will. He believed that what the people have devised, the people can revise. Council has been told the only options are no zoning or the zoning in this Plan. However, that is not true. Council can change the zoning, as he attempted to at the last City Council meeting. When people are very clear about their will, it is important that Council listens and respects their wishes. A document is just a document, but people are people. He was troubled at the last hearing that Council was told certain people who do not attend public meetings or speak publicly to Council still expect to influence Council decisions. This is an issue in the city. People feel backstage influencing occurs. The ability of people to speak to Council should count for a lot. People who cannot attend meetings can communicate via email. However, it is troubling that people refuse to communicate with Council but still expect to influence decisions. He believed the amendments presented are not what the people want.

Councilor Nemlowill believed the people did speak through the Riverfront Vision Plan. Certain people do attend City Council meetings, but the majority of people in Astoria do not. The Riverfront Vision Plan went out to the people in all types of venues to collect massive amounts of public input that led to this balanced document. The steering committee for the Riverfront Vision Plan had citizen representatives that represented a variety of interests. The woman most opposed to any overwater development was pretty satisfied with the final plan. It is too bad the plan was adopted so long ago because it seems as if people have forgotten what the people said when it was adopted. She believed the people did speak with the Riverfront Vision Plan. This portion does not include zero development over the water like the Civic Greenway Area's Blueway Zone. She explained she was not trying to convince Councilor Herzig to change his mind, but just wanted to explain her perspective.

City Manager Estes suggested that the Ordinance and the proposal to direct the Planning Commission to consider the three areas of the Bridge Vista Area be addressed in separate motions.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Warr, seconded by Councilor Nemlowill, to conduct the second reading of the ordinance amending the Development Code and Astoria Land Use and Zoning Map to implement the Bridge Vista Area of the Riverfront Vision Plan. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

Director Cosby conducted the second reading.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Warr, seconded by Councilor Nemlowill, to adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff report and approve Amendment Request A14-05 to the Development Code and Astoria Land Use and Zoning Map, and adopt the ordinance. Motion carried 4 to 1. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: Councilor Herzig.

City Manager Estes clarified there were two ordinances to consider for second reading and adoption regarding the Bridge Vista code amendments, the reading of two ordinances.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Nemlowill, seconded by Councilor Warr, to conduct the second reading of the ordinance amending the Comprehensive Plan and Plan Figures to implement the Bridge Vista Area of the Riverfront Vision Plan. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

DRAFT

Director Tucker conducted the second reading.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Nemlowill, seconded by Councilor Warr, to adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff report and approve Amendment Request A14-05 to the Comprehensive Plan and Plan Figures, and adopt the ordinance. Motion carried 4 to 1. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: Councilor Herzig.

Mayor LaMear read the rules of appeal.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Price, seconded by Councilor Herzig, to direct the Astoria Planning Commission to consider expanding certain development restrictions in three specific areas of the Bridge Vista Area and provide a recommendation to City Council within the next three months.

Councilor Herzig asked if it would be acceptable for the Planning Commission to decide at its next meeting to recommend no further amendments.

Councilor Price believed the Planning Commission would understand that Council would want justification for such a recommendation. She expected the Planning Commission to consider this very thoroughly, as it always has.

Councilor Herzig said he was hesitant to direct the Planning Commission to change their recommendations because it seemed over-directive.

Councilor Price clarified that the Planning Commission has not made any recommendations on these three specific areas.

Councilors Herzig and Nemlowill agreed that this direction to the Planning Commission was an indication that Council believed their original recommendations were unacceptable. Councilor Price said this was not her intention.

Councilor Warr said a lot people worked very hard and a lot of people gave public input. He believed no more action was necessary and Council should move on. This issue has been worked over pretty well and Council should not go any further with it.

Motion failed 2 to 3. Ayes: Councilors Price and Herzig; Nays: Councilors Warr and Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear.

Item 7(b): <u>Ordinance regarding Amendment A15-01 – Gateway Overlay Zone (2nd reading & adoption) (Community Development)</u>

As a part of the Civic Greenway Riverfront Vision code amendment process, the City Council approved the extension of the Gateway Overlay Zone to 41st Street; however, the Comprehensive Plan contains a map (Figure 1.1) which illustrates the location of the Gateway Overlay Area from 15th to 29th Streets. In order to ensure that the Development Code is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, staff has prepared an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan that extends the Gateway Overlay Area from 29th to 41st Street, and makes various "housekeeping" changes to the description of the area. Changes include updated information concerning John Warren Field, the East Mooring Basin and the Astoria Plywood Mill, and a synopsis of the Riverfront Vision Plan. The only policy change is as follows:

Comprehensive Plan Section CP.08.1.b, Gateway Overlay Area Policies, is amended to read as follows:

> *"b. Enhance the primary uses, such* as *the Columbia River Maritime Museum and Columbia Memorial Hospital, and work to redevelop areas such as the former John Warren Field site, which have significant development potential."*

DRAFT

The Planning Commission considered these changes at their April 28, 2015 hearing. The City Council held the first reading of the ordinance at their June 1, 2015 meeting. If Council is in agreement, it would be appropriate to hold the second reading and adopt the ordinance.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Warr to conduct the second reading and adopt the Ordinance regarding Amendment A15-01 – Gateway Overlay Zone. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

Director Brooks conducted the second reading.

Mayor LaMear read the rules of appeal.

Item 7(c): Resolution Adopting Supplemental Budget for FY2014-15 (Finance)

ORS 294.473 provides a procedure for a municipality to pass a supplemental budget that adjusts for changes occurring during a fiscal year. There is a requirement to hold a hearing for budget adjustments that exceed 10% the total expenditures. After the hearing, Council may consider a resolution that would adopt the supplemental budget as advertised. The attached staff memo provides detail of the adjustments described as follows:

Capital Improvement Fund (CIF). This supplemental budget increases resources and the related requirements by a total of $261,550. A supplemental budget, approved on June 1, 2015, recognized additional requirements for the Converge contract and are included in this cumulative presentation of the fund changes.

Parks Operation Fund (POF). The supplemental budget for Parks Operation Fund increases resources and the related requirements in an amount not to exceed $197,980. Review of transactions through May along with projections for June indicate projected revenues will are approximately 12% above 2013-14 levels and 6% above 2014-15 budgeted levels. Projected expenses are approximately 10% above 2013-14 levels and 12% above 2014-15 budgeted levels. Expenses reflect an increase in minimum wage, increases to pay rates providing the ability to offer competitive part-time wages to skilled employees and additional efforts required for parks maintenance. Deferred parks maintenance, greater emphasis for immediate cemetery and parks remediation and unseasonably warm weather throughout much of the year contributed to increased costs.

General Fund. This supplemental budget increases the transfer to the Parks Operation Fund in an amount not to exceed $197,980 by reducing the General Fund contingency by an amount not to exceed $197,980 from $1,412,190 to $1,214,210.

Building Inspection Fund. This supplemental budget increases the Beginning Fund Balance by $19,500 to reflect a higher beginning cash amount than was budgeted. Revenues associated with charges for services are increased by $3,000 to reflect increased revenues. Resources are increased in total, $22,500.

The appropriate attached notice was advertised on June 10, 2015. If Council approves these transactions, it is recommended that Council consider adopting the attached resolution implementing these supplemental budgets.

Mayor LaMear opened the public hearing at 8:20 pm and called for anyone wanting to speak on the supplemental budget for FY2014-15 to come forward. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing at 8:21 pm and called for Council discussion and deliberation.

Councilor Herzig asked if Mike Barnes was considered a vendor.

City Manager Estes explained that Mr. Barnes has a contract with the City, so he is considered a vendor.

Councilor Herzig said this supplemental budget included $80,000 to be paid to the Friends of the Astoria Column as a reimbursement of fees to Converge Communications and for the contract the City has with Converge Communications. He understood people were concerned about this. So far, the City has not had a real contract with the Friends or Converge. He believed the City has done a lot more fiscal oversight this year, which is a good thing and he would not apologize for the attention being given to this issue. He understood people were concerned that the City was giving money away without a contract in place. However, all of the items in the

supplemental budget are completely legitimate. He stated he would abstain from voting because of the public concerns over the $80,000.

City Manager Estes noted that the budget amendments for the Friends and Converge were addressed at the last City Council meeting. Those amendments have been included in this supplemental budget just as a summary of the other budget amendments that have already been approved.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Nemlowill, seconded by Councilor Warr to adopt the Resolution implementing the Supplemental Budget for FY2014-15. Motion carried 4 to 0 to 1. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None. Abstentions: Councilor Herzig.

NEW BUSINESS & MISCELLANEOUS
There were none.

REPORTS OF COUNCILORS

Item 9(a): Councilor Herzig reported that on June 14th, the Parks Department/Foundation hosted their first 0k run, which was very well attended and very well organized. The next CHIP-In event will be on Sunday, June 21st at Fort Astoria from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm. This will be the last CHIP-In for Janice O'Malley Galizio because she is moving. The City and the public owe her a lot of gratitude for all that she has done for the CHIP-In program. The next Parks After Dark will be at Shively Park on Saturday, July 27th. Teams will compete in a game of Capture the Flag. Ages 14 and over are invited. Alcohol will be served in a controlled area. The entry fee is $5. His next Meet the Public event will be on Saturday, June 20th in the Flag Room at the library at 12:30 pm.

Item 9(b): Councilor Price reported that she attended the State of Wonder presentation at the Liberty Theatre that afternoon. Chief Johnston and Mayor LaMear also attended. Keith Clark, Matt Love and Jack Harris all spoke about coming to Astoria because of the beautiful river and landscape, the affordability of living in the City, and because Astoria is pedestrian friendly. Darren Orange spoke about the decreasing number of affordable living and working spaces for artists, who serve as one of the backbones of the gentrification of Astoria. The City is still conducting an affordable housing survey to find out what Astorians want in affordable housing. She has been discussing this on Facebook because the metrics tend to use a city's median wage, which is $44,000 in Astoria. Financial advisors say people should spend 30 percent of their income on rent or a mortgage, which would be over $1,000 per month of the city's median wage. She was sure most people in Astoria did not consider this to be affordable, but there is a good supply of housing around $1,000 per month.

Item 9(c): Councilor Warr reported that the weekend of June 13th and 14th was the 30th anniversary of the movie *The Goonies*. About 12,000 people visited the house over the weekend. He believed the City and the Chamber of Commerce did a great job controlling the event. The people who walked by his house were charming and were from all over the world.

Item 9(d): Mayor LaMear said Staff has definitions for what is considered affordable housing, workforce housing, Section 8 housing, and subsidized housing. She believed it would be important to figure out what the community needs and that the community has a good grasp on the definitions of the various types of housing. She reported that City Council and the Port of Astoria Commission met to discuss how to work together. She hoped Council would meet with the Commission again in the future. She attended the Patriot Hall ground breaking at Clatsop Community College. The college is such an important part of the community. The building renovations will be wonderful and she was excited to be part of the ground breaking because the college has come so far since she has lived in Astoria. She attended the State of Wonder at the Liberty Theatre. She encouraged everyone to attend the CHIP-In even on June 21st. Ms. Galizio was hired to start the CHIP-In program and it would be a great testament to her if as many people as possible could show up for the event. The event will be from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm at Fort Astoria.

Item 9(e): Councilor Nemlowill reported that the meeting with the Port was a great first step. She believed Mayor LaMear's speech at the Patriot Hall ground breaking about the little college that could was great. A thriving college in Astoria is key to economic development. He husband attended Clatsop Community College and now owns Fort George, which employs many people. There are many other good examples like his and she was glad to see the college renovation project. Roger Rocka recently wrote a letter to the editor of the

DRAFT

newspaper, which stated, 'Tourism has largely been good for Astoria providing profits, jobs, and amenities. The attractiveness of our community and word of mouth will likely keep visitors coming. So, let's begin a community conversation about how to best embrace our visitors while maintaining the character and quality of life that we and they hold dear.' She has been thinking about this and believed the community should as well.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 pm to convene the Astoria Development Commission meeting.

ATTEST: **APPROVED:**

_____ _____
Finance Director City Manager

DRAFT

CITY OF ASTORIA
Founded 1811 • Incorporated 1856
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

July 10, 2015

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: BRETT ESTES, CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: PROJECT STATUS REPORT – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

The following are summaries of Community Development Department projects and activities.

STAFFING

The Community Development Department has seen a large turnover in employees over the past year. Community Development Director Brett Estes became City Manager in October, 2014 after spending a year as Interim City Manager. Planner Rosemary Johnson retired in September 2014 after 35 years with the City, but worked full time until January 1, 2015 as a temporary employee. Rosemary Johnson has remained as a part-time Special Projects Planner to assist with some of the larger projects. Interim Planner Mike Morgan was hired as a part-time employee to cover the Planner's duties until a new Planner is hired. Building Official Jack Applegate left in June 2015 for another position. The new Community Development Director Kevin Cronin was hired in June and will begin work on July 13, 2015. With a department of only five employees, this has created a large workload on everyone in the department, but will stabilize with the addition of David Kloss, Interim Building Official, and a new planner position being posted soon.

PLANNING PROJECTS

Flood Insurance Maps

Over the last few years, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) have been developing new flood zone maps for the entire nation. In 2010, new FEMA maps were adopted by the City with the knowledge that additional mapping would soon be completed by DOGAMI for coastal communities to better identify the "at risk" areas of each community. DOGAMI has completed a LIDAR survey of the entire Oregon coast, including Astoria, and had prepared a set of maps to identify potential hazard areas and to eliminate areas that were previously thought to be a hazard based on old, less detailed information. With the LIDAR survey, the maps now can identify the specific elevation of the land in more detail thereby removing guess work from the equation.

FEMA and DOGAMI requested that the local communities enter into a Partnership Agreement. The Partnership Agreement represents a good-faith effort by all parties to share data, communicate findings, and plan mitigation activities to reduce the exposure of the citizens within the communities to hazard risk. It is intended to provide a common strategy to address hazards and increase resilience within the communities. While communities are not required to sign the Agreement, it is encouraged that all participants sign and enter into the Agreement. At their meeting on February 19, 2013, the City Council authorized the Mayor to sign the agreement.

Staff has been working with FEMA and DOGAMI to assure that the information and maps for Astoria reflect the issues and concerns specific to our community. On December 10, 2013, the City received the draft FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) for review. Prior to this draft, the adopted 2010 flood zone designations in Astoria had not changed dramatically from the 1978 FIRMs and therefore, Astoria had little concern with the new mapping. With the new drafts, there are major changes that will impact the citizens of Astoria and their ability to obtain flood insurance and/or to develop along the Columbia River and Young's Bay. At the same time as the proposed map changes, the Biggert-Waters National Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act (2012) was adopted which drastically increased the flood insurance rates nationwide. Staff spoke with representatives from Clatsop County, Warrenton, and Seaside to coordinate the responses from the various communities concerning the proposed changes. A letter was sent to DOGAMI identifying questions and concerns with the new mapping. A copy of the letter was sent to the City's US Senate representatives to keep them apprised of our concerns. Clatsop County and Warrenton also sent letters of concerns.

Several of the issues/concerns include the change of the Columbia River and Young's Bay to a "velocity zone" which increases the potential flood impact areas and raises the Base Flood Elevation. In addition, the draft maps use an extremely high data point from the Tongue Point Tidal Station that appears to be an anomaly and alters the Base Flood Elevation by one foot or more. The inclusion of this data in the model has a tremendous impact on not only development in these areas, but could also have an effect on insurance rates for citizens in these areas. There were several other issues noted in the letter to DOGAMI. Staff has been in contact with the US Senators who continue to monitor and work on this issue on the Federal level.

Staff has been working closely with Clatsop County and Warrenton on the above issues that impact the entire north County / Columbia River area. DOGAMI forwarded the letters to FEMA. The City received a response from FEMA in June 2014 which did not completely answer the City's concerns. There is still question as to the accuracy of the information in the new mapping and the data and model used to calculate the potential flood risks in Clatsop County. Department of Land Conservation and Development representative Patrick Wingard is assisting with the map overview and getting the answers needed to address the City's concerns. Based on the fact that FEMA did not adequately address our concerns, it was determined that Clatsop County, Warrenton, and Astoria should present a unified response to FEMA as the issues impact the entire north County area. Over the last few years, the local jurisdictions have been meeting with FEMA to obtain the data necessary to review and analyze FEMA's findings. We have now received the data and Warrenton has hired a consultant to review the material in order to prepare a formal response to FEMA. The County, Warrenton, and Astoria consolidated resources and are sharing in the costs to hire

the consultant through an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA). At their December 1, 2014 meeting, the City Council authorized the Mayor to sign the Agreement. This initial review is estimated to cost $20,000 with a not to exceed amount of $7,000 for each jurisdiction. The consultant has completed the initial analysis and submitted them to FEMA. It appears that there may be errors in the FEMA data The consultant hired, Coast and Harbor Engineering, has conducted the analysis. Representatives from local jurisdictions along with the consultant met with FEMA reps late Spring. It appears that additional information is needed by FEMA to respond to the issues raised. It is anticipated that City Council will be reviewing an IGA amendment to address this additional work t a future Council meeting.

Staff will continue to work with the representatives and other local communities on the draft maps. Staff will ultimately present the draft maps to the Planning Commission and City Council for consideration once they are finalized by FEMA and DOGAMI.

Oregon Heritage All Star Community

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) began a new program in 2012, the Oregon Heritage All-Star Community, to recognize cities that make the most of their heritage resources. By doing so, communities safeguard important elements of the past, advance both "quality of life" and economic objectives, and enhance their unique character. The program has three primary goals: 1) to educate communities about the full spectrum of cultural heritage activities available to them; 2) to encourage communities to expand and strengthen their participation in cultural heritage activities; and 3) to recognize communities, through a "certification" process, that reach an exemplary level of participation.

The program is sponsored by the Oregon Heritage Commission which was established to secure, sustain, enhance and promote Oregon's heritage. The Oregon Heritage Commission created a list of heritage related criteria by which the program can be measured. To be considered as a Heritage All-Star Community, 15 of the 20 criteria need to be met. To receive designation the community needs to submit an application which is reviewed by Oregon Heritage Commission staff and the designation is then approved by the Oregon Heritage Commission.

Some of the criteria include: having a historic preservation program that has Certified Local Government status, the community maintains a list of historic designated properties, the community partners with non-profit organizations in the area (such as Clatsop County Historical Society), that the community have a history museum, the community has a cultural heritage coalition, the community has successfully managed heritage related grant projects, public education programs, heritage website, the community is an Oregon Main Street city, have businesses that have been in operation for over 50 years, maintain public records preserving historic and other public records, the community has a historic photo archive, has conducted heritage events for at least 25 years, the community has received State or National awards in the heritage field, etc.

All-Star Communities receive special benefits including:

- a certificate for display
- two metal signs for display
- the designation noted on the Travel Oregon web site
- a logo to use in publications and marketing materials
- Heritage All-Star Community Technical Services

This designation would add to Astoria's reputation as a community that supports historic preservation and cultural heritage. The Bicentennial Celebration was a cultural heritage project that received the 2011 Oregon Heritage Commission award. Construction of the Garden of Surging Waves is one of the recent heritage projects the City has completed, and the Astoria Regatta was designated as an Oregon Heritage Tradition in 2013. This designation would help promote Astoria to visitors and those interested in locating to this area. On December 3, 2012, the City Council authorized staff to prepare and submit an Oregon Heritage All-Star Community application for submittal to the Oregon Heritage Commission/ SHPO. However, staff was unable to devote enough time to this project to complete the application. During the CLG Program Review, Kuri Gill of SHPO encouraged Astoria to submit the application. HLC President Gunderson suggested that the HLC may be able to help consolidate the necessary information to complete the application. With the assistance of the HLC the necessary information was gathered and the application was submitted.

At its April 2015 meeting, the Oregon Heritage Commission (OHC) reviewed and approved the application and designated Astoria as an Oregon Heritage All-Star Community. OHC Chairman Kyle Jansson attended the June 15, 2015 City Council meeting and presented the City with the designation certificate and signs.

Oregon Heritage Excellence Award

Special Projects Planner Rosemary Johnson received the Oregon Heritage Excellence Award from the Oregon Heritage Commission, State Historic Preservation Office, in April 2015 in North Bend at the Oregon Heritage Conference. The award was presented to Rosemary for her ". . . more than 25 years of outstanding work in preserving and developing heritage resources in Astoria and Clatsop County."

Permits

For the calendar year 2014, the Community Development Department has processed approximately 343 various permits. These include items such as conditional uses, variances, signs, flood permits, historic design review, amendments, etc. This number is fairly consistent with the number of permits that have been processed each year during the last four years. Prior to that, permits were ranging in the 150 to 250 per year. This indicates a steady growth in activity for the department.

In the first half of 2015, the Community Development Department has processed approximately 205 various permits.

CODE AMENDMENTS

Riverfront Vision Plan Implementation

In 2009 the City of Astoria adopted the Astoria Riverfront Vision Plan. The Riverfront Vision Plan describes a future vision and specific recommended implementation measures related to open space, land use, and transportation plans along the Columbia River waterfront. For purposes of the Riverfront Vision Plan, the City's riverfront was divided into four plan areas: Bridge Vista, Urban Core, Civic Greenway, and Neighborhood Greenway.

Over the past few years, the City Council adopted goals regarding implementation of the Riverfront Vision Plan. In 2012-2013, the City of Astoria requested and received a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) Code Assistance grant to develop and write updated Comprehensive Plan language, Development Code text, and map amendments to implement policies and recommendations in the City's adopted Riverfront Vision Plan for the Civic Greenway Plan Area (Phase 1) and Bridge Vista Plan Area (Phase 2). The intent of the implementation process is not to revisit or revise recommendations from the Riverfront Vision Plan which has been accepted by the Astoria City Council.

The first step in the process to implement the Riverfront Vision Plan was adoption of code amendments for the Civic Greenway Plan Area. The Council adopted the amendments at their October 6, 2014 meeting. The adopted materials are accessible on the City's website at www.astoria.or.us, Community Development, Projects, Riverfront Vision Plan, or they can be obtained at City Hall, 1095 Duane Street.

With the completion of Phase I, DLCD approved funding for Phase II of the project to develop implementing code and map amendments for the Bridge Vista area (Portway Avenue to 2nd Street, north of West Marine Drive). Similar to the Civic Greenway process, the project team has been holding work sessions with the Planning Commission to develop the various code sections such as uses allowed in the zones, height and setbacks for buildings, landscaping, building design, etc. Work sessions open to the public have been advertised and held on October 28, 2014, November 25, 2014, and December 17, 2014. A town hall meeting to give an overview of the proposed changes for the Bridge Vista area was held on January 6, 2015 with over 100 people in attendance. The next work session with the Planning Commission was scheduled for January 27, 2015. The public hearing before the Planning Commission was held on May 27, 2015. The City Council held a public hearing on June 2, 2015, and adopted the amendments at their June 16, 2015 meeting. The adopted materials are accessible on the City's web site as noted above.

In addition, the City was notified that funding from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) Coastal Management Technical Assistance Grants for the FY 2014-2015 grant cycle was awarded to the City to assist in code writing for implementation of Phase 3 of the Astoria Riverfront Vision Plan for the Neighborhood Greenway Area (41st Street to Tongue Point). The grant agreement between DLCD and the City was approved by City Council on March 2, 2015. Work is now underway in drafting the potential code amendments to implement the Riverfront Vision Plan in the Neighborhood Greenway Area. It is anticipated that Planning Commission work sessions open to the public would be held this fall.

Wind Energy Amendment

Beginning in 2010, the City saw an increase in inquiries for smaller scale wind energy facilities. Current Development Code language does not specifically address these issues. At the petitioning of a potential wind energy developer, the Planning Commission made an interpretation that wind energy facilities would be allowed similar to "utilities" in the IN Zone (Institutional) and S-2 Zone (General Development Shorelands) but that they needed to comply with the height regulations of those zones or obtain a variance.

This issue was brought back to the Planning Commission in August 2012 for a work session to continue discussions on draft ordinance language. The Planning Commission agreed that the two draft codes (wind and solar) should be addressed separately. Legislative changes in 2012 impacted how cities can regulate solar facilities and staff addressed these changes in the draft solar energy ordinance. Multiple work sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council were held and at their September 24, 2013 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the ordinance. The City Council adopted the Solar Ordinance at their November 4, 2013 meeting.

The Planning Commission will continue work on the wind energy ordinance following completion of / or between gaps in work on the Riverfront Vision Plan implementation project. Once the Planning Commission has held a public hearing(s) on this code language, it will be forwarded to City Council for final consideration.

Hillside Development (Geologic Hazard) Ordinance Amendment

In order to better address construction in geologic hazard and/or steep hillside areas, staff has been developing possible Development Code revisions to address this issue. Staff initiated this process several years ago but it was not finalized anticipating the integration of LIDAR study results. However, a preliminary draft was circulated among professionals in the field, the Planning Commission, City Council, and staff for review and comment. The LIDAR survey completed by the State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) to identify areas of past slides and weak soil areas was completed. Staff has integrated comments received from the earlier draft and has been coordinating with DOGAMI to find the best way to integrate LIDAR information into the draft code language. With this new information/data, it was determined that it would be beneficial to establish "hazard zones" that could be addressed individually based on the severity of the hazard and the nature of the proposed work within the City. Work between the Planning and Engineering Departments continues on the draft ordinance. The Engineering Department hired a geologist to map the known landslide areas to be entered into the City's GIS mapping system. This additional information will further assist in development of the Hillside Development Ordinance language. The field work on the mapping was completed in June 2015 and Engineering staff are now entering the data into the City's GIS. Staff at DOGAMI have been contacted and will be working with City staff on the draft ordinance.

URBAN RENEWAL

Heritage Square

With the completion of the Garden of Surging Waves, the City will be continuing with the next phase of improvements to Heritage Square including the gathering area for concerts and community festivals, and to provide a permanent space for the Sunday Market.

In 2012, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) awarded the City of Astoria a Brownfields Multi-Purpose Grant. The grant consists of $200,000 for assessment and $200,000 for cleanup of the Heritage Square property. This grant assisted in testing top soil from the Garden of Surging Waves and will address brownfield contamination issues required to be addressed prior to construction on the next phase of the Square. Prior to receiving the grant, several environmental investigations had been conducted at the property. These investigations determined that there are multiple contaminants on the site from past uses of the property which included an automobile repair garage and paint shop, a car sales business, a dry cleaning establishment, and a newspaper printing company.

A public meeting on this project was held on May 21, 2014. An informational sign concerning the environmental work on Heritage Square has been developed and was installed on the east side of the Garden of Surging Waves. Additional soil samples funded by the EPA grant were taken in June 2014. A report by project consultants was recently presented to the City Council.

A report titled "Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the Heritage Square Project outlining the study results and cleanup strategy that will take place is currently under final review by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the EPA. Once approved, our consultant will proceed with preparing a detailed cleanup plan referred to as an "Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives (ABCA)". After the ABCA is approved by DEQ and EPA, the consultant will commission a contractor to perform all proposed cleanup work. During review of these documents DEQ has stated that additional site testing is required. Site cleanup is anticipated to take place late summer / early fall. An expected milestone for the cleanup phase of the redevelopment is a Notice of No Further Action ("NOFA"), which will be issued by DEQ once the project meets cleanup standards. Once the NOFA is issued, the City can begin the next phase of redevelopment for the site. At the July 20th City Council meeting, the City's project consultant will be presenting additional information to update Council on the EPA grant project.

Astor-West Incentive Program for Development / Redevelopment

In order to address the 2012-2013 City Council goal on this issue (Develop an Incentive Program to Promote Development and Redevelopment within the Boundaries of the Astor-West Urban Renewal District, with a Focus on Properties Along the West Marine Drive Corridor), staff has been collecting and reviewing information on City urban renewal programs for building facade grant and/or loan programs. Staff has also been talking to the staff of these Oregon communities to understand what has worked well in their respective cities. Starting in 2013, staff worked with City urban renewal consultant Elaine Howard to develop a program for the Astor-West District. Design guidelines need to be established for

this project. Code implementation of the Bridge Vista Area of the Riverfront Vision Plan began in September 2014. Design Guidelines for the Astor West Urban Renewal District are a part of that project. The draft program and process/guidelines will be submitted to the Development Commission for consideration tentatively this fall now that the Bridge Vista Area codes have been adopted.

OTHER PROJECTS

Coxcomb Hill Wireless Communication Facility Relocation

The current public emergency communication facility and Verizon private facility are located on Coxcomb Hill adjacent to the Astoria Column. For over eight years, the City has been working with Verizon concerning the upgrade of their services and the need to upgrade the public emergency services. After much consideration of the existing site, it was determined that the facility should be relocated to another site to improve the aesthetics of the Astoria Column Park. The City and Verizon have identified alternate locations that would provide emergency communications as well as cell service to replace what is provided by the tower at the Column. One site is located in the Land Reserve near Reservoir 3 (east of the Column) and would include both private and public facilities. The other site is within Shively Park. The City Council has scheduled a public hearing to consider a potential street vacation of an unimproved portion of Nile Street adjacent to Shively Park Road to accommodate this location.

Staff has been working with the Converge Communications (consultant)and Verizon representatives on the various aspects of this project. Once the consultant was finished with the work contracted by the Friends of the Column, and due to the technical complexity of working with wireless communication facilities, the City Council approved a contract with Converge in June 2015 to assist the City through the next phase of the project. Converge will update the Council at their August 3, 2015 meeting.

Investigation of the viability of the sites has been completed and draft leases for use of the City-owned properties have been reviewed by staff, Converge, and the City Attorney. The draft leases are proposed to be submitted to the Council at their August 3, 2015 meeting to determine if the Council agrees with the lease and locations. Once that is complete, there are multiple land use permits that are needed which will require notification and public review for both sites. It is anticipated that these land use permits will be processed this fall if the sites are approved by Council.

Senior Center Remodel

In April 2013, the City of Astoria received a $1.5 million Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) to renovate the Astoria Senior Center. Astoria Senior Center members partnered with the City by providing a cash match for the renovation. CDBG funding comes from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), administered by Business Oregon.

Concurrent with completion of the CDBG pre-construction activities, an architectural firm (Scott Edwards Associates) and Al Jaques, construction manager, were hired in June 2013.

Public meetings were held at the Senior Center in July and October 2013 to receive feedback on preferences/needs for the renovated facility.

Due to the delay in obtaining the Environmental Assessment review, renovation of the Center was delayed. At its July 7, 2014 meeting, Construction Manager Al Jaques made a presentation to City Council concerning the construction delay. The Board of the Astoria Senior Center supported the delay to avoid potential higher construction costs which would be anticipated should the project go out to bid in the summer. The City Council concurred with a proposal to initiate the bidding project in December 2014. City Council authorized the contractor selection process after their January 5, 2015 meeting.

Following receipt of bids in late February 2015, project staff worked with the apparent low bid general contractor (Skyward Construction), the project architect, Senior Center staff, and City staff to adjust the scope of work in the bid documents. This work was done to align closer with the available renovation funds in consideration that the bids received exceeded the project cose estimate. The scope adjustment was also done to address the core needs of the Senior Center within the CDBG grant requirements. Concurrent with the work to adjust the scope City staff were successful in obtaining an additional $240,000 of CDBG funds for the project. At the June 20, 2015 Council meeting, Council approved a construction contract for the Senior Center project. The groundbreaking ceremony occurred on July 9th.

Downtown Mainstreet Program

Staff has been working with the Astoria Downtown Historic District Association (ADHDA) on various items identified in the Building Blocks for a Successful Downtown plan. Planner Rosemary Johnson served on the Design Committee as a liaison to the City until her retirement in September. City Engineer Jeff Harrington has assumed those duties. The Design Committee reviews and suggests ways to improve the aesthetics of the downtown. This committee manages the spring downtown cleanup, and was instrumental in getting merchants to adopt planters which were installed with the Downtown Streetscape project. Community Development Director Kevin Cronin has recently joined the ADHDA Business Development Committee and will be working with that group on business development / retention activities.

Certified Local Government Grant

In alternating years, Certified Local Government (CLG) cities are eligible to submit grant applications to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for historic preservation related work. On April 7, 2014, the City Council accepted a grant to provide a "pass-through" grant to both commercial and residential property owners for facade renovations. The City has had this grant program in past years and has initiated the program for this year. The availability of the grant funds for facade restoration was advertised widely to make the public aware of the opportunity. Individual grants were processed by staff and reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission, if necessary. Grants were limited to a maximum of $3,000 and the grant was matched dollar for dollar by the property owner. For example, if an owner wanted to replace non-original aluminum windows on the front of the structure with wood or steel windows, and the cost to purchase and install the windows was $4,200, the Facade

Restoration Grant would provide $2,100 toward the work. The grant was for reimbursement only, and work done before the grant application was not eligible.

The City received five applications for the Restoration Grant program for the maximum available funds for the following projects. All of the projects have been completed.

4910 Ash Street; replace 18 windows on over-water building
1711 Grand Avenue – restore original leaded glass window
3720 Duane Avenue – reconstruct rear addition, restore wrap around porch, misc. repairs
1380 Commercial Street – replace broken storefront window, restore street side glass door
591 12th Street – repair and paint porch, pillars, eaves, and cedar siding

In addition, the CLG grant includes $1,000 in architectural assistance funds for historic buildings. The architectural assistance funds are used to hire an architect or historic building designer to assist property owners in rehabilitating the exteriors of their buildings. Over the years, the City has retained John Goodenberger as a temporary employee to serve in this capacity. The City has provided this service each year under the CLG Grant program. The grant funds of $1,000 will provide approximately 15 hours of design time to approximately 15 property owners.

Historic Design Guidelines

John Goodenberger and staff developed a set of residential design guidelines which will assist owners of historic properties with their restoration projects. The guidelines identify best practices, not regulations. They provide examples of good design features and materials that should be used or implemented when working on historic properties and will assist citizens through the historic design review process. It is intended as a tool for property owners to use when planning their projects. The design guidelines, "Rehab Astoria Right: A guide to working with Astoria's historic residences", has been completed and is available to the public at City Hall and on the City's web site. Staff is now working on a new set of design guidelines for commercial properties which are anticipated to be completed during this two-year grant cycle.

City Hall Facade Renovation

City Hall interior renovation was completed in 2012. Several exterior features were not addressed during the previous renovations. Windows are steel and many are rusting and need to be reglazed. The front entry to City Hall had some rust and deterioration including one metal panel that was replaced with a wood panel many years ago. Staff got an estimate for repair of the first floor windows and the front entry doorway of $14,250. At their September 24, 2013 meeting, City Council authorized submittal of two grant applications to help fund this project. One grant was received from the Kinsman Foundation for $5,000. The Public Works Department hired a local metal worker as a temporary employee to complete the restoration work. He has completed the windows and most of the work on the front entry doorway. There is some additional work that needs to be completed on the lettering and decorative pieces on the area above the door. The grant portion of the project is complete and the additional work should be completed by the end of 2015. Additionally, concrete sidewalk surfaces at the front entry of City Hall was repaired in June 2015. This

included filling of surface cracks and resurfacing where "outdoor carpet" had once been adhered.

US Coast Guard Housing

Over the last four years, the City has been working with the US Coast Guard (USCG) concerning potential expansion of their existing housing area on the South Slope. The property was sold by the City to the USCG in 1991 with a Memorandum of Agreement concerning development of the site. The Community Development Department received the Governor's Livability Award in 1995 for the existing housing area and its integration into the community. The USCG proposes to build approximately 50 housing units in two-family, three-family, and multi-family dwellings in two phases. The housing is proposed for the area north of the existing houses and would be accessed from Klaskanine Avenue. The USCG and staff have met several times over the last year to assure that the new development will comply with the intent of the Memorandum of Agreement and meet the requirements of the USCG. Part of the process included a street vacation for the unimproved Niagara Avenue which is located in the northern portion of the USCG property and a zone change to allow multi-family dwellings (approved 11-5-12). At its June 2, 2014 meeting, the City Council approved a street vacation for the USCG allowing for the proposed construction. Construction has begun and completion of Phase I of these houses is anticipated for this winter 2015-2016.

Business Development

City Manager attends Col-Pac committee meetings with City Councilor Warr to coordinate the efforts of the region for business development. Additionally, City Manager serves on the CEDR Board of Directors to address economic development issues in Clatsop County. Staff regularly meets and works with CEDR staff concerning assistance for new businesses to the area. New Business License applicants are referred to CEDR for assistance and CEDR provides them with information on how to work through the required City processes and other needed State and Federal permits. Additionally, as stated earlier, Community Development Director Kevin Cronin recently joined the Astoria Downtown Historic District (ADHDA) Business Development Committee.

Climate Change Adaptation

Staff has met with the State of Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and other Clatsop and Tillamook County jurisdictions regarding a DLCD led initiative for planning for climate change for this region. DLCD organized several meetings over the past year with local, State, and Federal agencies to work with local jurisdictions concerning what actions may be needed and how to develop a regional-scale adaptation plan or framework. Planner Rosemary Johnson and City Engineer Jeff Harrington were active with this group and helped to develop the "Regional Framework for Climate Adaptation – Clatsop and Tillamook Counties" which was completed in March 2015.

Planning and Engineering staff have begun to address questions identified by DLCD. These deal with factors which could potentially affect City facilities, analyzing risks and vulnerabilities, and will then begin to prioritize a management plan for consideration. Staff

will continue to ,work with DLCD on this issue. Staff has begun review of various aspects of climate change and the City's resiliency for this and other natural disasters. The City has a Pre-Disaster Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan which addresses and identifies plans for many of the issues related to climate adaptation.

Pre-Disaster Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan

At their October 20, 2008 meeting, Astoria City Council adopted a Pre-Disaster Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan and the City of Astoria Addendum. This Plan was developed in partnership with Clatsop County and Columbia River Estuary Studies Task Force (CREST). The purpose of the Plan was to increase the County's and City's resilience to natural hazards that could affect the region including earthquakes, floods, droughts, landslides, coastal erosion, tsunamis, windstorms, winter storms, wildfires, and volcanoes.

Staff was notified by the County in 2013 that FEMA requires a five-year review and update of the County's Plan and recommends that the city Addendums also be updated if modifications are needed. If no modifications are required, cities would still need to readopt the Addendum by Resolution. Staff from the Community Development, Public Works, Engineering, Police, Fire, and Parks Departments reviewed the Addendum Plan and developed recommendations for updates to the Plan. The proposed updates to the Plan and the Resolution were submitted to FEMA for review and approval prior to final adoption in the County's Plan. Earlier this year, FEMA responded to the proposed updates and requested that the City include notation of the responsible department and/or agency for each of the "Action" items in the Plan. Staff made those proposed notations and the City Council adopted the revised Addendum by Resolution 15-23 at their regular meeting on July 6, 2015.

Staff will continue to work with all departments to identify Action Items that need to be completed and any needed potential updates to the Plan for the next five year review in 2018.

Landfill Closure and Redevelopment

With the completion of the Landfill Closure and the redevelopment of the site as the sports complex, the City has received recognition for the success of the project. In March 2015, Clatsop Economic Development Resources (CEDR) presented the Community Partnership Award to Columbia Memorial Hospital, City of Astoria, Astoria School District, and Recology Western Oregon for the Williamsport Land Fill / John Warren Field project. The award was presented *". . . to the parties that managed to cut through vast spools of red tape and give the Astoria community a big multi-part victory."*

At the suggestion of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and Business Oregon, a nomination was submitted for the Astoria Landfill Redevelopment Project (a.k.a. sports complex) for an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Phoenix Award. The Phoenix Award is the highest Federal award given for environmental redevelopment projects. The City of Astoria has been a prior recipient of the Phoenix Award with the redevelopment of Mill Pond. Staff worked closely with DEQ, Business Oregon, and project consultant staff to compile the detailed nomination packet. Judges will review the applications in July with a judging session in early August. Award recipients should be notified in early August.

BUILDING CODES

The Building Department staff implemented the newly approved permit fees in May of 2014. Permit fees collected from May through December 31, 2013 increased by $21,335.00 in the same time period in 2014. Calendar year 2014 showed the busiest permit issuance and inspection activity since 2008 for new structures. As an example of the activity increase in new construction, there were 15 new single-family homes in 2014 up from 4 in 2013. For the first half of 2015, there were ** new single-family homes. The last two Columbia Townhouse buildings (six units) at the foot of 29th Street are nearing completion. This year looks to remain steady and busy with larger commercial projects such as the Astoria Senior Center, Buoy Ten Apartments Phase II at 1310 West Marine Drive, new commercial building at 1636 Marine Drive, and Clatsop Community College Expansion at Patriot Hall.

The Building Official attended regular meetings with local Home Builders' Association groups and on several occasions provided free building, mechanical, and energy code training classes as part of our public outreach efforts.

The implementation of the State-wide Electronic Permitting program in Astoria with the Oregon Building Codes Division (BCD) was implemented in May 2015. The full-service "e-permitting" program will allow contractors to buy simple, non-plan review permits online which gives the City a virtual 24 hour open service counter for these types of permits and allows contractors to schedule inspection and review results of field inspections online 24 hours a day. Once implemented many simple permit applications will be processed online through the e-permitting program, at buildingpermits@Oregon.gov. The implementation took approximately six months which included testing and training of City staff on the e-permitting system prior to use. This will be a very customer friendly, time saving and tested method that will make permit application submittals much easier, quicker and without additional City costs to maintain. In addition, licensed architects and engineers can submit permit applications, including documents and building plans for new buildings via an electronic portal.

In the first month of "e-permitting", 100 permits were issued. This is a large increase in the number of permits as the yearly total number of permits issued ranges between 500 to 600 permits. For the first half of 2015, there were 318 permits compared to 235 permits for the same period last year. That is an increase of 83 permits or 35%.

CODE ENFORCEMENT

Derelict Building Ordinance Enforcement

Community Development staff continues to address nuisance, property maintenance, and derelict building violations. Staff regularly attends community meetings and events to get the word out and answer questions about code enforcement. The primary Code Enforcement Officer is the Building Official. In June 2015, Jack Applegate left the City to take a job elsewhere. With his absence, Clatsop County is assisting with building permits but they are not doing the daily code enforcement. If there is a dangerous building situation, the County would be able to assist. However, several code enforcement actions are on hold until a new Building Official is hired. Planning staff is working to address code enforcement issues as they arise. An update on specific code enforcement efforts is included below.

- 778 38th Street - property was dilapidated, needed paint, the stairway was gone, windows were broken out, no gutters were present, and code enforcement attempts going back to 2005 had failed to get results. With the new tools in the Nuisance Abatement Code, staff stepped up enforcement and a new owner took possession in August of 2011. This property was completely remodeled and restored in 2014. The home now has new paint, new stairs and porches, windows were fixed and now the new owner has earned a local historical building designation.

- Flavel Properties - The Code Enforcement action on the three Flavel properties has ended and the City has reached a mutual agreement with the owner on these properties. The long term enforcement goals were reached. The house at 627 15th Street was sold to Greg Newenhof and he has begun work on the house and yard. One of the commercial structures is available for sale.

- 4867 Birch Street - The City received multiple complaints about the condition of the property. The owner was warned of the many code violations and refused to comply with the City Code notices and warnings. The owner was then cited and fined in Municipal Court. The owner has begun making some progress with cleaning up the yard and debris and fixing the roof. Enforcement actions will continue and more citations may be issued if steady progress is not made. Two citations were given to the owner for failing to comply. The City Attorney drove by the property recently and witnessed the owner mowing, but the abandoned cars remain. No further action has been taken.

- 775 Madison Avenue - Many complaints were received by multiple neighbors since 2012. The property has now been sold to new owners after Code Enforcement sent final warnings of daily fines if violations were not abated. The new owners have maintained the yard and completed the extensive garbage removal. The exterior walls in some areas have been opened up to examine the structure and start planning for permits and making the required repairs this year. The owners have hired a licensed structural engineer to help determine the next steps for a major repair and restoration of the home in 2015.

- 12th and Marine Drive - A commercial property with multiple tenants located on the southeast corner of 12th and Marine was contacted by Code Enforcement in 2012 for nuisance abatement due to rusted flashing, rusting rebar and falling debris above sidewalks. The owner completed structural repairs in 2014 and continues to make cosmetic repairs to the facade, trim, and paint, and has worked with the City to not only repair the building but bring the storefront back to its historic origins.

- 1339 8th Street - The Hilltop commercial building continues to have repairs made to the building. The owner has added some vintage window displays, fixed broken windows and has repaired and painted much of the buildings siding. He continues to make steady progress as weather, time, and budget allows.

- 1121 11th Street – The historic home was vacant, had boarded up windows, and tall grass, failed to make the required repairs and maintain the yard as required. After several attempts over 24 months to gain compliance, the owner was warned twice by mail and then cited and fined for multiple code violations. The threat of continued fines resulted in the sale of the

home in December 2014. The new owner secured funding in advance of the purchase and has agreed to work with the City. The owner is excited to start a full historically appropriate restoration of the house in 2015. Permits have been issued and they are actively remodeling.

- 4696 Ash Street - A dangerous home with structural dry rot, unsafe wiring and many City Code violations for the yard and buildings appearance was investigated and enforcement started. Investigation resulted in discovering alterations had been done to the electrical, water heater, and plumbing without required permits and in a dangerous manner. The owner agreed to disconnect the utilities and have the tenant move out of the building. The owner worked with the City and obtained a demolition permit. The Fire Department demolished the building using it for a "Burn to Learn" exercise.

The City receives a large number of garbage, grass, and junk complaints in the spring and summer. Many of these cases were resolved right away with placing a notice at the door and providing a warning and the owner quickly addressing the issue. These take most of the code enforcement available time to monitor, inspect, write letters, issue citations, and attend court if needed. Repeat offenders are usually cited for continued violations. As time allows staff routinely inspects these and other sites to ensure that progress continues to be made. We also receive numerous complaints related to landlord / tenant issues that we do not regulate but often require inspection and time with the owners to discuss their concerns and see if hazards are present.

By: Rosemary Johnson

Rosemary Johnson, Planner

CITY OF ASTORIA
Founded 1811 • Incorporated 1856

July 14, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: BRETT ESTES, CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: UPDATE OF REVOLVING LOAN FUND RESOLUTION

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

Resolution No. 01-30 was adopted November 5, 2001 to recognize the continued management of revolving loan funds by Shorebank Enterprise Pacific (ENTERPRISE). In 2013 the operations of ENTERPRISE, for Washington and Oregon were rebranded as Craft3 (CRAFT3). CRAFT3 continues to manage $ 113,450 of Revolving Loan Fund assets which provide business loans to third parties and recoverable grants to support economic development and redevelopment opportunities consistent with City goals and strategies.

The budget for 2015-16 contains amounts intended to support potential code enforcement under the derelict building program (Astoria Code Section 5.670 through 5.746). Subsequent collection of code enforcement expenses would be reimbursed to the revolving loan fund.

The attached resolution recognizes the rebranding of ENTERPRISE to CRAFT3 and acknowledges the continued relationship for management of the City Revolving Loan Funds, to promote the economic and community development objective of the City.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the attached resolution.

By: _____
Susan Brooks, CPA
Director of Finance and Administrative Services

RESOLUTION NO. 15-_____

A RESOLUTION ADDRESSING PROGRAM DETAILS FOR THE CONTINUED USE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE CITY REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS TRANSFERRED TO CRAFT3 (FORMERLY KNOWN AS SHOREBANK ENTERPRISE PACIFIC).

CIRCUMSTANCES

The City of Astoria ("CITY") maintains a Revolving Loan Fund which was created to receive loan payments made by the Astoria Dairy Queen, which was the recipient of a Community Development Block Grant received by the CITY. This Fund is intended for use to establish a revolving loan program for economic and business development. In 1998, by Resolution 98029, the CITY transferred $ 113,450 from the Revolving Loan Fund to Shorebank Enterprise Cascadia ("ENTERPRISE"), rebranded as CRAFT3 in 2013. This resolution supersedes and replaces Resolution 01-30 as to the use and management of the Revolving Loan Fund.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY:

Section 1. Shorebank Enterprise Cascadia ("ENTERPRISE") has rebranded as Craft3 ("CRAFT3").

Section 2. The CITY agrees to continue a relationship with CRAFT3 for the management of the Revolving Loan Fund. Such funds shall be used by CRAFT3 exclusively to promote the economic and community development objectives of the Astoria City Council within Astoria City limits. Such objectives may include but will not be limited to business loans to third parties and recoverable grants to CRAFT3 for such purposes as land assembly. In all cases, funds will be used in support of economic development and redevelopment opportunities consistent with CITY goals and strategy. CRAFT3 agrees to supplement the Fund with its own assets in an amount not less than 40% of the amount originally transferred by the CITY.

Section 3. When specifically approved in advance by the CITY, Revolving Loan Funds may be subordinated to other loan resources provided by CRAFT3 and, accordingly, be subject to write off in the event of default. No write off, however, shall occur without CRAFT3 using all reasonable and prudent means to recover 100% of invested funds.

Section 4. CRAFT3 retains complete credit authority and shall maintain client confidentiality in all cases. In addition, CRAFT3 retains the right to determine loan terms, pricing, conditions and performance requirements at its sole discretion.

Section 5. CRAFT3 will use prudence and due diligence in its underwriting in order to provide reasonable assurance of continued availability and benefit of the funds to the CITY.

Section 6. When loans to third parties will not accomplish the objectives of the CTIY, the City Council may authorize recoverable grants to CRAFT3 under terms of separately authorized agreements.

Section 7. CITY may at its sole discretion terminate this authorization. In such event, all liquid CITY assets shall be refunded to the CITY within 30 days. Illiquid assets shall be transferred to CITY as practical.

Section 8. Effective Date. This Resolution is effective on the date of its passage.

ADOPTED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL THIS 20TH DAY OF JULY, 2015.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR THIS 20TH DAY OF JULY, 2015.

_____
Council President

ATTEST:

_____
City Manager

ROLL CALL ON ADOPTION		YEA	NAY	ABSENT
Councilor	Nemlowill			
	Herzig			
	Price			
	Warr			
Mayor LaMear				

CITY OF ASTORIA
Founded 1811 • Incorporated 1856

July 6, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: BRETT ESTES, CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE THERMOPLASTIC FOR CROSSWALK DELINEATION

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

The Public Works Department, over time, will be changing the configuration of the crosswalks from painted standard parallel lines to Thermoplastic "continental" style crosswalks. An example of this design is attached to the memo. Continental is the style used by the Oregon Department of Transportation on the recently placed crosswalks downtown on Marine Drive and Commercial Street.

Thermoplastic is a torch down material that is centered mostly out of the tire path portion of the crosswalk section of the street. When properly positioned and applied, it far outlasts traditional traffic paint.

Ennis-Flint has the State of Oregon contract for Thermoplastic. City Code 1.967 (I) Cooperative Procurement Contracts states that cooperative procurements may be made without competitive solicitation as provided in the Oregon Public Contracting Code. The purchase price for the material is $12,038.00. Fiscal year 2015-2016 Streets budget has funds appropriated to purchase materials to complete Duane Street from 7th Street to 13th Street. The CSO contractor will complete 14th Street to 17th Street after construction.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended Council approve the purchase of Thermoplastic from Ennis-Flint for $12,038.00.

Submitted By: Ken P. Cook (CON)
Ken P. Cook, Public Works Director

Prepared By: Ken B. Nelson (CON)
Ken B. Nelson, Public Works Superintendent

07.14.2015 16:44

CITY OF ASTORIA
Founded 1811 • Incorporated 1856
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

July 15, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: BRETT ESTES, CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: PARKLET PILOT PROPOSAL

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

City staff has been approached by two business owners over the last year concerning the potential for their businesses to be able to establish small outdoor commercial spaces in the street rights of way adjacent to their locations. In many communities that permit this activity, this is what is referred to as a "Parklet". In downtowns or older commercial areas where open space is lacking, they are seen as a way to provide more outdoor seating or landscaping, and to enliven the streetscape.

The parklet would basically be a deck occupying most of a parking space, approximately 7' wide by 18' long, and contain landscaping and seating. It may or may not be in conjunction with a restaurant. They must meet ADA and building standards, and be open to the public on a 24/7 basis. They could be removed in the winter months. Staff has recommended that they be allowed only on the "side streets" (not Marine Drive, Commercial Street, Duane or Exchange Streets), and that they be in the interior of the blocks and not on the corners.

Since this involves the private use of a public right of way, staff (including ADHDA staff) has drawn on work done in other cities to develop and adapt several policies which are attached for the Council's review. The ADHDA Board has reviewed the policies and proposed the idea of doing a two year pilot project for up to two parklet spaces. Once a property owner proposes a parklet project, staff would bring the proposal to the City Council for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council consider the proposal of a pilot project for a two year period, and if approved, adopt the attached resolution.

By: _____
Jeff Harrington, City Engineer

By: _____
Mike Morgan, Interim Planner

City of Astoria

Parklet Requirements

Parklets

Parklets are allowed within the street rights-of-way in accordance with the following:

1. "Parklet" is defined to mean a sidewalk extension that provides more space and amenities for people using the sidewalk in conjunction with the adjoining business.

2. Parklets will only be permitted in the Downtown area and will not be allowed on Marine Drive, Commercial Street, Duane Street, or Exchange Street due to truck traffic dangers.

3. Only fronting properties/businesses can apply for a parklet permit.

4. The size of a parklet must not exceed 7 feet into street (providing 1-foot clear from parking line) and a total length of the existing parking space minus 2 feet (1 foot on each side to provide clearance from adjacent parking spaces).

5. It is the responsibility of the permitee to design the parklet in compliance with Americans With Disability Administrative Guidelines (ADAAG) if the structure will provide pedestrian access.

6. Shall be considered public spaces therefore will be available to the general public 24 hours a day when not occupied by the business which installed the structure.

7. Will be allowed year around but must be a removable structure.

8. Limited to 1 parking space and one per block per side of block.

9. A parklet must have adequate drainage under structure adjacent to curb to pass street drainage.

10. A parklet must be located at least 20 feet from a crosswalk or street corner.

11. Structure corners must be reflectorized to provide night time visibility by oncoming traffic.

12. Rubber wheel stops must be placed on both ends of the parklet structure to warn parking cars of structures presence.

13. The permitee shall keep the parklet and surrounding area clean and well maintained. City street sweeper will not be able to access the street under and near the parklet so the permittee will be required to clean the area not maintained by the street sweeper.

14. A parklet cannot be located over water valves, adjacent to a fire hydrant or over any other utilities existing in the street.

15. The permitee must insure the structure and list the City as an additional insured.

16. No merchandise will be allowed on a parklet.

17. The parklet shall not have any utilities that require wires or conduit crossing the sidewalk.

18. The parklet shall not have a roof structure.

19. Building permit may be required for structure and ADA compliance.

20. Applicant must contact all property owners on the block to solicit input. Owner's comments may be considered by the City but individuals owners or businesses who object cannot "veto" project.

21. Application will be reviewed by Development Review Committee (City Staff) for general requirements and by the Community Development Director for Design Review and then submitted to City Council for approval with any conditions that may apply.

22. Application to City must include the following:
    a. Location map
    b. Concept design plans
    c. Verification of neighboring property (ADHDA: and neighboring businesses) owners support or concerns
    d. A design that meets sight distance and safety requirements
    e. If original submittal does not include enough detail for Design Review or final approval, additional information will be requested by the City to complete the approval process.

It is the intention of this document to provide general requirements for the implementation of a 2 year pilot project. Only 2 parklets will be permitted during the 2 year pilot project period. Staff will continue to work on and refine parklet requirements drawing on the experience of other cities.

RESOLUTION NO. 15-_____

A RESOLUTION CREATING A PILOT PROGRAM TO ALLOW "PARKLETS" ON SIDE STREETS IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA.

WHEREAS, certain businesses in the downtown area have expressed interest in building "parklets" on the City streets in front of their businesses; and

WHEREAS, the Astoria Downtown Historic District Association (ADHDA) has supported the concept of a two year pilot project for up to two projects to determine outcomes; and

WHEREAS, many cities around the country have successfully allowed parklets to be constructed in rights of way

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF ASTORIA:

Section 1. That the City of Astoria hereby allows the institution of a pilot project for a two year period to permit up to two parklets on the side streets in downtown Astoria.

Section 2. Effective Date. This Resolution is effective on the date of its passage.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL THIS 20TH DAY OF JULY, 2015.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR THIS 20TH DAY OF JULY, 2015

_____
Council President

ATTEST:

_____
City Manager

ROLL CALL ON ADOPTION	YEA	NAY	ABSENT
Councilor Nemlowill			
Herzig			
Price			
Warr			
Mayor LaMear			

CITY OF ASTORIA
Founded 1811 • Incorporated 1856

July 9, 2015

TO: MAYOR AND ASTORIA CITY COUNCIL

FROM: BRETT ESTES, CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: CARBON CREDIT PROJECT – CONTRACT APPROVAL FOR THIRD-PARTY VERIFIER

BACKGROUND

At the June 4, 2015 City Council meeting, Council approved a contract with The Climate Trust (Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement) to sell carbon credits generated from the City of Astoria Watershed carbon project. The Climate Trust has agreed to pay the City over a two-year period (2016-2017) $2,057,500 for carbon credits generated by Watershed carbon project. The contract with The Climate Trust requires the City to deliver carbon credits from the City's forest carbon project that are third-party validated and verified as meeting all American Carbon Registry (ACR) standards and requirements. On June 17, the Public Works Department issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to validate and verify the City's forest carbon project. The RFQ was sent to ACR-accredited verification bodies with a due date of July 8, 2015.

The City received four responses to its RFQ by ACR-accredited verification bodies. The Public Works Department staff evaluated all submissions and ranked them against the evaluation criteria contained in the RFQ; including qualifications, experience, specific experience validating and verifying carbon offset projects where The Climate Trust was the purchaser of verified carbon offsets, and demonstrated ability and commitment to meet the City's project timeline. Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI) of North Lawrence, Ohio earned the highest overall ranking by staff. No ACR-accredited verification bodies are located in the Pacific-Northwest; however, ESI does subcontract with qualified local forestry consultants to assist with validation and verification tasks. Staff subsequently negotiated a contract price of $29,500 to complete validation and verification of the City's forest carbon project. This price is within the budget estimate presented and approved by the Council at its June 4, 2015 meeting.

City Attorney Blair Henningsgaard has reviewed the ESI contract for forest carbon project validation and verification services and he has approved it as to form.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council approve award of the Bear Creek Watershed ACR Improved Forest Management Project Validation and Verification contract to Environmental Services, Inc.

Submitted by: Ken P. Cook

Ken P. Cook, Public Works Director

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.
3800 Clermont Street N.W.
North Lawrence, Ohio 44666

Phone 330-833-9941 * Fax 330-833-9875

www.environmentalservicesinc.com

01 July 2015

Mr. Ken P. Cook
Public Works Director
City of Astoria
1095 Duane Street
Astoria, OR 97103

Sent via email to: Mr. Ken P. Cook (kcook@astoria.or.us)
and Mr. David Ford (davidford27@gmail.com)

RE: Bear Creek Watershed IFM Project – ACR Validation and Verification
City of Astoria, Oregon

Dear Mr. Cook:

Thank you for contacting Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI). Pursuant to the Request for Qualification received on 17 June 2015 and my discussion with David Ford on 22 June 2014, we are pleased to enclose the attached proposal for third-party validation and verification services.

Our third-party validation/verification procedures (ISO 14064-3:2006) are implemented in conjunction with the American Carbon Registry standards and procedures. The validation/verification team will include Shawn McMahon (Lead Validator/Verifier), Rich Scharf (V/V Team Member), Caitlin Sellers (V/V Team Member), Jonathan Pomp (V/V Team Member), Guy Pinjuv (V/V Team Member), Matthew Perkowski (V/V Team Member), Eric Jaeschke (V/V Team Member), Aaron Holley (V/V Trainee), and Katie Talavera (Team Member/GIS Analyst), with QA/QC provided by Janice McMahon.

As required under ACR and ISO 14064-3/ 14065 standards, ESI maintains and implements a conflict of interest policy and procedure. As such, our internal impartiality and conflict of interest (COI) procedure is implemented and COI investigation conducted after ESI receives a signed contract for validation/verification services and prior to the start of any validation/verification activities. Ultimately our participation in the validation/verification project will be dependent upon the results of our COI investigation. ESI also pledges to demonstrate ethical conduct through trust, integrity, confidentiality, and discretion throughout the verification process (ISO14064-3: 2006, 3.3).

ESI maintains clear, traceable, and accurate information regarding our activities and the sectors in which we operate. This information is available upon request.

ESI's policy on confidentiality includes safeguarding all information obtained or created during the validation/verification. This includes all information obtained from the client, as well as information regarding the client obtained from independent sources. ESI staff will not disclose

information regarding a client that is not already public, without the express consent of the client. ESI reserves the right to responsibly utilize and disseminate information or work products as necessary and as required to satisfy industry accreditation, certification, audit or surveillance requests, or when legally compelled. ESI staff will use appropriate equipment and facilities to reasonably ensure the secure handling of confidential information. This does not include information provided to ACR as part of the required validation/verification process.

Once the signed contract and project documentation is received by ESI and the Conflict of Interest procedure successfully completed, we will prepare the validation plan and a verification/sampling plan, which will specifically address the following seven items in more detail; however, we will briefly discuss them here to gain approval from the client: Level of Assurance, Objectives, Criteria, Scope, Materiality, Handling of Records, and Client Statements Regarding Validation and Verification. In addition to these seven main areas, the schedule of activities and specific documents required from the client will also be outlined.

Level of Assurance: The level of assurance is used to determine the depth of detail that the validator/verifier places in the validation and verification plan to determine if there are any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). For ACR validations/verifications, ESI will select samples of data and information to be validated/verified to provide *reasonable assurance* and to meet the materiality requirements of the specific project (*ACR Verification Guideline for GHG Projects v1.1, June 2012*). ACR considers verification to be a risk-based process where the verifier examines a sufficient amount of data and used verifier's professional judgment to provide a reasonable assurance. Sample size will be determined based on project parameters and will be outlined in the verification sampling plan.

Objective: For this project, the validation and verification objective will include an assessment of the likelihood that implementation of the planned GHG project will result in the GHG emission removal enhancements as stated by the project developer (ISO 14064-3:2006). The objective is to ensure the project is in compliance with *The ACR Standard, v4, January 2015, The ACR Verification Guideline for GHG Projects v1.1 (June 2012),* and *The ACR Forest Carbon Project Standard, November 2010-v2.1* criteria and ESI will assess the GHG emission removals through the afforestation and reforestation project. ESI will notify the clients of any changes to the GHG protocol requirements (ACR) that may affect the client's objectives which occur after the signing of this contract up and until the completion of the validation and verification report and statements.

Criteria: The criteria will follow the validation/verification guidance documents provided by ACR located at http://www.americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards. These documents include the:

- *ACR Standard, v4, January 2015*
- *ACR Forest Carbon Project Standard, November 2010 – v2.1*
- *ACR Validation and Verification Guidelines for GHG Projects, June 2012, v1.1*

- *Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emissions Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non-Federal U.S. Forestlands*

Scope: The scope of the validation/verification generally includes the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered. The geographic scope is defined by the project boundary, the carbon reservoir types, management activities, growth and yield models, inventory program, and contract periods. The scope of the project was generally outlined by the project developer prior to this proposal/contract (via RFQ and phone call) and is re-defined as follows for the GHG project:

Baseline Scenario	Commercial forestry practices and management to objective to provide high quality drinking water to the residents of the City of Astoria
Activities/Technologies/Processes	Improved Forest Management utilizing the ACR methodology for Non-Federal U.S. Forestlands Benefits: maintaining the diversity of natural forest communities and aligning management with ecological regimes and watershed protection.
Sources/sinks/Reservoirs	Above-ground biomass carbon – included Below-ground biomass carbon – included Standing dead wood - included/optional Lying dead wood – optional Harvested wood products – included Litter/Forest floor – excluded Soil organic carbon – excluded Burning of biomass – included for CH4
GHG Type	CO_2 and CH_4
Time Period	Start date: Crediting Period: Verification Period:
Project Boundary	City of Astoria, OR within the Bear Creek Watershed 3,700 acres of contiguous commercial forest

Materiality: Materiality is a concept that the individual or aggregation of errors, omissions, and misstatements could affect the GHG assertion and the decisions of the intended users. Materiality is also used as part of the verification sampling plan design, to determine the type of verification processes to be used by the verifier to minimize the risk of not detecting a material misstatement. ACR's materiality threshold is +/-5% of the GHG project's emission reductions or removal enhancements. In other words, ACR requires that the emission reductions/removals claimed by the project proponent and estimated by the verifier be immaterial (less than +/- 5%). Individual or aggregation of errors or omissions greater than

the ACR materiality threshold of +/-5% require re-stating before verification statements can be accepted by ACR.

Handling of records: ESI shall keep all documents and records in a secure retrievable manner for at least two (2) years after the end of the project crediting period, even if ESI does not carry out verification for the whole project crediting period (ACR Eligibility Criteria). Records can be destroyed at any time, pending agreement between the client, ESI, and ACR. ESI shall maintain and manage records of its validation/ verification activities including:

- Application information and validation/verification scopes
- Justification for how validation/verification time is determined
- Confirmation of the completion of validation/verification activities, including findings and information on material or non-material discrepancies
- Validation and Verification statements (opinions)
- Records of complaints and appeals, and any subsequent correction or corrective actions

ESI shall maintain all validation/verification records securely and confidentially, including during their transport, transmission, or transfer. ESI shall retain validation/verification records in accordance with any legal, contractual, and/or ACR requirements, per ISO 14065:2013, Sec. 7.5. Records may be reviewed on-site or off-site by ESI and its observers, as approved by the client. Please note if only on-site review will be permitted, as the client it is your responsibility to notify ESI prior to approving this proposal, as additional time and cost may be required.

Client Statements Regarding Validation and Verification and GHG Assertions: It is the policy of Environmental Services, Inc. that the following statement be used by clients when the validation/verification status (GHG Assertion) of the project is described:

> *The Bear Creek Watershed IFM project located in Astoria, Oregon of approximately 3,700 acres has been (is being) validated and verified by Environmental Services, Inc. to the appropriate standards as defined by American Carbon Registry Standards and guidance documents associated with improved forest management. For a complete record of the attestation associated with this project validation/verification, please contact Environmental Services, Inc. - Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division at 904.470.2200 or forestry@esinc.cc and reference project number VO15044.00.*

The statement may be used for a period of one (1) year after the completion of the project validation and verification; however, after the verification is completed it is better to use the issued verification statement. During the proposal and report stage of each project, the Lead Validator/Verifier and/or the Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Sr. Vice President/Technical Director will tailor the statement to the specific project. Deviations from the statement provided above will be granted on a case-by-case basis, primarily when in conflict with formatting requirements or space limitations. These deviations will be reviewed by the Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Sr. Vice President/Technical Director, and substitute language agreed upon in writing.

The client shall also be responsible for complying with all validation/verification requirements, making all necessary arrangements for the validators/verifiers and observers (as appropriate) to conduct the validation/verification, providing access to all documentation, processes, property, records and personnel, and to accommodate validators/verifiers as much as possible (ISO 14065:2013, sec. 7.2). Please note under our Terms section at the end of the proposal that as the client, you assure ESI has permission to work on the property being evaluated and that you will advise us regarding the proper procedures for accessing the property.

Again, please note, this proposal has been prepared prior to the implementation of our impartiality and conflict of interest procedure, and our ultimate participation in this project is subject to the results of our internal review. To expedite the process, please complete and return the attached COI Questionnaire (Form 059) with the signed contract.

We are prepared to proceed upon receipt of the signed and initialed contract and a retainer in the amount of $1,000 (US dollars). Please approve the proposal by signing the enclosed document and returning it to me by email (jmcmahon@esinc.cc) or by fax (904-470-2112). We look forward to working with you.

Please contact me should you have any questions. Thank you for selecting ESI to assist with your validation/verification needs.

Sincerely yours,

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Janice McMahon

Janice McMahon
Sr. Vice President/Technical Director
Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division

Attachment:
- Appendix A – Supplemental Information
- Appendix B – ANSI Accreditation
- Appendix B – Resumes
- Form 059 – COI Questionnaire

JPM/rb/VO15044.00 proposal.doc
K: pf 07/01/15f

CONTRACT FOR SERVICES
ESI PROJECT NO. VO15044.00

The following Contract for Services is an agreement between Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI) and City of Astoria, (Client) with the terms specified herein. Client and ESI agree to take into account the requirements of ISO 14064-3 (4.3) as described in the attached proposal letter (pages 1-5, dated 01 July 2015). Client agrees that the company/individual signing this agreement has the ability to compensate ESI for the work described even if the proposed project is not positively verified. ESI agrees to perform the following tasks for the associated fee. This proposal is intended to cover all tasks occurring during **one visit**. If separate visits are required, the proposal will be revised.

Project Name: **Bear Creek Watershed IFM Project – ACR Validation and Verification**

Project Location: **City of Astoria, Oregon**

SCOPE OF SERVICES	**FIXED FEE**
Task 1 Validation Under ACR Forest Carbon Project Standard (v2.1) for Afforestation/Reforestation (A/R) Project.	$15,000

ESI will provide offset project validation services of the Bear Creek Watershed IFM project located in Astoria, Oregon. As defined by ISO 14064-3:2006 (E), validation is the systematic, independent, and documented process for the evaluation of a greenhouse gas assertion in a GHG project plan against agreed validation criteria.

The scope of the validation will includes an assessment of the GHG Project Plan against the applicable requirements of the ACR Standard, Forestry Project Standard (v2.1), and the approved IFM methodology. The assessment will also include the validation of the following: baseline assumptions and appropriateness; emissions assumptions and appropriateness; additionality, leakage, monitoring plan design; environmental impact; etc.

ESI will conduct a validation for the GHG Project Plan to ensure adherence to the selected ACR (v2.1) validation criteria and IFM methodology. This task will include the following three steps: initial review of documentation provided by the client/site visit; submission of formal requests for clarification (CL) and/or non-conformity reports (NCR); and review of the client's response to requests for CLs/NCRs. These three steps equate to One (1) Round. If the responses provide are, in the opinion of the validator, insufficient to satisfy the validation requirements, additional cycles of request/response will be conducted under Task 3.

This task also includes four (4) main meetings (up to one hour each): opening meeting, calculation/model walk-through, Round 1 NCR/CL meeting, and closing meeting. If additional meetings are requested by the client, the time will be billed under Task 3.

Based on the results of the validation, ESI will prepare a validation report that is a validation of the project plan and project elements as described above. The validation report shall describe in detail the validation process employed and the findings of validation. A draft of the report will be provided to the client for review. Upon approval, the report will be finalized and submitted to ACR for review and approval. Upon approval from ACR, the client is authorized to use any statements made within the report or validation statement only within the context of the larger report. Final report will be delivered upon receipt of the final payment to ESI for services rendered.

This contract is for third-party validation services from ESI; accordingly, ESI is not bound to the client in any way to produce a favorable report. ESI will conduct the validation according to the ACR Forest carbon Project Standard (v2.1) for A/R projects and will report its findings and recommendations without bias.

NOTE: The completed, accurate, and finalized Project Plan (PP), modeling/calculations, and supporting project documentation must be received by ESI at least four (4) weeks prior to the site visit. The information ESI receives must be the completed and accurate versions. Round 1 review and the site visit will be based on the project documentation received four weeks in advance of the site visit. If any project documentation is incomplete or anticipated to change prior to the issuance of Round 1 NCRs/CLs, please notify us immediately. These changed/updated items will not be reviewed during Round 1 but will instead be reviewed during Round 2 on a Time & Materials basis. If significant changes occur, additional site visits may be warranted, especially if the changes relate to baseline assumptions, harvesting scenarios, and/or total carbon stocking ***Initials*** ____

Task 2 Verification Under ACR Forest Carbon Project Standard for Afforestation/Reforestation (A/R) Project. $12,000

ESI will provide project verification services of the Bear Creek Watershed IFM project in Astoria, Oregon. The projects will be verified under the *ACR Forest Carbon Project Standard, November 2010 –v2.1.*

The scope of the verification includes the GHG project and baseline

scenarios; project boundary and temporal boundary; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHG's; and time periods covered.

The verification shall include both field and desk review components to confirm the projects compliance with the ACR standards and the approved methodology. This may include, but is not limited to the following topics: GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs; conditions prior to the project; additionality; leakage; completeness; technology/methodology used; measurement accuracy and precision; buffer risk analysis; permanence; negative environmental or socio-economic impacts; the reported species mix and characteristics; acreage enrolled in the program; forest management practices on enrolled land are in compliance with the program criteria; monitoring and reporting plan; and identification of any acres not in compliance with eligibility criteria.

This task will include the following three steps: initial review of documentation provided by the client/site visit; submission of formal requests for clarification (CL) and/or non-conformity reports (NCR); and review of the client's response to requests for CLs/NCRs. These three steps equate to <u>One (1) Round</u>. If the responses provide are, in the opinion of the verifier, insufficient to satisfy the verification requirements, additional cycles of request/response will be conducted under Task 3.

This task also includes four (4) main meetings (up to one hour each): opening meeting, calculation/model walk-through, Round 1 NCR/CL meeting, and closing meeting. If additional meetings are requested by the client, the time will be billed under Task 3.

Deliverables will include a verification report and statement consistent with the reporting requirements of ACR and ISO 14064-3/14065 for IFM projects. The verification report shall describe in detail the verification process employed, and the findings of verification. A draft of the report will be provided to the client for review. After approval, ESI will submit the finalized report and statement to ACR for review and approval. Upon approval from ACR, the client is authorized to use any statements made within the report or verification statements only within the context of the larger report. Final report will be delivered upon receipt of final payment to ESI for services rendered.

This contract is for third-party verification services from ESI; accordingly, ESI is not bound to the client in any way to produce a favorable report. ESI will conduct verifications according to the ACR

Forest Carbon Project Standard (v2.1) for IFM projects and will report its findings and recommendations without bias.

NOTE: The completed, accurate, and finalized Project Monitoring Report, modeling/calculations, and supporting project documentation must be received by ESI at least four (4) weeks prior to the site visit. The information ESI receives must be the completed and accurate versions. Round 1 review and the site visit will be based on the project documentation received four weeks in advance of the site visit. If any project documentation is incomplete or anticipated to change prior to the issuance of Round 1 NCRs/CLs. These changed/updated items will not be reviewed during Round 1 but will instead be reviewed during Round 2 on a Time & Materials basis. If significant changes occur, additional site visits may be warranted, especially if the changes relate to baseline assumptions, harvesting scenarios, and/or total carbon stocking. ***Initials*** ____

NOTES:

NOTE: All travel expenses, including airfare, mileage, lodging, meals, etc., to be paid by client under Task 4. These expenses are not included in the fixed fees of Task 1 and Task 2. ***Initials*** ____

NOTE: If completed documents are not received, our Round 1 review will only include the items provided four (4) weeks prior to the site visit. If anything changes or if we are given new information/updated calculations, their review automatically goes to the Round 2 review with a possible second site visit. ***Initials*** ____

NOTE: The contract price includes two (2) field days for two (2) staff members. Field days consist of 10-hour maximums. If more than 10 hours are worked in a day, the additional time will be billed on a T&M basis under Task 5. If additional field days are required, the time will be billed under Task 5. ***Initials*** ____

NOTE: If a project deviation is discovered during the course of the validation and/or verification that was not approved by ACR prior to the start of validation/verification, all time associated with reviewing and discussing said deviation with ACR will be T&M under Task 3.

Initials ____

NOTE: All NCRs/CLs must be corrected/addressed to satisfy the required reasonable level of assurance as determined by the verification team's professional judgment. Any Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) issued are not required to be corrected/addressed, but based on the verification team's professional judgment, they would add a better

level of clarity and quality to the project. ***Initials*** ____

NOTE: If any rounds of NCR responses are provided by the client to ESI greater than 2 months (60 calendar days) from the date they were originally provided by ESI, a $2,000 fee will be assessed for the continuation of the review. This is to account for the cost of rediscovery associated with any long delays (i.e. greater than 60 days). ***Initials*** ____

NOTE: All external deadlines (GHG credit arrangements, sales, contracts, etc.) set by the client (project proponent/project owner or any affiliated party) are the sole responsibility of the client and are irrelevant to the verification process. ESI makes responsiveness and efficiency a top priority, but ESI shall not be held to deadlines outside the verification process that we cannot control. ***Initials*** ____

******NOTE:*** *ESI requires the Project Proponent/Consultant/Client to conduct all field operations in compliance with regional industry safety standards. We require strict safety awareness/performance and expect all safety concerns (terrain, wildlife, weather conditions, accommodations, food, etc.) to be discussed with the ESI field team prior to and during the site visit. ESI also expects the Project Proponent/Consultant/Client to have emergency contingency plans in place in case an emergency situation is encountered during a site visit. These plans and actions required in case of an emergency should be discussed with the ESI field team prior to initiating the site visit. The client's failure to address safety concerns or provide information regarding emergency situations will result in the verification team's refusal to conduct the field visits and may require rescheduling of the site visits at additional cost to the Client.* ***Initials*** ____

ESI strives to accurately scope the site visit duration based on past experience and the information provided by the Offset Project Operator to-date. If new information becomes available that has the potential to affect the scoping of field work, please notify ESI as soon as possible so that we may revisit the scope and provide you with a more accurate forecast of time in the field.

TIME AND MATERIALS

Task 3. Critical Issues or Omissions $150/hr

Any critical issues or omissions of necessary data discovered during (or after) the validation/verification process outlined in Task 1 and Task 2 (i.e. Round 2 and beyond, additional meetings, etc.), will be billed at $150 per hour. These issues might include, but are not limited to, general mathematical or statistical calculation errors, terminology issues,

project deviations and missing documentation where ESI has to specifically request additional information to resolve. This does not preclude the option that ESI staff finds the project unacceptable relative to the validation/verification process. It will be the sole discretion of ESI staff whether any issues discovered during the process can be resolved under this task/contract process, or are outside of the scope of this validation/verification agreement.

If the ESI Verification Team and the Project Developer cannot reach a mutual understanding or interpretation of a specific requirement of the program, ESI may need to request official guidance from ACR. Typically, these requests require significant documentation research, and coordination with ACR and Project Developer outside the scope of the original contract. If a guidance request is required to facilitate verification, then the work will be completed on a Time and Materials (T&M) basis. ***Initials*** ____

If ESI is requested by ACR and/or associated Registry to address findings and/or update reports or verification documentation; any time associated with answering questions or updating associated documents/reports will be billed under this task on a T&M basis.
Initials ____

Task 4. Travel Expense — Incurred Costs

All travel expenses (for two (2) staff members, including but not limited to airfare, mileage, lodging, and meals, will be billed to and paid by the client at base cost

Task 5. Additional Field Verification Hours / Additional Field Verification Days — $150/hour/ staff member **and/or** $3,000/day (2 staff members)

If additional field hours are required (i.e., more than two, 10-hour days), the additional hours will be discussed with the client prior to the day's completion. Upon agreement from the client, additional hours will cost $150/hour/staff member.

If additional field verifications days are required to re-sample the number of plots needed and/or conduct the field verification to reach a reasonable level of assurance, the client will be notified and the issues will be discussed. Upon agreement from the client, ESI will add additional field day(s) at a cost of $3,000/day (2 staff members). All travel expenses associated with additional days (i.e., plane ticket changes, etc.) will be billed under Task 4.

We will work on the basis described above using the outlined costs defined above for each task.

We are prepared to proceed upon receipt of the signed and initialed contract, completed conflict of interest form, and a retainer in the amount of $1,000.

ESI is committed to providing quality service to our clients. Every verification project is conducted by an ESI Lead Verifier and reviewed by the Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division Sr. Vice President/Technical Director to ensure that the work has been performed in compliance with ISO 14064-3:2006(E), the ACR Forest Carbon Project Standard, and our goal of providing superior service and solutions to our clients.

TERMS:

- ESI will complete the work described above in a timely manner unless delayed by Client's request, lack of information, or intervening factors beyond our control.
- Client assures ESI and its observers that it has permission to work on the subject property and will advise ESI of proper procedures for accessing subject property.
- ESI reserves the right to responsibly utilize and disseminate information or work products as necessary and required to satisfy industry accreditation certification, audit or surveillance requests, or when legally compelled.
- **ESI will maintain a minimum $1,000,000 errors and omissions (professional liability) insurance, $1,000,000 per occurrence and $2,000,000 aggregate liability insurance, and $5,000,000 single limits excess policy for the duration of the project. If any additional insurance requirements are necessary, please return the specifications with the signed proposal. They will become a part of this contract as agreed by both parties.**
- **A retainer of $1,000 (US dollars) is required; the retainer will be subtracted from the <u>last</u> invoice and is required by ESI to initiate work.**
- **Client is responsible for bank fees associated with electronic or wire funds.**
- Client will provide ESI with any special billing formats or considerations with the signed contract.
- Billing is done monthly. **<u>Payment is due immediately upon receipt of the invoice</u>**; after 30 days the Client agrees to pay 1.5 percent late fee per month or portion thereof on unpaid balances. Unpaid balances after 30 days from the date of the invoice may result in work stoppage until overdue accounts are resolved.
- Failure to pay within 45 days from the date of invoice will be considered by ESI to be a breach of contract, and ESI may cease work and withhold all work product(s) immediately without penalty from the Client.
- The final report will be delivered upon receipt of final payment to ESI for services rendered.
- Any disputes regarding payment for services will be resolved in a court in the county of the ESI office responsible for the work. Client agrees to pay all legal fees and other collection costs incurred by ESI to collect unpaid invoices.
- ESI maintains a client Complaints, Disputes and Appeals Policy and Procedure. Policy available upon request.
- ESI maintains and implements an Impartiality and Conflict of Interest Policy and Procedure. Policy available upon request.
- ESI rates change on March 1 of each year.
- ESI policy states that only the Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division Sr. Vice President/Technical Director, Chief Operating Officer, or Chief Executive Officer of ESI may approve and sign proposals (creating a contract). Accordingly, ESI requires that an officer or similarly responsible entity must approve and sign the proposal into contract for the client.
- ESI shall retain authority and responsibility for all its validation or verification activities, decisions, and statements.
- Per the Registry(ies) Standard, ESI must be a third-party entity, maintaining a professionally skeptical approach to reviewing the Project. ESI is in no way allowed to perform consulting duties or assist in aiding the Project through verification. Our sole role is to review the information and documentation provided against the rules and standards of the Program/Registry. If we receive documentation that contains substantial gaps or errors (at the discretion of the Lead Verifier), then ESI will notify Client, explain why

ESI has made this determination, and then immediately stop all verification work, including impending site visits. The contract will be halted, but Client will be billed Time and Materials (T&M) for all work completed at that time. If Client desires to correct the documentation, hiring of additional consultants may be required, as ESI cannot provide guidance on what needs to be corrected. After Client corrections are made, ESI will revisit the contract and may re-start verification activities as soon as next availability.
This proposal is valid for a period of 60 days following the date of issuance.

TERMS ACCEPTED:	**ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.**
SIGNATURE:	Janice McMahon
	SIGNATURE:
NAME (print):	NAME (print): Janice McMahon
FIRM:	FIRM: Environmental Services, Inc.
TITLE:	TITLE: Sr. Vice President/Technical Director Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division
DATE:	DATE: 01 July 2015

Purchase Order #
Client Project File #
BILLING ADDRESS AND CONTACT IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE:

JPM/rb/VO15044.00 proposal.doc
K:pf 07/01/15f

APPENDIX A – SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION OF VALIDATION/VERIFICATION BODY

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI) is a full-service environmental firm established in 1986 with the mission of providing superior solutions to environmental, natural and cultural resource needs. The company, comprising five technical divisions, includes Forestry, Carbon and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Services, Ecology, Stream Restoration, Archeology and Cultural Resources, and Site Assessment and Remediation. Our knowledge, experience, and depth of resources have provided us the ability to adapt quickly within the fields of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and reductions (offsets), carbon sequestration, ecosystem services, and GHG validation and verification, both nationally and internationally.

ESI is accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) under ISO 14065:2007 for greenhouse gas validation and verification bodies including: ISO 14064-3:2006, ISO 14065:2007, validation/verification of assertions related to GHG emission reductions and removals at the project level for Land Use and Forestry (Group 3), and verification of assertions related to GHG emissions and removals at the organizational level (Group 1 – General, Group 2 – Manufacturing, Group 3 – Power Generation, Group 5 – Mining and Mineral Production, Group 6 – Metals Production, Group 7 chemical Production, Group 8 – Oil and Gas Extraction, production, and Refining including Petrochemicals, and Group 9 – Waste).

ESI is also accredited by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) as an Offset Verification Body.

ESI is an approved third-party validator and/or verifier for the Verified Carbon Standard, Climate Action Reserve, California Air Resources Board, American Carbon Registry, Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance, CarbonFix (Gold Standard), Natural Forest Standard, Plan Vivo, The Climate Registry, BC Reporting Regulation, and ON Reporting Regulation. For additional information on ESI, please visit www.esicarbon.com.

APPROVED TO PERFORM ACR PROJECT VALIDATIONS/VERIFICATIONS

ESI's Certificate of Accreditation for Greenhouse Gas Validation and Verification from ANSI demonstrates that ESI is approved as an AFOLU (Scope 14) validator/verifier and can provide validation/verification services for ACR. Please see **Appendix B.**

PROJECT TEAM

Resumes of key personnel can be found in **Appendix C.**

PAST AND CURRENT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

ESI has been accredited by ANSI to perform third-party validations and verification since March 2010. Due to strict confidentiality requirements associated with many of our current and past validation and verification

projects, we are unable to discuss the full details of the projects; however, the following is a list of past and current ACR project validation and verification experiences as well as AFOLU project validation/verification experience with other programs.

ACR Project Verifications:

Name of Project	Project Category	Verification Complete
Green Trees, LLC Series GT and A-1	AR	Yes
GreenTrees ACRE (Advanced Carbon Restored Ecosystem) Project - 2011	AR	Yes
GreenTrees ACRE (Advanced Carbon Restored Ecosystem) Project – 2012	AR	Yes
GreenTrees ACRE (Advanced Carbon Restored Ecosystem) Project – 2012.2	AR	Yes
Green Trees – annual Verification for 2013 (and two new instances)	AR	Yes

ACR Project Validations and Verifications:

Name of Project	Project Category	Validation Complete	Verification Complete
Restoration of Bottomland Hardwood Forests at National Wildlife Refuges in the South Central US	AR	Yes	Yes
GreenTrees ACRE (Advanced Carbon Restores Ecosystem) Project	AR	Yes	Yes
MSU – EPRI – Nitrous Oxide Reduction in Corn	ALM	Yes	Yes
UPM Blandin – ACR Validation/Verification	IFM **	In Process	In Process

** Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emissions Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non-Federal U.S. Forestlands

ARB Project Verifications:

Name of Project	Project Category	Verification Complete
Farm Cove Community Forest Carbon Project - Early Action Desktop Review	IFM	Yes
Willits Woods IFM Project - Early Action Desktop Review (2005-2011)	IFM	Yes

Gualala River CAR660 – Early Action Desktop Review (2007-2012)	IFM	Yes
Gualala River CAR660 – Early Action Desktop Review (2013)	IFM	Yes
Gualala River CAR660 – Early Action Desktop Review (2014)	IFM	In Process
Big River – Salmon Creek CAR408 – Early Action Desktop Review (2010, 2011, 2012) – 2008, 2009 added	IFM	Yes
Big River – Salmon Creek CAR408 – Early Action Desktop Review (2013)	IFM	Yes
Garcia River CAR102 – Early Action Desktop Review (2010, 2011, 2012)	IFM	Yes
Garcia River CAR102 – Early Action Desktop Review (2013)	IFM	Yes
Blue Source/Bishop IFM CAR973 – ARB Verification (full compliance)	IFM	Yes
Alligator River CAR497 – Early Action Desktop Review (2010,2011,2012)	AC	Yes
Alligator River CAR497 – Early Action Desktop Review (2014)	AC	In Process
VanEck – Early Action Desktop Review (re-verification)	IFM	Yes
Willits Woods IFM –Early Action Desktop Review (2012)	IFM	Yes
Middleton Avoided Conversion – South Carolina – Early Action Desktop Review (2007-2011)	AC	Yes
Middleton Avoided Conversion – South Carolina – Early Action Desktop Review (2012-2013)	AC	Yes
Brookgreen Gardens IFM Project (full compliance)	IFM	Yes
Finite Carbon – The Forestland Group CT Lakes (full compliance)	IFM	Yes
Yurok Tribe Sustainable Forest Project –ARB Early Action (CAR777)	IFM	Yes

Yurok Tribe Sustainable Forest Project –ARB Early Action (CAR777) – 2012 and 2013	IFM	In Process
McCloud Project – ARB Early Action	IFM	In Process
Virginia Highlands I – ARB Verification (full compliance)	IFM	Yes
Goodman Project – ARB Verification (full compliance)	IFM	Yes
Willits Woods IFM –Early Action Desktop Review (2013)	IFM	Yes
Willits Woods IFM – EA Desktop Review (2014)	IFM	Yes
ARB Verification – Natchez, MS (full compliance)	IFM	In Process
Finite-Grand Lakes ARB (full verification)	IFM	In Process
Buckeye Forest Project (full compliance)	IFM	Yes
Rips Redwoods – ARB EA Verification	IFM	In Process
Ashford III – ARB (full verification)	IFM	In Process
Huron Mountain Club – ARB (full verification)	IFM	In Process
Howland Research Forest (CAR681) – Early Action Review	IFM	In Process
Alder Stream Reserve (CAR655) – Early Action Review	IFM	In Process
Blue Source/Bishop IFM CAR973 – ARB Verification (annual)	IFM	Yes
Hawthorne – ARB (full verification)	IFM	In Process
Wyoming IFM Project in West Virginia – ARB (full verification)	IFM	In Process

Climate Action Reserve Project Verifications:

Name of Project	Project Category	Verification Complete

Cuyamaca Ranch State Park Reforestation Project	R	Yes
Virginia Conservation Forestry Program – Clifton Farm	IFM	Yes
Virginia Conservation Forestry Program – Rich Mountain	IFM	Yes
Finite Carbon – The Forestland Group Champion Property (CAR645)	IFM	Yes
Blue Source – Francis Beidler Improved Forest Management Project (CAR683)	IFM	Yes
Finite Carbon – Brosnan Forest (CAR658)	IFM	Yes
Finite Carbon – Potlatch Moro Big Pine CE (CAR648)	IFM	Yes
Virginia Conservation Forestry Program, Tazewell – Elk Garden (CAR697)	IFM	Yes
Virginia Conservation Forestry Program, Tazewell – Elk (CAR697) – 2014 annual review	IFM	Yes
Pre-verification of Mellon IFM project	IFM	Yes
Finite Carbon – The Forestland Group Champion Property (CAR645) – Annual	IFM	Yes
Berry Summit – CAR Verification	IFM	Yes
Virginia Conservation Forestry Program – Clifton Farm (CAR686) – Annual Review (2012 and 2013)	IFM	Yes
Virginia Conservation Forestry Program – Clifton Farm (CAR686) – Annual Review (2014)	IFM	Yes
Virginia Conservation Forestry Program – Rich Mountain – Annual Review for 2012, 2013, and 2014	IFM	Yes
Van Eck Forest – Verification 2005-2012	IFM	Yes
Garcia River – CAR102 – Reserve Verification	IFM	Yes

Big River/Salmon Creek – CAR408- Reserve Verification	IFM	Yes

VCS Methodology Assessments:

Methodology	First Validation	Second Validation
Quantifying N_2O Emissions Reductions in US Agricultural Crops through N Fertilizer Rate Reductions	Complete	
ALM Adoption of Sustainable Grassland Management Through Adjustment of Fire and Grazing	Complete	
VM0009 (original) – Methodology for Avoided Deforestation		Complete
VM0021 – Soil Carbon Quantification Methodology, v1.0	Complete	
Methodology for Sustainable Grassland Management (SGM)	Complete	
Protocol for the Creation of Forest Carbon Offsets in British Columbia		Complete
VM0009, v2.1 – Methodology for Avoided Deforestation		Complete
Methodology for Coastal Wetland creation		Complete
Revision/Extension of VCS Methodology, VM0007	Current	
Reduced Impact Logging Practices that Reduce Carbon Emissions (RIL-C) IFM Methodology Element/RIL-C East Kalimantan Performance Method Module	Complete	
Methodology for Avoided Ecosystem Conversion VM0009, v3.0	Complete	
VCS WRC Methodology Validation	Current	
Revision of VCS Methodology VM0010	Current	

VCS Project Validations:

Name of Project	Project Category	Validation Complete
Kariba REDD+ Project	REDD	Yes
Lower Mississippi Valley Grouped Afforestation Project	ARR	Yes
Kuzuko Lodge Private Game Reserve Thicket Restoration Project	ARR	Yes
Sustainable Agriculture in Changing Climate (SACC) Project – Western Kenya	ARR	Yes

Conversion to Protection of the Amazon Rain Forest	REDD	In process
Fondo de Capital Privado – Reforestation with Rubber on Degraded Lands of Colombia – ARR Project	ARR	In process
Russas Project – A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil	REDD	Yes
Valparaiso Project - A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil	REDD	Yes
Duarte project – Pre-Validation	AD	Yes
Abote Project – Pre-Validation	ARR	Yes
Envira Amazonia – Acre Brazil	REDD	Yes

VCS Project Verifications:

Name of Project	Project Category	Verification Complete
Protection of a Tasmanian Native Forest (Project 3: Peter Downie)	IFM	Yes
Protection of a Tasmanian Native Forest (Project 1: Redd Forests' Pilot)	IFM	Yes
Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase I – Rukinga	REDD	Yes
Reforestation Across the Lower Mississippi Valley	AR	Yes
Kasigau Corridor Redd Project – Phase II – The Community Ranches	REDD	Yes
Natural High Forest Rehabilitation Project on Degraded Land of Kibale National Park	ARR	Yes
Boden Creek Ecological Preserve Forest Carbon Project	REDD	Yes
INFAPRO Rehabilitation of Logged-Over Dipterocarp Forest in Sabah, Malaysia	IFM	Yes
Redd Forests Grouped Project: Protection of Tasmanian Native Forest, Version 1.20	IFM	Yes
Kariba REDD+ Project	REDD	Yes
The Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase I – Rukinga Sanctuary	REDD	Yes
The Kasigau Corridor REDD Project Phase II – The Community Ranches	REDD	Yes

-Protection of a Tasmanian Native Forest-Project3 Peter Downie; and -Protection of a Tasmania Native Forest (Project 1: REDD Forests' Pilot); and -Grouped Project - Protection of a Tasmania Native Forest	IFM	Yes
Purus Project- A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil	REDD	Yes
Purus Project- A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil	REDD	Yes
Purus Project- A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil (2014 monitoring)	REDD	In Process
Russas Project -A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil	REDD	Yes
Valparaiso Project - A Tropical Forest Conservation Project in Acre, Brazil	REDD	Yes
Rimba Raya – VCS 2nd Verification, Borneo, Indonesia	REDD	Yes
Bethlehem Project, Pennsylvania	IFM	Yes
Bethlehem Project, Pennsylvania – annual verification	IFM	Yes
Envira Amazonia – 2014 Verification	REDD	In process
Alto May Conservation Initiative Project	AD	Yes

VCS Project Validations and Verifications:

Name of Project	Project Category	Validation Complete	Verification Complete
Restoration of degraded areas and reforestation in Cáceres and Cravo Norte, Colombia	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Kenya VCS-001	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Kenya VCS-002	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Kenya VCS-003	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Kenya VCS-004	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Kenya VCS-005	ARR	Yes	Yes

Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project: Phase 1	REDD	Yes	Yes
Redd Forests Grouped Project: Protection of Tasmanian Forest	IFM	Yes	Yes
Protection of a Tasmanian Native Forest – Project 3 Peter Downie	IFM	Yes	Yes
Protection of a Tasmanian Native Forest – Project 1 Redd Forests Pilot	IFM	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Uganda VCS-001	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Uganda VCS-002	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Uganda VCS-003	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Uganda VCS-004	ARR	Yes	Yes
Protection of the Bolivian Amazon Forest	REDD	Yes	Yes
Reforestation of Degraded Lands in the Valle California of Patagonia, Chile	ARR	Yes	In Process
April Salumei Sustainable Forest Management Project	REDD	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Kenya – VCS-006	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Uganda – VCS-005	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Uganda – VCS-006	ARR	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in India – VCS-001	ARR	Yes	Yes
Avoiding Planned Deforestation and Degradation in the Valdivian Coastal Reserve, Chile	REDD	Yes	Yes
TIST Program in Kenya – VCS-009	ARR	Yes	Yes
Reforesting Degraded Lands in Chile Through the use of Mycorrhizal Inoculation	ARR	Yes	Yes
Protection of the Amazon Rain Forest II	REDD	In process	In process
Grouped Project – Protection of a Tasmanian Native Forest	IFM	Yes	Yes

Tasmanian Land Conservancy– New Leaf Project	IFM	Yes	Yes
Bishop – VCS Validation/Verification (Peru)	REDD	In process	In process
FCO – VCS Validation/Verification – Laguna Seca Project	REDD	In process	In process
Northern Rangelands Trust project in Northern Kenya	ALM	In process	In process

COMMUNICATION PROCESS

As Lead Verifier, Shawn McMahon will be the primary contact throughout the project for the client, with Janice McMahon (Technical Director) being the secondary contacts. Throughout the verification process, it is ESI's goal to provide direct, transparent communications with the client, starting with the Opening Meeting and continuing through the Closing Meeting. ESI utilizes various means of communications throughout the process including conference calls, Skype communications/calls, emails, and face-to-face meeting. During the review process if critical issues are discovered, the client is notified immediately via a phone call and email. After each round of clarifications or non-conformity reports, ESI will request a conference call with the project proponent to discuss the findings. We believe this step helps increase efficiency and reduces confusion.

TIMEFRAMES

The timelines will be contingent upon the finalization of the contract, COI process/ACR approval and end of reporting period. This allows us time to review the project documentation, prepare a sampling plan, and adequately prepare for the site visit. The following timelines are example of potential workflow based on the requested site visit dates and current work schedules. The final timelines and schedules will be discussed upon receipt of a signed contract.

Proposed Timeline – Project Validation/Verification

Project Validation /Verification Activity	Date (TENTATIVE)
Proposal submitted to project proponent	30 June 2015
Signed contract and completed COI form received from project proponent	13 July 2015
ESI conducts COI procedure and notifies project proponent	13-16 July 2014

ESI receives all project documents: PD, MP, and all supporting documentation from project proponent	14 August 2015 (4 weeks prior to site visit)
ESI prepares verification plan and submits for project proponent approval/opening meeting; start verification review	19 August 2015
ESI conducts field visit - 2 days onsite	15-16 September 2015 (tentative but needs to be scheduled soon)
ESI submits Round 1 Findings (questions, comments, etc.) after site visit	20 business days after site visit – 15 October 2015
Project Proponent responds to NCRs and Clarifications (Round 1)	October 2015
ESI reviews responses and completes ACR verification (if round 2 is not required)	November 2015
Draft Reports submitted to Project Proponent for review	December 2015 (if additional rounds are not required)
Closing Meeting	December 2015
Final reports submitted to ACR for review/approval	December 2015

*Please note: It is important to note that ESI recognizes the desire of the City of Astoria to complete the project validation/verification in an efficient and effective manner, while minimizing the risks. We believe the timeframes for the project outlined above are sufficient to complete the work; however, the timeframes are dependent upon the execution of the contract, overall preparedness of the project proponent, and holiday schedules. Once a signed contract is received, ESI will coordinate with you to outline the final project timeline to help reach the end goal of February 2016.

WHY ESI?

Our accreditations underline and reinforce our ability to meet the stringent requirements for independent, third-party validators and verifiers of the leading GHG programs. To achieve our accreditation, we successfully completed an exhaustive review and assessment process, during which our unique ability to provide independent and impartial validation and verification of GHG emissions and removals was thoroughly demonstrated.

The ESI philosophy and technical approach stresses experience, competence, communication, and above all, responsiveness to the needs of our clients. We strive to identify potentially complex issues before they become problems and to assist our clients in understanding and dealing with their GHG project validation and verification needs. We look forward to answering any of your questions about our process and look forward to working with you.

APPENDIX B – ANSI CERTIFICATE

CERTIFICATE of ACCREDITATION

GREENHOUSE GAS VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION

The **American National Standards Institute** hereby affirms that

Environmental Services, Inc.

7220 Financial Way, Jacksonville, FL 32256, USA

ACCREDITATION ID#0800

meets the ANSI accreditation program requirements and those set forth in
ISO 14065:2013 Greenhouse gases - Requirements for greenhouse gas validation and verification bodies
for use in accreditation or other forms of recognition

for GHG programs* that recognize ANSI accreditation within the following

SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION

(Please see page 2)

*Visit www.ansi.org for GHG programs recognizing ANSI Accreditation

ANSI

ANSI Accredited Program
GREENHOUSE GAS
VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION

Lane Hallenbeck

ANSI VICE PRESIDENT, ACCREDITATION SERVICES

2016-09-03

VALID THROUGH

Certificate ID: ZUEBPDE

GREENHOUSE GAS VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION

Environmental Services, Inc.

ACCREDITATION ID#0800

SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION

Verification of assertions related to GHG emissions and removals at the organizational level

GRANTED 2011-08-31:
01. General
02. Manufacturing
03. Power Generation
05. Mining and Mineral Production
06. Metals Production
07. Chemical Production
08. Oil and gas extraction, production and refining including petrochemicals
09. Waste

Verification of assertions related to GHG emission reductions and removals at the project level

GRANTED 2010-03-08:
03. Land Use and Forestry

Validation of assertions related to GHG emission reductions and removals at the project level

GRANTED 2010-03-08:
03. Land Use and Forestry

APPENDIX C – RESUMES

Resumes are attached for the following key personnel:

Shawn McMahon
Guy Pinjuv
Jonathan Pomp
Janice McMahon

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

SHAWN MCMAHON
Senior Manager/Lead GHG Validator/Verifier

Education Level:
B.S. Forest Resource Management, University of Florida, 2000

Years Experience:
15

Professional Affiliations:
- Society of American Foresters
- Ohio Forestry Association
- International Society of Arboriculture

Certifications:
- Verified Carbon Standard, AFOLU Expert - WRC
- California Air Resources Board, Lead Verifier, Executive Order H2-13-164
- Society of American Foresters, Certified Forester #4081
- Climate Action Reserve (CAR), Forest and Urban Forest Project Lead Verifier
- ISO 14001 Trained Lead Auditor

Mr. McMahon is a Senior Manager and Lead Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Validator/Verifier for the Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division of ESI, with over 15 years of experience in forestry, ecology, natural resource management, arboricultural, and GHG reduction/removal projects. Mr. McMahon specializes in GHG validations/ verifications, carbon sequestration project development, development/implementation of management plans for enhancement of carbon stocks, development of carbon and environmental asset tracking programs, arboricultural and biological assessments, land management, habitat assessments, endangered/threatened species surveys, and ecosystem services assessment/planning. He is a Certified Forester under the Society of American Foresters, a Certified Arborist under the International Society of Arboriculture, and a Verified Carbon Standard AFOLU-Wetland Restoration and Conservation expert. Mr. McMahon is approved to conduct GHG validations and/or verification for the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), California Air Resources Board (ARB), Climate Action Reserve (CAR), American Carbon Registry (ACR), CarbonFix Standard (CFS), Pacific Carbon Trust (PCT), Natural Forest Standard (NFS), Plan Vivo, and Climate Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and has conducted GHG validations/ verifications of numerous carbon sequestration projects around the world.

At ESI, Mr. McMahon is responsible for team management, client coordination, and performance of senior technical project management, such as conducting third-party, independent GHG validations and verifications. Mr. McMahon also leads lectures and seminars throughout the United States regarding sustainable resource topics, forest carbon project development and verification.

ESI GHG Validation and Verification Experience
ESI has been conducting third-party validations and verification since 2007, and has been accredited by ANSI under the ISO 14065:2007 since March 2010. Due to strict confidentiality requirements associated with many of our current and past projects we are unable to discuss full details of projects; however, the following is a list by program of the past and current project validation/verification experiences. Mr. McMahon has been the Lead validator/verifier or senior team member on each of the following projects:

- Verified Carbon Standard
  - Methodology Validations: Four soil carbon methodologies, one REDD methodology, one REDD methodology revision, one IFM/REDD methodology, and one wetland methodology
  - Project Validation and Verification: Twenty ARR projects (Columbia, Kenya, Uganda, Chile, India, and USA), four REDD projects (Belize, Bolivia, Chile, and Zimbabwe), and one IFM project (Tasmania)
  - 2nd Verification of Risk and/or Leakage: Three REDD projects, four IFM, and two ARR (Tasmania, Kenya, Belize, Lower Mississippi Valley, Malaysia, Uganda)
- Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance
  - Project Validation and Verification: Eight projects (Kenya, Uganda, India, and Colombia)

- Project Validation: Six projects (Panama, Chile, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Bolivia and British Columbia)

- Climate Action Reserve
  - Project Verification: Eleven IFM projects (Arkansas, Virginia, New York, and South Carolina) and one Reforestation project (California)
- California Air Resources Board
  - Early Action Desktop Verifications: Five IFM projects (Maine and California)
  - Full Verifications: Two IFM Projects (Michigan and South Carolina)
- American Carbon Registry
  - Project Verification: Two AR projects (Lower Mississippi Valley)
  - Project Validation and Verification: Two AR projects (Lower Mississippi Valley)
- Natural Forest Standard
  - Project validation/verification: Two projects (Brazil)
- Chicago Climate Exchange
  - Project Verification: 19 projects; AR, Managed, and Long-lived Wood Products (Chile, Brazil, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, New York, Montana, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, and Louisiana)

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

DR. GUY PINJUV
Senior Scientist/Lead GHG Validator/Verifier

Education Level:
Ph.D. Forest Modelling, University of Canterbury, 2006

M.S. Forestry Economics, Northern Arizona University, 2000

B.A. Physics, University of Montana, 1998

B.S. Forestry, University of Montana, 1997

Years Experience:
13

Professional Affiliations:
- Society of American Foresters (Western Representative of the Forest Science and Technology Board)

Certifications:
- Climate Action Reserve Forest and Urban Forest Project Lead Verifier
- California Air Resources Board, Lead Verifier, Executive Order H2-14-190
- Verified Carbon Standard, AFOLU Expert - IFM
- Verified Carbon Standard, AFOLU Expert - REDD

Dr. Guy Pinjuv is a Senior Scientist and Lead Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Validator/Verifier for the Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division of ESI, with over 13 years of experience. Dr. Pinjuv's expertise lies in forest carbon growth modeling, carbon project development, forest offset project validation and/or verification and forestry related methodology assessments.

Prior to joining ESI in September 2013, he worked with Village Corps, where he was the Vice President of Agroforestry and Carbon Finance responsible for large scale implementation and design of Agroecological solutions to climate change and food security. Dr. Pinjuv was also the CEO and founder of Ptarmigan Forestry and Carbon Consulting LLC, which focused on eco asset related strategic planning, carbon project development, and verification. While with Ptarmigan, he acted as the Monitoring Reporting and Verification Specialist for the USAID East Africa Re-Greening Study which contributed to methodologies reducing GHG emissions for scaling-up/applying elsewhere. Results also contributed to national thinking on REDD+/GCC policy and practice development, biodiversity conservation in the sense of USAID funding, and contributed to other co-benefits (such as GCC adaptation, food security, socioeconomic, gender equity, and livelihoods). His skill set of natural resource economics, growth modeling, statistics, biometrics and forestry is essential to project development while his experience as an auditor provides valuable insight to the project validation process.

Dr. Pinjuv also previously worked as a Biodiversity Fellow with The Carbon War Room working on profitable solutions to curb deforestation and habitat loss in Brazil. He has been a forest Ecophysiological Modeler and Forest Economist with the Pacific Northwest Research Station of the USDA Forest Service.

Dr. Pinjuv is approved to conduct GHG validations and/or verification for the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), Climate Action Reserve (CAR), American Carbon Registry (ACR), CarbonFix Standard (CFS), Pacific Carbon Trust (PCT), and Climate Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and has conducted GHG validations/ verifications of numerous forestry offset projects around the world.

At ESI, Dr. Pinjuv is responsible for team management, client coordination, and performance of senior technical project management, such as conducting third-party, independent GHG validations and verifications.

ESI GHG Validation and Verification Experience
ESI has been conducting third-party validations and verification since 2007, and has been accredited by ANSI under the ISO 14065:2007 since March 2010. Due to strict confidentiality requirements associated with many of our current and past projects we are unable to discuss full details of projects; however, the following is a list by program of the past and current project validation/verification experiences. Dr. Pinjuv has been the Lead validator/verifier or senior team member on each of the following projects:

- Expert reviewer of the VCS Methodology VM0003 Version 1.0,
- Technical reviewer of the VCS VM0009 (2010)
- Expert reviewer of a REDD project DNV's Validation/ Verification of Wildlife Works Carbon, Kasigau RED in Kenya in 2011

- Internal Reviewer for DNV's Validation Report for the Kenya Agricultural Carbon Project submitted to VCS by the World Bank.
- Expert Reviewer of the Verification of four Climate Action Reserve avoided conversion projects in North Carolina (2012)
- Expert reviewer VM0009 V1.1 (2012)

- Reserve
  - Project Verification: One IFM Project
- California Air Resource Board
  - Early Action Desktop Verifications: One IFM project
  - Full Verifications: One IFM Project

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

JONATHAN A. POMP
Senior Forester

Education Level:
M.S. Forestry, West Virginia University, 2008

B.S. Forest Resources Management, West Virginia University, 2006

Years Experience:
6

Professional Affiliations:
- Society of American Foresters
  - WV Division Executive Committee Member
- WV Board of Registered Professional Foresters
- International Society of Arboriculture

Certifications:
- California Air Resources Board, Lead Verifier, Executive Order H2-14-188
- SAF Certified Forester #3966
- WV Registered Professional Forester #731
- MI Registered Professional Forester #3301046058
- SC Registered Professional Forester #1852
- ISA Certified Arborist #MA-5347A
- Wildland Firefighting (I-100, S-130, S-190)
- WV Certified Commercial Pesticide Applicator (Categories 3, 7, 13C)

Mr. Pomp is a Senior Forester for the Forestry, Carbon, and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Services Division of ESI. He has a very diverse forestry-related background with over six years of professional experience. Mr. Pomp's specialties include forest/fire ecology, forest inventory, growth/yield modeling and associated biological and financial analyses, forest carbon offsets, forestry reclamation/reforestation of disturbed sites, and Right-of-Way (ROW) vegetation management.

For more than half of his professional career, Mr. Pomp has specialized in the area of forest carbon offset consulting, design and implementation, quantification & analysis, marketing, strategy development, project development, and validation/verification. He has managed Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) Managed Forest projects and has extensive experience in conducting various forest carbon inventories and market feasibility studies. At ESI, Mr. Pomp is responsible for GHG forestry offset project validations/verifications, forest biometrics, project scoping analyses, and field assessments for projects around the world.

Mr. Pomp has wide-ranging experience with forestry offset projects under rule sets of the CCX, the Climate Action Reserve (Reserve), the California Environmental Protection Agency's Air Resources Board (ARB), the United States Department of Energy (US DOE) 1605(b), various Over-the-Counter (OTC) scenarios, the Duke standard (Harnessing Farms and Forests in a Low-Carbon Economy), the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), the American Carbon Registry (ACR), International Standards Organization (ISO) International Standards, and the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS). He has spoken at various venues and has co-authored informative articles pertaining to carbon markets and forestry offset opportunities.

Mr. Pomp is a professional member of The Society of American Foresters (SAF), and is currently a Certified Forester (CF) with the organization; he also serves on the Executive Committee for the WV Division. He is a Registered Professional Forester in West Virginia (WV), Michigan, and South Carolina, and a Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture. Mr. Pomp is also a Certified Commercial Pesticide Applicator in WV with authorization to apply herbicides for vegetation management in forests and ROWs.

ESI GHG Validation and Verification Experience
ESI has been conducting third-party validations and verification since 2007, and has been accredited by ANSI under the ISO 14065:2007 since March 2010. Due to strict confidentiality requirements associated with many of our current and past projects we are unable to discuss full details of projects; however, the following is a list by program of the past and current project validation/verification experiences for Mr. Pomp since joining ESI in the fall of 2012.

- Verified Carbon Standard
  - Project Validation and Verification: Six ARR project (Kenya, Uganda, India, Lower Mississippi Valley, and Chile), Six IFM projects (Papua New Guinea and Australia), Six REDD Projects (Papua New Guinea, Brazil, Peru, and Indonesia)
- Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance

- Project Validation and Verification: Five projects (Kenya, Australia, Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Canada)

- Reserve
  - Project Verification: Eight IFM projects (Arkansas, Virginia, and South Carolina)
- California Air Resource Board
  - Early Action Desktop Verifications: Five IFM projects (Maine and California)
  - Full Verifications: Two IFM Projects (Michigan and South Carolina)
- American Carbon Registry
  - Project Verification: Two ARR Projects (Mississippi Alluvial Valley)
- ISO International Standards
  - Project Validation and Verification: One ARR Project (Canada)

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

JANICE P. MCMAHON

Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division Director

Education Level:
M. S. Wildlife Science, Auburn University, 2000

B. S. Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Minors in Forestry and Zoology, University of Florida, 1998

Years Experience:
14

Professional Affiliations:
- The Wildlife Society
- Society of American Foresters

Certifications:
- CSA America Certified Greenhouse Gas Quantifier
- CSA America Certified Greenhouse Gas Verifier
- The Wildlife Society Certified Wildlife Biologist®
- H2S Alive, Certification number 62683-12586-67705
- ISO 14064 Series Class Certifications (GHG Management Institute)
- Climate Action Reserve – Orientation for Verifiers
- The Climate Registry, Verification and Accreditation Orientation
- Master Tree Farmer
- Master Wildlifer Program
- GT Management and Mitigation Professional Training Program
- Certified Wetland Professional in Training

Ms. McMahon is the Forestry, Carbon, and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Services Division Director for ESI, with over 14 years of experience in ecology, forestry, natural resources, GHG emissions inventory and reduction projects, and GHG validations/verifications. Ms. McMahon specializes in natural resource management projects including carbon sequestration feasibility assessments, development/implementation of management plans for enhancement of ecosystem services, assessment of GHG emissions and reductions, development of environmental asset tracking programs, GHG validations and verifications, endangered/ threatened species assessments, habitat management plans, and integrated ecosystem services plans. She is a Certified Wildlife Biologist under The Wildlife Society (TWS) guidelines and is also a CSA Standards Certified GHG Verifier and Inventory Quantifier. Ms. McMahon was instrumental in establishing ESI as an authorized GHG validator/verifier for The Climate Registry (TCR), British Columbia Reporting Regulation (BC Reg. 272/2009), Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX), Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), Climate Action Reserve (CAR), California Air Resource Board (ARB), American Carbon Registry (ACR), CarbonFix Standard (CFS), Pacific Carbon Trust (PCT), Natural Forest Standard (NFS), Plan Vivo, and Climate Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA). Ms. McMahon led ESI through the process of receiving accreditation from American National Standards Institute (ANSI) under ISO 14065:2007 for greenhouse gas validation and verification bodies. The scope of accreditation includes ISO 14065:2007, ISO 14064-3:2006, verification/validation of assertions related to greenhouse gas emission reductions and removals at the project level for Land Use and Forestry (Group 3), and verification of assertions related to GHG emissions and removals at the organizational level for the following sectors: General (Group 1), Manufacturing (Group 2), Power Generation (Group 3), Mining and Mineral Production (Group 5), Metals Production (Group 6), Chemical Productions (Group 7), Oil and Gas (Group 8), Waste (Group 9).

Ms. McMahon is responsible for leading the Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division, which includes client and team coordination, proposal preparation and review, marketing presentations, maintenance of ESI's ANSI accreditation and Management System, and quality assurance and quality control for projects in the United States as well as the international market. Ms. McMahon also leads lectures and seminars throughout the United States and internationally regarding the carbon markets and opportunities and GHG validations/verifications. Ms. McMahon has been the Lead Verifier on over 25 GHG Compliance reports in BC and has provided technical review or QA/QC on 100+ AFOLU offset projects and methodology assessments around the world.

ESI GHG Validation and Verification Experience

ESI has been conducting third-party validations and verification since 2007, and has been accredited by ANSI under the ISO standards previously identified since March 2010. Due to strict confidentiality requirements associated with many of our current and past projects we are unable to discuss full details of projects; however, the following is a list by program of the past and current project validation/verification experiences. Ms. McMahon has been in integral part (QA/QC and/or Lead) to each of the following projects:

- British Columbia Reporting Regulations (BC Reg. 272/2009)
  - Organizational level verifications: 25 projects (oil and gas production, pulp and paper, and general greenhouse) - reporting years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013
- Verified Carbon Standard
  - Methodology Assessments: Four ALM methodologies, one REDD methodology, three REDD methodology revision, one IFM/REDD methodology, two IFM methodologies, and two WRC methodologies
  - Project Validation and Verification: Twenty ARR projects (Columbia, Kenya, Uganda, Chile, India, South Africa and USA), six REDD project (Belize, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, and PNG), and two IFM project (Tasmania)
  - Project Validations: four ARR projects (Kenya, USA, and South Africa), and three REDD Projects (Zimbabwe and Brazil)
  - Project Verifications: five IFM projects (Tasmania and USA), and five REDD projects (Zimbabwe, Kenya, Borneo, and Brazil)
  - 2nd Verification of Risk and/or Leakage: Three REDD projects, four IFM, and two ARR (Tasmania, Kenya, Belize, Lower Mississippi Valley, Malaysia, Uganda)
- Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance
  - Project Validation and Verification: Eight projects (Kenya, Uganda, India and Colombia)
  - Project Validation: Fourteen projects (Panama, Chile, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Kenya, Bolivia, Belize, Brazil, Peru, and British Columbia)
  - Project Verifications: Four projects (Kenya, Brazil, Borneo, Zimbabwe)
- Climate Action Reserve
  - Project Verification: Twelve IFM projects (Arkansas, Virginia, New York, California, and South Carolina) and one Reforestation project (California)
- American Carbon Registry
  - Project Verification: Five AR projects (Lower Mississippi Valley)
  - Project Validation and Verification: Two AR projects (Lower Mississippi Valley) and one ALM project (Midwest)
- Plan Vivo
  - Second (desktop only)- verification on existing project for offset buyer
- Natural Forest Standard
  - Project validation/verification: Two projects (Brazil)
- California Air Resource Board
  - Early Action Desktop Review: Twelve IFM projects (USA)
  - Full Verification: Five IFM projects (USA)
- Chicago Climate Exchange
  - Project Verification: 19 projects; AR, Managed, and Long-lived Wood Products (Chile, Brazil, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, New York, Montana, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, and Louisiana)

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

Impartiality and Conflict of Interest Questionnaire

For GHG Validation and/or Verification Services

In compliance with ISO 14064-3, ISO I4065, and the Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI) Management System, please provide the name, company/entity, and contact information (phone, email, address) for all individuals and/or firms who have been involved in the development and ongoing management of the project. This information will be used exclusively to identify any conflicts of interest arising from a pre-existing or currently-occurring relationship between ESI and the project stakeholders. Stakeholders are defined as being one or more of the following:

- Individuals/firms involved in developing and/or submitting Project Development Documents, individuals/firms with a material (financial) interest in the credits generated, and related.
- Individuals/firms involved in providing technical assistance relative to project development, either on a fee basis or otherwise.
- Individuals/firms having a financial interest in the ownership of the land on which the project is occurring.
- Individuals/firms involved in providing financial capital to support project development and/or management.

Please complete the following table for the City of Astoria, Bear Creek Watershed IFM Project – ACR Validation/Verification in Astoria, Oregon. Attach additional pages as necessary.

Name	Company/Entity	Contact Information	Responsibility

Authorized Representative Signature: _____

Name and Title (printed): _____

Company/Entity: _____

Date: _____

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance. This information will ensure a thorough investigation to prevent situations of real or perceived conflicts of interest, and allow us to better serve you. Please return the completed form to Janice McMahon at jmcmahon@esinc.cc.

VO15044.00 COI Questionnaire.doc
K: pf'07/01/15f

CITY OF ASTORIA
Founded 1811 ● Incorporated 1856

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM 7(c)
HERITAGE SQUARE ENVIRONMENTAL UPDATE

NO DOCUMENTATION IS INCLUDED FOR THIS AGENDA ITEM